

Weldon (FL)	Whitfield	Wynn
Weldon (PA)	Wise	Young (AK)
Weygand	Wolf	Young (FL)
White	Woolsey	

NAYS—49

Abercrombie	Hooley	Rush
Borski	Jackson-Lee	Sabo
Brown (CA)	(TX)	Skaggs
Brown (OH)	Johnson, E. B.	Slaughter
Clay	Jones	Strickland
DeFazio	King (NY)	Taylor (MS)
Dickey	Kucinich	Thompson
English	LaFalce	Thune
Ensign	LoBiondo	Vento
Fawell	Maloney (NY)	Visclosky
Fazio	McDermott	Wamp
Filner	Menendez	Watt (NC)
Furse	Miller (CA)	Watts (OK)
Gutknecht	Neal	Weller
Hefley	Oberstar	Wicker
Hilliard	Pickett	Yates
Hinchee	Ramstad	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Bilbray

NOT VOTING—54

Andrews	Ford	Owens
Becerra	Frank (MA)	Oxley
Berman	Franks (NJ)	Pascrell
Blumenauer	Gonzalez	Pelosi
Boucher	Gordon	Riggs
Brown (FL)	Green	Rothman
Buyer	Gutierrez	Scott
Clyburn	Hastings (FL)	Sensenbrenner
Collins	Herger	Smith (NJ)
Conyers	Kaptur	Smith (TX)
Cox	Kasich	Smith, Linda
Crane	Kleczka	Stark
Cummings	Klug	Stearns
Dixon	Lipinski	Thornberry
Engel	McInnis	Torres
Flake	McIntosh	Towns
Foley	Meehan	Velazquez
Forbes	Nadler	Wexler

□ 1019

Mr. DICKEY changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 68. I was inadvertently detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). Will the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. THUNE] come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. THUNE led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 514. An Act to permit the waiver of District of Columbia residency requirements for certain employees of the Office of the Inspector General of the District of Columbia.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments in

which the concurrence of the House is requested, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 58. Joint resolution disapproving the certification of the President under section 490(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 regarding foreign assistance for Mexico during fiscal year 1997.

The message also announced that in accordance with section 1505(a)(1)(B)(ii) of Public Law 99-498, the Chair, on behalf of the President pro tempore, appoints the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CAMPBELL] to the board of trustees of the Institute of American Indian and Alaska Native Culture and Arts Development.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain 1-minute at the end of legislative business.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1062

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the gentleman from California [Mr. BILBRAY] be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 1062.

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

There was no objection.

PROVIDING AMOUNTS FOR THE EXPENSES OF CERTAIN COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES IN THE 105TH CONGRESS

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 105 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 105

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution the House shall consider without the intervention of any point of order 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. An amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of House Resolution 102 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) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on House Oversight; and (2) one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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 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 once again makes in order House Resolution 91 authorizing funding for all but one of the committees of the House of Representatives for the 105th Congress, but this time under a closed rule providing 1 hour of debate divided equally between the chairman and ranking minority of the Committee on House Oversight.

The rule provides for consideration in the House without intervention of any point of order, it provides that the amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of House Resolution 102 shall be considered as adopted. It further provides for one motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, the new funding resolution that is made in order by this rule is a reasonable compromise. I applaud the work of Chairman THOMAS and others who helped put this compromise together.

It will allow our committees to continue operating until May 2 while freezing funding levels for all committees covered by the resolution except the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight at the 104th Congress levels. This will also allow us to maintain our commitment to take the lead in downsizing and streamlining Government.

More important, Mr. Speaker, it will allow the Government Reform and Oversight Committees's investigation into campaign fundraising abuses by the Clinton administration to proceed despite the best efforts of our colleagues in the minority to cover up those abuses and undermine our constitutional responsibility to investigate wrongdoing in the executive branch.

The resolution also maintains a \$7.9 million authorization for a reserve fund for unanticipated expenses of the committees of the 105th Congress because it makes sense. As my colleagues know, at the beginning of the 104th Congress, three annual funding sources for committees consolidated into one biennial calendar year funding resolution to make our committees fully accountable for what they spend. So a small reserve fund fully accounted for and open to public scrutiny to cover unexpected funding emergencies in the second session makes sound business sense.

Virtually every well-managed business in America has a reserve fund for unanticipated contingencies. We can benefit from implementing sound business practices in the House of Representatives. Mr. Speaker, failure to pass this rule and the funding resolution it makes in order would leave our committees without funds to operate after March 31. That is the reason I suspect many of our colleagues in the

minority oppose this resolution, but it is an irresponsible position and it damages the integrity of the whole institution, not just the majority or minority.

I urge my colleagues to do the responsible thing. We are trying to move along as expeditiously as possible because we know many Members want to leave town. I will assure my friends on the other side of the aisle that we hope that we will not consume the entire amount of time here. I hope they will do the same.

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

□ 1030

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HINOJOSA] for the purposes of a unanimous-consent request.

(Mr. HINOJOSA asked and was given permission to speak out of order.)

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR
OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 1

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove my name as cosponsor of House Joint Resolution 1.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, this is take two. I thank my dear friend, DAVID DREIER, the gentleman from California, for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in very strong opposition to this rule, and I must say that I am very disappointed in my Republican colleagues for bringing this matter up again. Yesterday's rule was defeated for three reasons: My Democratic colleagues and I were opposed to the ridiculously large investigative budget for the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight. The budget will be only used to investigate Democrats, despite the many Republican campaign problems reported in the papers.

And we, like most American citizens, could not believe that our Congress was proposing creating a brand new \$7.9 million slush fund for itself. As I understand it, my Republican colleagues, along with my Democratic colleagues, objected to the large increase in overall spending contained in this resolution because, Mr. Speaker, Members who talk about cutting Medicare, Members who talk about cutting school lunches in order to give tax breaks to the rich will have a very difficult time explaining a vote to spend millions of dollars of taxpayers' money for Congress to dip in whenever it wants.

None of this should have been news to the Republican leadership. For days the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT], and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR], have been trying to work with their Republican counterparts to work out a way to temporarily

fund committees so that negotiations could begin on the size, the scope and the expense of the investigation by the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight. But, Mr. Speaker, their overtures were ignored, and this is very unfortunate.

Furthermore, after the rule was defeated yesterday, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY], said on the floor of this House that he was going to talk to the Democratic leadership about the situation. We waited, we waited, we waited, and nobody came. Instead, Republicans retreated to their conference and came up with a solution that I imagine will only get Republican votes.

Mr. Speaker, I am not one to begrudge the majority party the right to run this House as it sees fit, but this latest episode makes me question the sincerity of the Republican leadership's commitment to bipartisanship on the part of the House, especially on the heels of the retreat at Hershey.

First, the bill will increase the amount of overall funding that Congress gives itself. Second, unlike the Senate investigation, the House Committee on Government Reform and Oversight is only going to look at allegations of Democratic campaign problems, despite the many Republican campaign issues surfacing these days. Third, Mr. Speaker, we objected to the \$7.9 million slush fund that my Republican colleagues are creating for undisclosed purposes.

Given these problems and the subsequent defeat of the rule, I would have expected my Republican colleagues to have gone back to the drawing board and fixed their mistakes. But late last night, Mr. Speaker, after waiting for that call that never came, we learned that they are only going to make the mistakes worse.

Today's resolution cuts only \$500,000 from yesterday's \$22 million; \$22 million increase, rather. It fully funds that partisan witch hunt in the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight and it does not change the scope of the investigation one iota. It does not say, OK, we will look into our own garbage while we are looking into everybody else's, and it fully funds that \$7.9 million Republican slush fund.

Mr. Speaker, when I first saw this resolution last night in the Committee on Rules, I really thought it was a joke somebody was playing on me. This resolution spends a total of \$6 million on all the House committees except one, and that one is the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

That committee, the committee that decided it wants to spend its time and taxpayer money digging up dirt on Democrats, gets \$20 million. Let me repeat that, Mr. Speaker. One committee gets \$20 million and all the other committees, totaled together, get \$6 million. Even the Republican slush fund gets more money than all the other committees in the House combined.

Mr. Speaker, I was in the House Chamber during every minute of yes-

terday's debate on this resolution and I did not hear one single person complain about the money the committees of the House received except the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight. So in response to that, my Republican colleagues increased the amount of money the committee gets and cut the amount that the rest get. Does not make any sense to me.

Yesterday my colleagues complained long and loud about the \$7.9 million slush fund but they did not make a peep about the other committees. But this resolution cuts all the other committees instead of the committee that everybody complained about.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot imagine why my colleagues on the other side of the aisle who opposed the rule yesterday because the bill spent \$22 million over last year's level would vote for a resolution that saves only \$500,000 while it still increases the spending of hard-earned taxpayers' dollars by over \$20 million.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, it looks like the Republican leadership is not interested in a bipartisan solution. If they were, they would have called to talk and they would have asked us for our input on committee funding and they would have tried to work together. Instead, they are giving us a proposal that ignores the concerns expressed by our side and puts into stark relief the Republican leadership's priorities: pure, partisan politics.

The only thing kept whole in this resolution is the one-sided, politically motivated, partisan investigation at the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight. And to ensure the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight has enough money, as I said before, \$7.9 million set aside in a slush fund just in case.

Mr. Speaker, in the Republican Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, the new star-chamber of campaign finance issues, there has been no input from the Democratic Members on the size and scope of this investigation; no input from Democratic Members on the issuing of subpoenas; no input from Democratic Members on how documents are to be handled in the committee; and, Mr. Speaker, it is not because the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN], has not tried.

The Senate was able to handle this issue in a bipartisan fashion. It is a shame their Republican counterparts in the House have not followed their example.

Mr. Speaker, the American people are sick and tired of the mud-slinging and the cynical partisanship that is being carried on by the Republicans in this one-sided investigation. I call on my Republican colleagues to put an end to it. Everybody knows there are many better ways for this House to vote and spend millions of taxpayers' dollars that would make our constituents proud, Mr. Speaker. This is not one of them.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Grand Rapids, MI [Mr. EHLERS], a member of the committee.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding me this time.

The previous speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts, has so totally mischaracterized the issue before us that it is necessary for me to run through it once again and outline precisely what this resolution will do.

First of all, it will establish funding for all committees, other than the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, until May 2, 1997. This interim funding is to permit the committees to operate during the next month while we resolve some of the questions which were raised yesterday.

Furthermore, it establishes for the entire 2-year cycle the funding for the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight at a 2-year funding level of \$20 million, including \$3.8 million for investigative purposes in 1997 alone. Furthermore, it authorizes a reserve fund of \$7.9 million for the entire 105th Congress.

I also have to respond to the characterization of the gentleman from Massachusetts that this is a slush fund. I am from Michigan. I know what slush is. It is dirty, it is messy and it gets splashed all over. That may accurately characterize the way the Members on the other side of the aisle handled the money under the jurisdiction of the Committee on House Administration during their tenure, but this reserve fund is not a slush fund.

This is going to be a tightly controlled reserve fund. It will be under the control of the Committee on House Oversight and it will be parceled out only when necessary and for appropriate purposes. That is certainly not a slush fund. It is out in the open. All decisions will be in the open, widely publicized, and not a slush fund of the type that we are familiar with from Congresses prior to the 104th.

This resolution also provides that any increase in spending in the 105th Congress, as compared to the 104th Congress, must be offset by spending decreases in other legislative branch activities. In other words, this is a zero sum in terms of funding. It is a very important provision, and that helps us fulfill our commitment to balancing the budget.

Under this resolution, committee staff levels remain at one-third of the levels of the 103d Congress, continuing to fulfill the promise we made in the Contract With America more than 2 years ago.

It is a good resolution. It freezes the current committee funding at its current level, which is also the level we had in the 104th Congress, and which is substantially below the level of the 103d Congress when the gentleman across the aisle was in charge.

Mr. Speaker, I urge we adopt this resolution. It is fair, it is proper, and it will get us on the track to better government in this House and in this Nation.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to say that if that \$7.9 million is not a slush fund, I do not know what it is. It will be used for undisclosed purposes. It will be a fund that Members of this House will not be able to vote on. I note the Democrats never pocketed money away like that in this kind of legislation.

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

Mr. MOAKLEY. I yield to the gentleman from New York, the chairman of the Committee on Rules, if he can deny that charge.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that if he looks at the National Taxpayers' Union ratings, he is listed as one of the biggest spenders in the Congress. And the same people are arguing this point?

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, evidently, the gentleman just showed he has no answer.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GEJDENSON].

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I would have thought there would have been additional funds in this bill for medical needs of Members on the majority side who had their arms twisted yesterday. I have not been able to find that.

They have done a fine job of it, I understand. They marched them in, they had them explain why they voted against it yesterday, and then they brought them back here all united. But let us make sure that the other side understands what they are united on.

This is not a freeze. What this is is an increase over last year's spending. They can be for it or against it, but they cannot call it a freeze.

□ 1045

You increase spending on Mr. BURTON's committee by \$4.8 million, you increase with a slush fund of \$7.9 million, and you have increased funding for the other committees in this bill before us today of \$5.8 million. So what you have here is an increase in funding. You can bring them home to your caucuses and tell them they have got to stay with the party line. You can tell them not to talk to the Democrats and try to work anything out, but you cannot call it a freeze.

Now, you may be able to argue for the other committees in this Congress that they need those funds. I do not have a problem with that. Where we do have a problem is on a rogue operation that is being put together here to spend at least \$4.8 million and possibly another \$7.9 million without dealing with the issues that the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN] has raised.

So let us get straight where we are today. You are going to vote for the same thing you voted for yesterday, minus half a million, because what it does is it continues the funding for the next several months, and if you follow that pattern you are not freezing spending.

Now, if you want to be for an increase, vote for an increase. If you want to be for a slush fund, stand up and admit that you think you need a slush fund. But do not fool yourselves. This is not a freeze. What you are doing is you are taking yesterday's bill, you are moving the numbers around, and at the end of the day you are increasing spending over last year.

Ask your own guys before you come up to vote. If you follow through the numbers that are in this program, if you continue what you have set up between now and May 2, will you spend the same amount of money as last year or will you spend more money than last year? And the answer is, you are spending more money than last year.

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

Mr. GEJDENSON. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, for the new Members on both sides of the aisle, I am not one that demagogues this institution. As a matter of fact, I am very definitely opposed to demagoguing this institution, on either side. Unfortunately, in the past we have seen that. It has denigrated the image of this institution with the American public.

I will tell my colleagues on either side of the aisle that all of us, every one of us, is adversely impacted by that kind of debate, but we ought to be honest in the debate. And I want to say to my friends on your side of the aisle, particularly as you attacked or raised in pointed terms how we were not accurately funding the committees, and say to my friend from Michigan who says this is a freeze. It is not. There is \$8,170,000 that under the Contract With America would have to have been included in this budget, because you said that what Democrats were doing were taking detailees from the Department of Energy, the Department of Defense and having them on committees and not accurately reflecting the expenditures of the committee.

I will tell my friends, particularly those of you who voted "no" yesterday and who are for honesty in budgeting and putting before the American public what the expenses of the committee are. We have changed that policy just 22 months after it was so proudly adopted, where the committee last Congress said that committees would have to fund their detailees. We have now included back detailees off budget, so your committees that you are going to fund in this bill can spend \$8,170,000 beyond what is in this budget.

If that is what you meant by reform, if that is what you meant by the Contract With America, I think some of us

were deceived, and frankly I think some of you were deceived. For that reason this is clearly not a freeze.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time and closing on that point, you are spending \$18.5 million more than last year.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Winter Park, FL [Mr. MICA], the chairman of the Subcommittee on Civil Service.

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

Mr. Speaker, the other side would have you believe that we are being unfair in this process as far as funding. I serve on the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight. I came to the floor back in 1993 and 1994 and asked for fairness. We were given initially 5 investigative staff, and this is when they controlled the White House, the House and the other body, 5 investigative staff to their 55 staffers. It was finally brought up to 12. But let me tell my colleagues that we provide for 25 percent staffing for the minority under our proposal. Is that fair? I just ask, are we being unfair?

They would also have my colleagues believe that the reason for last night's delay was that some of us were opposed to the investigation or that we caused these problems by investigating. Nothing could be further from the truth. This is the responsibility of the House and this House Investigations and Oversight Committee to do this task. It has been that task since the early 1800's, when the predecessor of this committee was formed.

Let me read you this morning's paper about why we need these funds and what these funds will be used for. And this is not what I say. This is what is in the paper this morning:

The Clintons and their administration are submerged in what one Democrat activist has called a scandal of unprecedented proportions: China-gate, Lippo-gate, Campaign-gate, File-gate, Travel-gate, Whitewater-gate, the illegal naturalization of alien criminals in order to swell Democratic voter rolls, IRS-political-auditing-gate, Waco, Ruby Ridge, Reno-gate, Espy-gate, Ron Brown-gate, Paula Jones-gate, Lincoln-bedroom-gate, an FBI director who admits he lied to Congress, special prosecutors, congressional investigations, disgrace Presidential appointees, and innumerable first couple utterances of "I don't recall" swirl in such profusion around the Presidency that only rocket scientists can keep up with it all.

That is why we need these funds. To accuse us of creating a slush fund, when I saved over \$200,000 in my first 2 years and it went into a fund that we never saw again, not to mention the banking scandal, the post office scandal, I mean this other side of the aisle created the term "slush funds" with their actions.

Mr. Speaker, that is what we are here for.

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

I would like to ask my colleague from Florida what paper he is quoting.

Mr. MICA. If the gentleman will yield, I am quoting columnist Paul Craig Roberts.

Mr. MOAKLEY. What paper?

Mr. MICA. I do not have the title of the paper. It was just given to me.

Mr. MOAKLEY. The Washington Times. A very liberal newspaper, very well read, well accepted.

Mr. SOLOMON. It happens to be a very good newspaper, too, my friend.

Mr. MICA. At least someone tells the truth.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER].

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

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

Mr. Speaker, what we have seen the last 2 days unfortunately seems to be a metaphor for what this term in Congress is going to be like. You have a small group on the extreme right of the Republican Party dictating policy to everybody else. We had a proposal last night. Eleven people, twelve people said, do it our way or no way, and you succumbed.

Now, what is it that united this party? Well, if you take the rhetoric of this budget, what you are saying, and the gentleman from Florida corroborates it, you do not want to legislate, you do not want to get things done, you do not want to come to the center and try and deal with the problems of America. All you want to do is investigate.

When a party is divided, when you cannot come to any substantive agreements on virtually any issue, haul out a whole bunch of investigative committees. That is what you have done. That is the only thing that can bring the votes here. We are going to see that, my colleagues, again and again and again. And then even worst of all, it is hypocritical, because you know you cannot budget with a freeze. You know you cannot do the job. So you tell those Members it is a freeze, but it really is not, as has been pointed out before.

I am afraid we are in for 2 rough years of sledding. I am afraid, seeing what I have seen here, that we are going to have an extremist small group dictate policy on the floor of the House, that there will be no interest in coming to the center and legislating and that to cover up the fractured differences of the other party, we are going to spend a lot of time doing a lot of dances about investigation, investigation, investigation when we all know the Congress is the worst place to investigate these kinds of things because partisan clouds hang over every investigation.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Falls Church, VA [Mr. DAVIS].

(Mr. DAVIS of Virginia asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. If Congress is not the one to be investigating this, maybe some of my colleagues would join with us in calling for a special prosecutor on some of these areas, that we clear that up instead of Congress having to do the work. But let me make a couple of points.

The Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, which I think has been greatly maligned this morning. Under the 103d Congress, when we were still in a minority, it then comprised one committee. In the 104th Congress we combined it into three committees from the old Congress, the Post Office and Civil Service and the District of Columbia Committee. Under the funding currently proposed, we are at 75 percent for the committees of what the funding was in the 103d Congress, even with all of the additional money that is being given for investigations; on a trail, I might add, that leads to China, to Cuba, to Guam, to Hawaii, to Hong Kong, to Indonesia, to Paraguay, to South Korea, to Taiwan, to Thailand, to the Ukraine and Vietnam, very extensive investigation, multilanguages involved. Still even with these and the combining, 75 percent of the level that was funded in the 103d Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to speak in favor of the rule.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to my very good friend, the gentleman from Poland, OH [Mr. TRAFICANT].

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I voted with the Democrats yesterday and most Republicans toed the line and we are seeing party discipline, but we are not seeing the Congress governing. \$7.9 million, I do not know if it is a slush fund or an investment. But let me remind Congress as we speak that China got a sweetheart deal in Long Beach, CA; China is getting a United States guaranteed, Government backed loan of \$138 million in Alabama; a Chinese company was just awarded a \$250 million contract even though they have been convicted of smuggling AK-47's into America; and as we speak, a company with ties to China will operate both ports on each end of the Panama Canal that United States taxpayers built. Personally, I think both parties are debating a fly on their face while a Communist dragon is eating our assets here.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to vote for the rule today. I am going to vote for the bill.

Mr. Speaker, \$7.9 million is nothing compared to a \$20 billion trade deficit last month in manufactured goods and products. China in the last 2 months has amassed \$10 billion in trade surpluses. Enough is enough. Look at the impact in our State alone. Two thousand five hundred workers are being laid off by Ford Motor Co. in Lorain, OH. They have cited imports.

□ 1100

Goodyear Tire Co., Akron, OH, cutting 150 workers and moving their plant to Chile. Enough is enough.

And the Department of Labor, they tell us, "Don't worry; there's high tech jobs there."

Look at the Department of Labor manual for new jobs:

Handkerchief folder;
Corncob pipe assembler;
Hooker inspector; and
Pantyhose crotch closer.

And if they get a degree, they could become a pantyhose crotch closer supervisor.

Enough is enough.

Let me say this to both parties: I think there are more Americans that are tired of the Democrat-Republican business. They want us to vote for what they think is best for the country. What I think is best for the country is to give a bull dog, rather than demean him, a bull dog like the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON], the opportunity to get to the bottom of this Chinese mess, regardless who is in the White House, Democrat or Republican.

Now that may not make friends, but I appreciate the time.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] if he has any speakers.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, we are looking for speakers to counter all the speakers that the gentleman has. There are Members who are anxious to talk only if they are.

Mr. MOAKLEY. I think we could have saved a lot of time, Mr. Speaker, if the Democrats were allowed into the Republican caucus yesterday because that convincing argument that changed those 11 Members may have changed all of us.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT].

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I say to my colleagues, "If you want peace, seek justice. The wisdom of that ancient maxim seems to have been completely lost on the Republican leadership of this House. They want peace, they want smiling Democrats at peace on this floor as accomplices to most any injustice that they want to promote. They wanted peace on the opening day of this Congress when instead of adopting a democratic proposal to ask the committee to come back on April 7 with a proposal to reform the campaign finance system, they rejected that, and indeed that committee will not even begin its work by April 7 on doing something about the money chase. They wanted peace on the opening day of this session when they demanded that their own Members elect the Speaker who was himself a "pioneer" in tax free campaign finance. And of course they wanted peace, indeed they want a pat on the back, . . .

Yes, this Republican leadership tells us today—

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I would ask that the Member's words be taken down.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. [Mr. LATOURETTE]. A point of order has been raised. The gentleman from Texas

[Mr. DOGGETT] will please resume his seat, and the Clerk will report the words objected to.

□ 1107

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I am advised by the Parliamentarian that there can be no reference . . . and so I withdraw that part of my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. LATOURETTE]. Is there objection to the request?

There was no objection.

The gentleman from Texas may proceed in order and he has 1 minute remaining on the time yielded to him.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, it is against this background of false peace that today we are asked to focus entirely on alleged wrongdoing at the White House. For myself, I want a thorough and complete investigation of that alleged wrongdoing at the White House. In fact, we can investigate until our heart's content, so long as we apply the same level of scrutiny to this House that we apply to the White House.

Indeed, I suggest to all of my colleagues that they remember the injunction that is found in chapter 6 of Luke when it was said, "How canst thou say to thy brother, 'Brother, let me pull out the mote that is in thine eye,' when thou thyself beholdest not the beam that is in thy own eye. Thou hypocrite, cast out first the beam out of thine own eye and then shall thy see clearly to pull out the mote that is in thy brother's eye."

The problem today is that there seems to be a little bit more interest in pulling out "motes" than in focusing on the "beams" that are a little closer to home. Instead of building on the legitimate public concern on what happened on both sides of the political process in the recent election, that election and that public concern is being used to block and prevent any real reform. That is what this investigation is all about.

Do not legislate reform, investigate and point fingers at the other side. We need thorough scrutiny, but it needs to be scrutiny aimed at peace and justice. In the words of Dr. Martin Luther King, true peace is not merely the absence of tension, it is the presence of justice, and until we get justice, there will be tension.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the Chair how much time is remaining on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] controls 17¾ minutes; the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY] has 10¼ minutes.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to my friend, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARR].

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise just to see if I got this straight. Yesterday we heard some very interesting arguments about in-

terpreting the rules of this House so broadly that the potential scope of the jurisdiction of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, according to folks on the other side, knows no bounds whatsoever and that the committee should, indeed can and indeed should, as they say on the other side, investigate all sorts of things. We have heard additional ones this morning perhaps that they want the committee to go into.

I think I have that right on their side, and I think also I have right their position on the other side that the modest increase in funds that we are proposing in funds on this resolution to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight is too much money. So on the one hand, they want the most expansive reading of the jurisdiction of this committee, and on the other hand, they do not want the funds to do it. Something is not right here, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARR] did not really have it right. We were not concerned that the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight should not investigate everything, but the excuse was being made that the reason they did not go to certain areas is because they did not have jurisdiction. I just wanted to point out in the law that they did have investigative jurisdiction to where they were asked to look. That is all.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE].

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, to my distinguished member of the Committee on Rules, I think what we are trying to do here on the Democratic side is just to provide a little light and a little education on what my colleagues may have gleaned from their meeting yesterday. I wish, as the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY] had said, we might have been flies in the room possibly to understand why this overall change of mind.

I have several points to make. One, I believe the gentleman who talked about creating jobs in America, that is an important issue, and I will simply ask my colleagues to think about the kind of money that they are giving the chairman to investigate the President of the United States and the abuses that they say have occurred, and yet not putting on the floor of the House real campaign finance reform.

If they take the \$15 million that they are now spending, and I might say, I thought my colleagues on the other side would come back and at least bring that number down, but that is \$1 per 15 million people in the United States of America. If they take 30 million people in the United States of America, they have to pay 50 cents for this one-sided investigation.

Then we find out that the Senate spent only \$1.8 million for White House, \$5 million was spent on the House and Senate Iran-Contra investigations, and \$6.9 million was spent on the Senate Watergate investigation.

I cannot understand why we have an investigation where there is no due process, where the chairman can unilaterally issue subpoenas, where the chairman can unilaterally secure documents and then issue the documents publicly. There is no protection, there is no committee oversight, there is no combined effort, and we are giving \$15 million, \$15 million. United States citizens must pay \$1; 30 million citizens must pay 50 cents in order to create this slush fund.

Mr. Speaker, I simply say we can solve all of the problems, create jobs, by bringing real campaign finance reform to the House, investigating all of us, and making sure that the abuses against the American people are not rendered by one person, subpoena power unilateral, document issuers unilateral.

Where is the due process in this whole process? Where are the American people in this process? Real campaign finance reform is the real issue.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to House Resolution 91, the committee funding resolution, because it is fatally flawed and grossly biased in four fundamental areas: First, the chairman's authority to issue subpoenas without a committee vote; second, the chairman's authority to release privileged and confidential documents; third, the scope of the investigation; and fourth, the budget allocation of the committee.

On the chairman's authority to issue subpoenas: Never before in the history of the Government of the United States of America, neither in the Senate, nor in the House, has a chairman of a standing committee, or any other committee, ad hoc or otherwise, exercised the power to unilaterally issue subpoena, without a vote of the committee or the approval of the ranking member.

The power to issue a subpoena is one that should be held by the entire committee, not just the chairman. There is a reason that several members from both sides serve on a committee. The purpose is to allow for a balanced, fair representation of issues and views.

Mr. Speaker, the model for our system of Government is that of a democracy, not a monarchy. Democratic principals should be reflected in every aspect of our governmental systems and should be reflected in the way in which Congress does the business of the American people. Thus, the decision to issue a subpoena should be reserved for the several members of the committee, not just the chairman.

The potential for abuse of this increasing power is enormous. No less than 30 subpoenas have already been unilaterally issued by the chairman. There are no safeguards in place to check the abuse of this roaming power. The unilateral issuing of these 30 unnecessary subpoenas clearly shows that there is no doubt that the chairman will abuse this unfounded privilege.

No established rules of congressional precedents have been followed in the issuing of up-

ward of 30 subpoenas. We must not allow a chairman to randomly issue subpoenas.

The nature of the subpoenas issued is most troubling. They seek to compel the production of extraordinarily sensitive national security and foreign policy documents that have absolutely no bearing on the substance of the committee's work and oversight.

This is a gross abuse of power. This is a witch hunt in the making with no end in sight. Chairman BURTON has issued subpoenas for all phone records from Air Force One and Air Force Two, which include phone calls made by the President and his national security team to heads of state on sensitive foreign policy negotiations.

Additionally, the chairman has issued subpoenas for all records of visitors to the White House residence for the past 4 years. This is a gross invasion of privacy which makes no exception for Chelsea Clinton's friends, relatives of the first family, or visits by doctors or clergy.

The chairman has issued subpoenas for the production of documents from the Democratic National Committee. This shows the pure partisan motives of the chairman and amounts to nothing more than an abuse of power. The chairman has requested the production of documents that have no place within the scope of the committee's scope of investigation.

If we allow the chairman of a committee to issue subpoenas solely on his own authority, then it will amount to nothing more than a witch hunt and a gross waste of time for the Congress and the people of the United States.

No one would be safe. There is no doubt that it would return us to the infamous days of the Red scare McCarthy hearings. The entire country was held hostage by misplaced power. But even then, it was not the chairman who acted alone in acting, it was a committee. How much more would the lives of hard-working Americans be violently disrupted by a power hungry, overzealous chairman of a committee who has the power to drag Americans before a committee.

On authority to unilaterally release documents: The chairman wants the power to unilaterally release these documents once he gets them. This is, without question, an abuse of power and a violation of the longstanding customs of the House. No committee chairman has ever been given the power that Chairman BURTON seeks.

This will allow the chairman to release documents, without anyone else's consent, that are submitted to the committee. This includes confidential financial records and trade secrets, medical histories and other personal records of individuals.

If given the inordinant power that the chairman seeks, he will be allowed to release the names of confidential FBI informants and other confidential law enforcement information, as well as privileged attorney-client communications.

Neither in Whitewater, nor in Iran-Contra investigations did a chairman have this type of unilateral authority. The sensitive nature of privileged documents demands that they be kept secret.

On the proposed budget for the investigation: One of the most ridiculous aspects of this resolution is the proposed budget for the Committee on Government Reform, which is over \$20 million. This is nearly a 50-percent increase of \$6.5 million from the budget in the 104th Congress.

Mr. Speaker, at the beginning of this legislative session, the word bipartisanship was promoted by both Democrats and Republicans alike.

Eighteen standing committees of the House and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence each depends upon this resolution for its funding authorization.

The Government Reform and Oversight Committee's reserve funds will weigh in at between \$12 to \$15 million for one purpose and one purpose alone—to waste the taxpayer money and time on bogus hearings on Democratic fundraising activities for last year's election. These hearings will be nothing more than Gestapo tactics and Red scare threats to try and hang all of the problems of campaign fundraising on the backs of hard-working Democrats.

The Government Reform Committee proposes that it will only use \$3.8 million for the investigation of Democratic fundraising. It does not make a difference if it is \$15, \$3, or \$1 million. It is still a gross waste of taxpayer money.

In comparison to other investigations, the \$12 to \$15 million available to the Government Reform Committee for the campaign finance investigation also far exceeds the \$1.8 million spent on the Senate Whitewater investigation, the \$5 million spent on the House and Senate Iran-Contra investigations, and the \$6.9 million spent on the Senate Watergate investigation. after adjusting for investigation.

The official policy of the House Oversight Committee is that "all committees should allocate at least one-third of the resources to the minority." This particular allocation is not being met in the Government Reform Committee.

To add insult to injury, the rules of the Government Reform Committee require that the committee budget be prepared in consultation with the minority. However, despite repeated requests, the majority did not consult with the minority in preparing the proposed committee budget. In fact, the minority was not provided a copy of the budget until 2 weeks after its submission to the House Oversight Committee.

Scope of Investigations: If we are to hold the executive branch to a standard of conduct then we should hold this Congress to the same standard of conduct. This includes both parties—not just the Democrats.

The limited scope of the investigation proposed by this resolution prevents any scrutiny of campaign finance abuses in Congress. Under this approach the committee would be precluded from investigating illegal or improper fundraising activities such as: The use of congressional buildings or telephones for nonprofit organizations to circumvent "hard money" limits, the solicitation of illegal "hard money" corporate contributions, the use of congressional campaign committees to transfer improper campaign contributions, and improper foreign contributions to Members of Congress, among others. There are grounds for investigating this area of the House.

House Resolution 91 states that the scope of the investigation will be limited to fundraising improprieties and possible violations of law by executive branch officials and the Government agencies in the 1996 Presidential campaign.

In stark contrast, the Senate voted 99 to 0 in favor of an investigation of illegal or improper activities in connection with 1996 Federal election campaigns. Unlike the proposed

House investigation, the Senate investigation is not limited to alleged abuses by the executive branch, but will also examine abuses in congressional campaigns. Also real campaign finance reform can be done by passing bipartisan campaign finance reform legislation this year.

In opposing House Resolution 91—this is our opportunity to do what the American people sent us here to do—act in their best interest and make laws that improve the lives of Americans. To do otherwise, is to levy a gross injustice on the backs of the American people.

I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on the passage of this resolution and protect the American people. House Resolution 91 violates the spirit of bipartisanship and fairness that the Republicans were so fond of promoting just a few weeks ago; it is a divisive partisan effort that will only result in gridlock; and because it is a gross waste of taxpayer money that could readily be spent on the children or the disenfranchised in America.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to my very good friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. DOOLITTLE].

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

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, I would submit that campaign finance reform is not the issue. One of the previous speakers said, if we want peace, seek justice. Justice is exactly what we intend to seek.

The question is, why is the Democrat leadership trying to turn the investigation away from the Clinton administration? Here is what they are trying to divert our attention away from.

The President held 103 fund-raising coffees and 58 receptions and dinners at the White House. Here are a few of the disreputable individuals they invited:

Wang Jun, the director of a Chinese arms trading company under investigation for illegally shipping 2,000 fully automatic, Chinese-made AK-47's to the United States, a guest at the White House.

Jorge Gordito Cabrera, a convicted felon currently serving 19 years in prison for conspiring to smuggle 6,000 pounds of cocaine into the United States, another guest of the President and Mrs. Clinton at the White House.

Eric Wynn, another convicted felon whose company, Wireless Advantage, gave \$25,000 to the Democratic National Committee 2 days before Wynn had coffee at the White House. Wynn, who had already served 2 years in prison for a scheme that may have benefited the Bonanno crime family, is reported to have been seeking a pardon from the President. He was at the White House.

Gregori Loutchansky, chairman of NORDEX, an Austria-based company, “associated with Russian criminal activity,” according to former CIA director, John Deutch, who refused to further discuss the company in an open hearing. He was at the White House.

Mr. Speaker, everybody was not doing this. Let us not get distracted from where the real scandal is. Mr.

Speaker, we ought to vote to fund the investigation led by a valiant, honorable, courageous, fearless man, Chairman DAN BURTON, who will get to the bottom of this. I fully support this rules resolution, and the resolution to come after it.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WISE].

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, I understand that everybody is racing to get out of here, but I have to think that this is going to be one of the most fateful votes that we are going to cast today; I have a feeling that in years to come, there are many in this Chamber that are going to rue the day that this vote was cast.

Mr. Speaker, I have been a Member of this body and the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight for 14 years. I am proud of that, and I am proud of the bipartisanship that has always characterized the investigations of that committee.

However, with this resolution what happens is, as I understand it, all committees but one come back in 30 days and the Congress acts on their resolution again. There is only one that gets clear sailing, gets its amount, and that is the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

No one disagrees with the need of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, which is an investigative committee, to do the investigation that needs to be done, whether it be the White House, the DNC, or Congress. Well, no, we all agree that there needs to be an investigation; whom it covers is something else.

I am sad for another reason, because when this resolution passes, Mr. Speaker, there is given to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight unbridled authority, authority that I have never seen, never seen exercised. Certainly in 14 years I have never seen the unilateral issuance of subpoenas, not even the consultation of the minority, much less a vote of the full committee. I have never seen the kind of trickling out in release of documents at the authority of the Chair of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight. I have never seen a committee so eager to investigate one group of alleged abuses, those at the DNC and White House, perhaps, but yet at the same time refuse to investigate other alleged areas.

Make no mistake about it. In the flood of allegations of campaign improprieties, the waters do not stop at the White House porch. They are also lapping at the steps of Congress, and yet this committee, the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, will be given the authority to do one and not the other.

Yes, I have heard about how it does not have the authority. It has the investigative authority to conduct a full investigation. And even if it does not in some people's minds, will somebody tell me what the schedule for inves-

tigations into congressional improprieties is? There is no other committee that intends to get into that.

MR. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER].

(Mr. ARCHER asked and was given permission to speak out of order.)

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR
OF H.R. 1055

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 1055. By clerical error in my office, my name was unfortunately added to that bill.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, can the Speaker notify the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] and myself of the remaining time?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] has 14¼ minutes, and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY] has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE].

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I heard my colleague from California [Mr. DOOLITTLE] say that campaign finance reform is not the issue here. I think the issue is campaign finance reform. What is happening here with this funding resolution is essentially that the Republican leadership is coming up with a great diversionary tactic where they will spend a year or perhaps 2 years at great expense to the taxpayers, essentially to do a probe of the White House, but at the same time they are not willing to open up this investigation to Democrats and Republicans in Congress.

There is no question in my mind about why this is happening. For one, we have the chairman of the committee, the chairman of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, who should be stepping aside. Many of the newspapers, the Washington Post: “Mr. Burton Should Step Aside.” But he does not want to open it up to a full investigation that would look at congressional campaign practices, because the first person they would have to investigate is himself.

□ 1120

So do not tell me that campaign finance reform is not the issue. They do not want to bring up the issue of campaign finance reform.

Day after day on the floor of this House, Democrats, including myself, have asked the Republican leadership to bring up campaign finance reform, to have a debate on campaign finance reform, and so far there has not even been a hearing in this House on campaign finance reform. But we can spend the next year or two looking and investigating the White House in a blatant partisan way at tremendous cost to the American taxpayer.

I just want to say, many of the Republicans who will vote for this resolution today came to Congress promising to shake up the institution and change the way this House does business. How can they vote for this resolution that throws up to \$11 million to an investigation that no one can claim is credible, due to the fact that the chairman of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight now has his own fundraising controversy that needs to be investigated?

If Members vote yes on this resolution, they are voting to waste millions in taxpayer dollars. They are voting to support the chairman of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, who all but admitted to appealing to the Ambassador of Pakistan for campaign contributions. They are voting for business as usual.

If Members vote for this resolution, I would say to my colleagues, congratulations, because they become part of the problem.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my friend, the gentleman from Del Mar, California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I would think that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle would like to at least take a look at this in the committee of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON]. Maybe we can do it a different way.

In my State, Cosco, a Chinese-owned and operated shipping company, has just been awarded to take over the Long Beach Naval Shipyard. Cosco is the same company that just took out the pier in New Orleans. It is the same company, I would say to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER], who passionately believes against assault weapons, and that we have too many weapons in this country, which we do; it is the same company that smuggled in the AK-47's, 2,000 of them, the same kinds of fully automatic weapon that was used in the Los Angeles bank robbery 2 weeks ago.

We have M-2's and grenade launchers that are going down to Mexico City out of Long Beach and could affect, in the next 90 days, the elections to put an anti-United States legislature within the Mexican Government and destroy anything, or the gains we have made.

The Coast Guard has violated Cosco six times this year and designated them unsafe. Yet both the arms dealer and Cosco gave money to the DNC, the President went along with Long Beach to go ahead and certify them, and at the same time this is the same company that is going to occupy, as of last week, both ends of the Panama Canal.

Remember last year when the Chinese went after Taiwan and shot missiles? They made this statement: Do you prefer Los Angeles or Taiwan? I think that is a national security interest that my friends would want to look into. That is why we are asking to take

a look at this, because we feel it is a very important national security issue, not even a campaign issue.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MENENDEZ].

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, so much for Hershey. The wisdom of the Constitution has been the division of powers between judicial, legislative, and executive branches of Government into separate and distinct parts. Congress has always had broad investigative powers, but these powers have been tempered by the hard-earned lessons of the judicial branch enshrined in the traditions of the grand jury.

A grand jury looks at an event, the evidence, and facts surrounding it. It has no presumptions. It is impartial. Releasing information presented to a grand jury is a felony. No special prosecutor, no attorney, no local prosecutor has the authority to issue subpoenas, investigate individuals, and then release this information without bringing criminal charges. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] should not have that power either.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution provides for millions of taxpayers' dollars to invoke powers and authority not even sought by Joseph McCarthy of Wisconsin, who has not brought credit to this institution by his investigative practices. The concentration of such power and authority is unwise and impairs the ability to judge fairly. It is an abuse of power.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution exceeds anything that the Founding Fathers contemplated as far as the appropriate investigative role of the Congress. We do not allow prosecutors to destroy individual rights of privacy, to publicize sensitive information. We certainly should not give millions of dollars to a congressional committee to do so. If Members are going to give such expansive powers, why are they so afraid of including themselves in such an investigative oversight?

Republicans do not seek justice in this process, as we have heard, they seek retribution. This is not about prosecution, this is about persecution. A government of the people and by the people must have certain controls. Let us not make this investigation into one in which the integrity of the House is at stake.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to my friend, the gentleman from Stephensburg, Kentucky [Mr. LEWIS].

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to just say to my colleagues across the aisle that in defense of their party, they remind me of the fox coming out of the chickenhouse with chickens all under his arms and getting caught, and saying: We have to do something about that

lock. But in the meantime, we have to investigate the farmer, because he has been getting chickens out of that henhouse, also.

Mr. Speaker, that is the way it is. Get real. There are problems that stink to high heaven in the DNC and in the White House, and we need to get to the bottom of it. When there are problems like that on this side, let us know and we will try to do something about it, also.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN].

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. LATOURETTE]. The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN) is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, it is wrong for the House to give the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. BURTON, twice as much to conduct a partisan investigation of one branch of Government as the Senate has provided Senator THOMPSON to look at both branches of Government in a bipartisan manner. That is our objection.

Mr. Speaker, I served with my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] 5 years ago when he was the ranking Republican on the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight. We were looking into the fact that the Bush White House had spent millions of dollars on Air Force One and staff to do partisan fundraising around the country.

The American taxpayers were supposed to be reimbursed. They were not. We had one trip down to Florida that cost the taxpayers hundreds of thousands of dollars to campaign for Republican candidates. The Republican National Committee reimbursed the taxpayers \$316. We had another one up and down the west coast, for Republican Senate candidates that cost nearly \$1 million. The RNC reimbursed about \$600 to the taxpayer.

We asked for the official travel logs to do an adequate investigation. The gentleman from Indiana said no, he did not want the White House to release any such information. At the time, he said, "If you suggest that the White House has done anything wrong, you should bring charges, not hold partisan hearings." That is the quote from my friend, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON]. He also said later on when we exposed even worse abuses on the part of the Bush White House, that the Congress should investigate its own problems before launching a fishing expedition on the executive branch.

I would suggest the gentleman from Indiana should take that statement to heart, to investigate the serious improprieties that were alleged in the Washington Post this week, where a current committee chairman, Mr. BURTON, shook down a lobbyist for campaign money and retaliated against that person when he did not raise enough. We have allegations that the Republican leadership is making a friends and enemies list of lobbyists they will and will not talk to.

Roll Call reports that the House Republican leadership is retaliating against groups and individuals who contribute to Democrats. We have a systematic process by which the Republican leadership has intimidated and retaliated against people and organizations who don't contribute enough to them.

To put a stop to such abuses this committee need not look down the mall at the President, but at themselves in the mirror.

We have a chance to forever change the system and enact campaign finance reform. Instead, this resolution will perpetuate the poisonous atmosphere that only contributes to our own demise and the cynicism of the voters.

We must vote this resolution down and place our priorities where they belong—in legislation and working to improve the lives of our constituents rather than finger pointing and partisan warfare.

Mr. Speaker, this is not fair. It is not right. Reject this resolution.

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

Mr. Speaker, we have come to what I think is a very fair and balanced compromise on this issue. We have tried not to consume our entire amount of time because we know both Democrats and Republicans are anxious to get moving, since we have already gone beyond the target adjournment date of yesterday.

Mr. Speaker, to close our debate, but not to use the entire amount of time, because I know he will not do that, I am very pleased to yield such time as he may consume to my dear friend, the gentleman from Bakersfield, CA [Mr. THOMAS], chairman of the Committee on House Oversight.

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

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, where was I? Yes, I remember, I was talking about democracy and majority rule. As a matter of fact, that is the way we make decisions in our constitutional Republic.

I did not realize how prophetic the introduction of my friend, the gentleman from California, yesterday was in talking about the opportunity to explain the Connecticut Compromise, that great compromise that allowed this Government to actually begin to function. The ability to create a more perfect union was based upon compromise.

To differ is human, but the genius of American politics is that we have created a system that allows us to resolve those differences. It is compromise. Yesterday we tried and we failed. Trying and failing is not failure. Failing to try is failure.

Mr. Speaker, the other side used some relatively harsh words today. We know the system that they created in trying to fund and run this institution, in which half of the money for funding committees was never looked at in a public hearing so that the American people knew what was going on. We are offering a more perfect system. The reserve fund is that.

But they have used harsh words today: "Slush fund," "hypocrisy," "extremist." I could go on. My friends say they want to work together, but their choice of words really makes it harder to do so. But as they say, tomorrow is another day, and we look forward to working with them tomorrow or the day after tomorrow.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, for those colleagues on my side of the aisle who, as individuals, reminded us that we all have to work together to be a majority, I thank the gentlemen for reminding us that we do have to include individuals. This system was created on the basis of individuals, and a majority comes together as a collection of individuals. I want to thank them for allowing the American system to work.

Mr. Speaker, I will ask for the support of the previous question and a "yes" on the rule. The majority is working. The Republic is safe.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 218, nays 179, not voting 35, as follows:

[Roll No. 69]

YEAS—218

Aderholt	Coble	Gillmor
Archer	Coburn	Gilman
Armey	Collins	Goodlatte
Bachus	Combest	Goodling
Baker	Cook	Goss
Balanger	Cooksey	Graham
Barr	Cox	Granger
Barrett (NE)	Crane	Greenwood
Bartlett	Crapo	Gutknecht
Barton	Cubin	Hansen
Bass	Cunningham	Hastert
Bateman	Davis (VA)	Hastings (WA)
Bereuter	Deal	Hayworth
Bilbray	DeLay	Hefley
Bilirakis	Diaz-Balart	Herger
Bliley	Dickey	Hill
Blunt	Doolittle	Hillery
Boehlert	Dreier	Hobson
Boehner	Duncan	Hoekstra
Bonilla	Dunn	Horn
Bono	Ehlers	Hostettler
Brady	Ehrlich	Houghton
Bryant	Emerson	Hulshof
Bunning	English	Hunter
Burr	Ensign	Hutchinson
Burton	Everett	Hyde
Callahan	Ewing	Inglis
Calvert	Fawell	Istook
Camp	Foley	Jenkins
Campbell	Fowler	Johnson (CT)
Canady	Fox	Johnson, Sam
Cannon	Frelinghuysen	Jones
Castle	Galleghy	Kelly
Chabot	Ganske	Kim
Chambliss	Gekas	King (NY)
Chenoweth	Gibbons	Kingston
Christensen	Gilchrest	Klug

Knollenberg	Pappas	Shays
Kolbe	Parker	Shimkus
LaHood	Paul	Shuster
Largent	Paxon	Skeen
Latham	Pease	Smith (MI)
LaTourette	Peterson (PA)	Smith (NJ)
Lazio	Petri	Smith (OR)
Leach	Pickering	Snowbarger
Lewis (CA)	Pitts	Solomon
Lewis (KY)	Pombo	Souder
Linder	Porter	Spence
Livingston	Portman	Stearns
LoBiondo	Pryce (OH)	Stump
Lucas	Quinn	Sununu
Manzullo	Radanovich	Talent
McCollum	Ramstad	Tauzin
McCrery	Regula	Taylor (NC)
McDade	Riggs	Thomas
McHugh	Riley	Thune
McInnis	Rogan	Tiahrt
McIntosh	Rogers	Trafigant
McKeon	Rohrabacher	Upton
Metcalf	Ros-Lehtinen	Walsh
Mica	Roukema	Wamp
Miller (FL)	Royce	Watkins
Molinaro	Ryun	Watts (OK)
Moran (KS)	Salmon	Weldon (FL)
Morella	Sanford	Weldon (PA)
Myrick	Saxton	Weller
Nethercutt	Scarborough	White
Neumann	Schaefer, Dan	Whitfield
Ney	Schaffer, Bob	Wicker
Northup	Schiff	Wolf
Norwood	Sessions	Young (AK)
Nussle	Shadegg	Young (FL)
Packard	Shaw	

NAYS—179

Abercrombie	Gordon	Moran (VA)
Ackerman	Hall (OH)	Murtha
Allen	Hall (TX)	Neal
Baessler	Hamilton	Oberstar
Baldacci	Harman	Obey
Barcia	Hefner	Olver
Barrett (WI)	Hilliard	Ortiz
Becerra	Hinchee	Pallone
Bentsen	Hinojosa	Pastor
Berry	Holden	Payne
Blagojevich	Hooley	Peterson (MN)
Bonior	Hoyer	Pomeroy
Borski	Jackson (IL)	Poshard
Boswell	Jackson-Lee	Price (NC)
Boyd	(TX)	Rahall
Brown (CA)	Jefferson	Rangel
Brown (FL)	John	Reyes
Brown (OH)	Johnson (WI)	Rivers
Capps	Johnson, E. B.	Roemer
Cardin	Kanjorski	Roybal-Allard
Carson	Kennedy (MA)	Rush
Clay	Kennedy (RI)	Sabo
Clayton	Kennelly	Sanchez
Clement	Kildee	Sanders
Condit	Kilpatrick	Sandlin
Costello	Kind (WI)	Sawyer
Coyne	Klecзка	Schumer
Cramer	Klink	Serrano
Cummings	Kucinich	Sherman
Danner	LaFalce	Sisisky
Davis (FL)	Lampson	Skaggs
Davis (IL)	Lantos	Skelton
DeFazio	Levin	Slaughter
DeGette	Lewis (GA)	Smith, Adam
Delahunt	Lofgren	Snyder
DeLauro	Lowey	Spratt
Dellums	Luther	Stabenow
Deutsch	Maloney (CT)	Stenholm
Dicks	Maloney (NY)	Stokes
Dingell	Manton	Strickland
Dixon	Markey	Stupak
Doggett	Martinez	Tanner
Dooley	Mascara	Tauscher
Doyle	Matsui	Taylor (MS)
Edwards	McCarthy (MO)	Thompson
Engel	McCarthy (NY)	Thurman
Eshoo	McDermott	Tierney
Etheridge	McGovern	Towns
Evans	McHale	Turner
Farr	McIntyre	Vento
Fattah	McKinney	Visclosky
Fazio	McNulty	Waters
Filner	Meek	Watt (NC)
Foglietta	Menendez	Waxman
Ford	Millender-	Weygand
Frost	McDonald	Wise
Furse	Miller (CA)	Woolsey
Gejdenson	Minge	Wynn
Gephardt	Mink	Yates
Gonzalez	Moakley	
Goode	Mollohan	

NOT VOTING—35

Andrews	Green	Pickett
Berman	Gutierrez	Rothman
Bishop	Hastings (FL)	Scott
Blumenauer	Kaptur	Sensenbrenner
Boucher	Kasich	Smith (TX)
Buyer	Lipinski	Smith, Linda
Clyburn	Meehan	Stark
Conyers	Nadler	Thornberry
Flake	Owens	Torres
Forbes	Oxley	Velazquez
Frank (MA)	Pascarell	Wexler
Franks (NJ)	Pelosi	

□ 1150

Mr. BROWN of California and Mr. POMEROY changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). Pursuant to House Resolution 105, the House will now consider the resolution (House Resolution 91) providing amounts for the expenses of certain committees of the House of Representatives in the 105th Congress.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of House Resolution 91 is as follows:

H. RES. 91

Resolved,

SECTION 1. COMMITTEE EXPENSES FOR THE ONE HUNDRED FIFTH CONGRESS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—With respect to the One Hundred Fifth Congress, there shall be paid out of the applicable accounts of the House of Representatives, in accordance with this primary expense resolution, not more than the amount specified in subsection (b) for the expenses (including the expenses of all staff salaries) of each committee named in that subsection.

(b) COMMITTEES AND AMOUNTS.—The committees and amounts referred to in subsection (a) are: Committee on Agriculture, \$7,792,162.00; Committee on Banking and Financial Services, \$9,414,784.53; Committee on the Budget, \$9,940,000; Committee on Commerce, \$14,671,538; Committee on Education and the Workforce, \$10,569,157; Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, \$20,020,572; Committee on House Oversight, \$6,160,946; Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, \$4,939,526.00; Committee on International Relations, \$11,150,892; Committee on the Judiciary, \$12,037,046; Committee on National Security, \$10,668,640; Committee on Resources, \$10,418,537; Committee on Rules, \$4,649,102; Committee on Science, \$9,128,727.44; Committee on Small Business, \$4,099,817; Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, \$2,439,300; Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, \$14,096,282; Committee on Veterans' Affairs, \$5,744,757; and Committee on Ways and Means, \$11,163,529.

SEC. 2. FIRST SESSION LIMITATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Of the amount provided for in section 1 for each committee named in subsection (b), not more than the amount specified in such subsection shall be available for expenses incurred during the period beginning at noon on January 3, 1997, and ending immediately before noon on January 3, 1998.

(b) COMMITTEES AND AMOUNTS.—The committees and amounts referred to in subsection (a) are: Committee on Agriculture, \$3,851,039.00; Committee on Banking and Financial Services, \$4,568,817.48; Committee on

the Budget, \$4,970,000; Committee on Commerce, \$7,179,440; Committee on Education and the Workforce, \$5,227,342; Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, \$11,702,573; Committee on House Oversight, \$3,133,200; Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, \$2,420,040.00; Committee on International Relations, \$5,433,555; Committee on the Judiciary, \$5,732,403; Committee on National Security, \$5,145,928; Committee on Resources, \$5,058,524; Committee on Rules, \$2,306,407; Committee on Science, \$4,519,172.00; Committee on Small Business, \$2,014,818; Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, \$1,237,300; Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, \$7,042,725; Committee on Veterans' Affairs, \$2,744,855; and Committee on Ways and Means, \$5,472,622.

SEC. 3. SECOND SESSION LIMITATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Of the amount provided for in section 1 for each committee named in subsection (b), not more than the amount specified in such subsection shall be available for expenses incurred during the period beginning at noon on January 3, 1998, and ending immediately before noon on January 3, 1999.

(b) COMMITTEES AND AMOUNTS.—The committees and amounts referred to in subsection (a) are: Committee on Agriculture, \$3,941,123.00; Committee on Banking and Financial Services, \$4,845,967.05; Committee on the Budget, \$4,970,000; Committee on Commerce, \$7,492,098; Committee on Education and the Workforce, \$5,341,815; Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, \$8,317,999; Committee on House Oversight, \$3,027,746; Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, \$2,519,486.00; Committee on International Relations, \$5,717,337; Committee on the Judiciary, \$6,304,643; Committee on National Security, \$5,522,712; Committee on Resources, \$5,360,013; Committee on Rules, \$2,342,695; Committee on Science, \$4,609,555.44; Committee on Small Business, \$2,084,999; Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, \$1,202,000; Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, \$7,053,557; Committee on Veterans' Affairs, \$2,999,902; and Committee on Ways and Means, \$5,690,907.

SEC. 4. VOUCHERS.

Payments under this resolution shall be made on vouchers authorized by the committee involved, signed by the chairman of such committee, and approved in the manner directed by the Committee on House Oversight.

SEC. 5. REGULATIONS.

Amounts made available under this resolution shall be expended in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Committee on House Oversight.

SEC. 6. RESERVE FUND FOR UNANTICIPATED EXPENSES.

There is hereby established a reserve fund for unanticipated expenses of committees for the One Hundred Fifth Congress. Amounts in the fund shall be paid to a committee pursuant to an allocation approved by the Committee on House Oversight.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 105, the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS] and the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GEJDENSON] each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS].

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

Mr. Speaker, this is a continued discussion about the way the House should be run. If you will recall in our discussions yesterday and today on the rule, the last time the Democrats con-

trolled the House, the funds for the committee total were about \$223 million. Notwithstanding the more than \$220 million, the resources available to the minority and the total number of staff were always an argumentative point.

One of the concerns that a number of us in the minority had was Congress after Congress, when the ranking member would appear before the then-Committee on House Administration, the chairman of the committee would say: Well, I would like to give my friend on the other side of the aisle what he is asking for, but of course it cannot come out of our resources. The only way the Members of the minority would be able to get the one additional staffer which would then raise the number that the minority would have from five to six, would be to increase the committee budget so that they could pay for that staffer.

What happened over a number of Congresses was that the staff on the committees grew. Ostensibly to provide the minority with some assistance, but for some reason, Congress after Congress, with the exception of just a couple of committees, notably Transportation, Agriculture, and several committees, Armed Services historically, in which it was a pooled staff rather than a majority-minority staff, the resources available to the minority crept, if at all, very, very slowly up the ladder.

I told Members yesterday that the Committee on the Judiciary in the 103d Congress provided the munificent percentage of 11 percent to the minority. Then House Committee on House Oversight provided 15 percent, on and on and on of percentage of the staff in the teens. But the staff continued to grow.

Now, Members need to know that of a committee budget, 85 to 90 percent of the funds of the committee are invested in the staff. And so no one wants to hold their staff at no increase. So you ask for a cost of living. A cost of living was voted by the committee. But then that was used to hire more staff, so you increased your base and you came back the next year and asked for more money. You increased the base. What happened was, we had a bloated staff structure on the committee but an enormously inequitable distribution of the staff. We asked the Democrats, would they please begin to address it.

In 1990, the Democratic Caucus met, discussed, and in their caucus, without any Republicans to discuss how much we would like to make a change, the Democrats, on their own, behind closed doors voted that the ceiling, the ceiling for Republicans on investigative staff would be 20 percent.

□ 1200

And yet there was committee after committee that never even came close to the 20 percent.

So when we became the majority in the historic 104th Congress, we said we would do at least two things: First, cut

the committee staffs. We believed we could do the job, and I think we proved it in the 104th with the unprecedented pieces of legislation that were moved through the committees and our continued ability to do the committee work with significantly reduced staffs.

What we see on this chart, portrayed graphically, is what we did. We went from more than 1,600 staff down to less than 1,100. More than 600 staff, in one day, lopped off of the committee structure. We reduced committee staff by one-third.

Mindful of when we were in the minority, however, and our desire to have a sufficient number of staff to do the job in a fair way, we said notwithstanding this red line, being the Democratic caucus' agreement to have a ceiling on Republican investigative staff at 20 percent, and notwithstanding this line, which was the historic percentage of the Republicans' share of that bloated staff, we said we are going to cut the staff by one-third.

But we wanted to commit ourselves to a goal of sharing not just the staff but the total resources of the committees. So, once again in the 104th Congress, we said we wanted to set a goal of one-third of the resources of the committees that would be provided to the minority.

We wanted to accomplish in a relatively short period of time what we wanted them to provide us when we were in the minority, and so in 1 day the resources to the minority, as a share of the committee funding, went from here to there. It is fairly easy to see that that is 29 percent. It is not one-third.

There were some committees that made it very easy to achieve one-third. The Democratic chairman moved over to the ranking member and the ranking member became the chairman. The Committee on Agriculture became a good example. It was one-third before and it is one-third now. But those committees that provided resources to the minorities of 11 percent, of 12 percent, of 14 percent, we have to grow that amount.

We have provided unprecedented percentages. In the committee that we were discussing, the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, prior to the Republican majority it was 15 percent. Today it is 25.

They are complaining, of course, that 25 is not 33 $\frac{1}{3}$. Had, in previous Congresses, the chairmen of those committees provided the minority with one-third, they would have one-third today. Our crime is not making every committee, at the same time, one-third.

Can my colleagues imagine the kinds of comments we would hear on this side of the aisle in terms of increasing the funds to do that? We are committed to it. We are moving every Congress in that direction. We are growing the minority's share, and we will continue to grow it until it is one-third for every committee of all the resources.

Let me spend just a minute, because the gentleman from Virginia [Mr.

DAVIS], used this, and I want to make sure my colleagues understand what it represents, because it is a classic example on the part of my friends on the other side of the aisle of bait-and-switch.

In the 103d Congress we had the Committee on Government Operations, the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and the Committee on the District of Columbia. Those were three separate committees with bloated staff. When we added up the budgets of those committees, it equaled \$26.6 million.

When we, as the new majority, collapsed committees and shrank the staff, these three committees became one, the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, and it was funded at \$13.5 million. Fifty percent of the previous Congress.

My good friend from Pennsylvania, our former colleague, Bill Clinger, became chairman, and he said, "I just do not have enough resources. I have to deal with all these jurisdictional areas and I just do not have enough helping hands." We listened. We watched. We believed that to be the case. So what we decided to do in this Congress was to increase the amount that the committee was to receive. That is the \$2.7 million.

We said we will go up to 61 percent of what the committee used to have. Not even three-quarters of what the committee had, not even two-thirds of what it had, but only 60 percent of what it had. Then, not at our doing, not at our doing, we began to discover what had been going on during last year's election; at the White House, in the Democratic National Committee, and in other areas.

There was a clear call for an investigation. There was even an editorial in Roll Call last January, which said although they are hearing cries of campaign finance reform, it is probably a good idea to investigate first to find out what happened so that, with knowledge, we have the ability to legislate.

So we said, all right. We do not know how long this will go on. We will take \$3.8 million for 1997 alone and provide it to the committee with the jurisdiction overseeing the executive branch, which is the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

So, my friends, the complaints on this side of the aisle are that we are taking three committees who would have shared that jurisdiction, which in the 103d Congress was provided with \$26.6 million, and we are in the 105th Congress providing that collapsed new committee with \$20 million. That is still only 75 percent of the resources, when they have been asked to take on this much larger job, than was available in the 103d Congress.

My colleagues are complaining that we are increasing a committee. Yes, we are increasing a committee over the 104th because we underfunded it. We are new to this job. We will admit we

are going to make mistakes occasionally. I will tell my colleagues what we have pledged. When we make mistakes, we will admit it, and when we correct it, we will correct it in public. Then we will go on, and if we make mistakes again, we will admit them and then we will correct them.

What we are admitting is that we underfunded this committee. We are going to put a little more money in it and we are going to make sure they have minimum dollars to go ahead and carry out an investigation with which they have been charged.

What we have before us today is a funding resolution that makes this change; that, as I said, instead of putting moneys into committees to have staff, it creates a reserve fund, so that if we have a job that was not anticipated at the beginning of the Congress and we did not fund for it, that money could be moved to that committee to do the job.

When the job is finished, they will not get to keep the staff, they will not get to grow their bloated committees, and that money comes back to the reserve fund so it can be spent somewhere else when needed. And if not needed, it is not spent.

Now, that is a more perfect system, so that we do not let the committees grow themselves but that we do have enough money to meet the needs of a Congress over a 2-year period. That is what we are voting on today.

The other 18 committees that we have as standing committees now are going to be retained at their previous funding level. We will come back in 30 days and we will examine how we fund those for the rest of the 105th.

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

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, before yielding to the gentleman from California, [Mr. MILLER], to say that we will give our colleagues on the other side an opportunity to vote for a real freeze that freezes spending at last year's budget without any games. A straight simple freeze. That will be our motion to them, and they will have a chance to choose between about a \$20 million increase and a freeze.

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

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time and I appreciate the explanation of the budget of all of the committees of Congress, but what I would prefer to hear is a discussion about how we are going to deal with campaign finance reform.

We have tried on the floor of the House now for many months to get the majority party to tell us when they are going to bring a campaign finance reform bill to the floor. Their suggestion is that they have to investigate first and the investigation takes the place of campaign finance reform; that they

only want to deal with those matters that are illegal.

The question I ask is: Is it legal and does the system condone the majority whip to let lobbyists sit in his office and write legislation and offer amendments?

Is it legal and does the system now allow for the Republicans to threaten lobbyists if they do not direct more of their contributions to Republican Members of the House?

Is it legal for the Republican leadership, including their party leadership, to berate 20 top executives from the Business Roundtable, telling them that they will have no access to the Republican Party, to the Republican leadership in this House, if they do not give more of their campaign contributions to Republicans?

Is it legal for the majority leader of the Senate to offer contributors access to the offices of the Senate?

Is it legal to start drafting up lists of trustworthy friends, those who can donate more to Republicans than to Democrats?

Is it legal for Members of this House to berate lobbyists because they have not come through with enough money, to tell them that they will be persona non grata; to call their boss and tell them that these people are done, as far as he is concerned, and they are going to tell their friends?

If that is legal, my colleagues, that is a system that must be changed. That is a system that cries out for change. That is a system that says money equals access. The American people can sit in the galleries but they cannot get access to the office of the majority leadership because they did not bring the money. They did not bring the money in the proper proportion. They did not bring the money in a sufficient amount.

That is what we are listening to day in and day out, day in and day out, are threats and intimidation against business leaders, against organizations and community activists; that if they do not bring the money they cannot have the access.

Now we have increased the budgets of the committees of jurisdiction, but no discussion of campaign finance reform, no discussion about how to give this institution back to the people of this country, no discussion about providing equal access for all the people of this country, no discussion about how decisions are made around here.

It is a money chase, it is a money chase that is corrupting the democratic principles upon which this institution was built. It is corrupting of the process and it is corrupting of how we make decisions. It must be changed, and I want to hear from the majority when will they bring a campaign finance bill to the floor.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. [Mr. LATOURETTE]. The Chair would advise all Members that the rules of the House require Members to refrain from

personal references to Members of the Senate.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BARTON].

(Mr. BARTON of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this is the body constitutionally that is closest to the people. We are the only Federal officials that have to be elected by the people. Therefore, we have the responsibility to conduct the oversight for the people more than any other body of the Federal Government.

I would like to point out that the resolution before us today is to give some additional assets for oversight, not just the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight but some of the other committees.

I am the chairman of the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations for the Committee on Commerce, and I would point out that in the last Congress, in a bipartisan way, we did oversight over the Food and Drug Administration, the Department of Energy, and other Federal agencies that resulted in significant cost savings; that resulted in significant policy changes.

Let me give my colleagues an example. One of the leading causes of death among American women is breast cancer. The FDA has had under consideration for 10 years, for 10 years, a sensor pad device that a woman can use in the privacy of her home to see or give increased sensitivity to determine if there is a lump in her breast. FDA refused to approve that for over-the-counter dissemination. Because of investigations and oversight in the last Congress, in a bipartisan way, we were at least able to get the FDA to approve that for use by a physician; by a physician.

There is much more that needs to be done. This is not just a debate about one specific committee. It is a debate of whether the House of Representatives is going to use its constitutional authority to represent the American people across the breadth and scope of the oversight responsibilities. I would hope we will vote for this bill so we can move forward.

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

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to address my remarks to my Republican colleagues. What we are considering today is raw and ugly but, as Dizzy Dean said, "It ain't bragging if you can do it."

But why do we want to do it? Let us be clear on the situation here. For the last 3 months House Democrats have repeatedly supported a broad, aggressive investigation and the immediate consideration of campaign finance reform legislation.

□ 1215

This is not a case where the minority is trying to hamstring a majority in-

vestigation. We have been ready to step up to the plate and investigate no matter what the consequences. Yet today the Republican leadership brings to the floor a bill that funds the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight and the Burton investigation at a record level with no amendments permitted.

This is an investigation where the chairman is insisting on a blatantly partisan scope, a scope limited exclusively to Democratic fund-raising practices, an investigation where the normal procedures are suspended because the chairman insists on issuing subpoenas and releasing confidential information without committee debate or vote, an investigation where the most the minority will receive is 25 percent of the committee budget.

That is what your leadership is bringing to the floor today. They are asking you to approve a record \$12 million budget for an investigation limited to Democratic practices and led by a chairman who insists on wielding unprecedented powers. No matter how hard you work at it, you could not make this more partisan or less fair.

Have we lost all perspective? The 1997 Committee on Government Reform and Oversight budget virtually matches the combined budgets of the Committees on Commerce and Ways and Means.

There was a different way for past investigations. In Watergate the majority and minority jointly hired staff. In Iran-Contra the House majority and minority staff worked in the same offices together, and yet here we have a blatantly partisan scope, procedures and funding allocation.

Before it is too late, you might want to rethink what your leadership thought was a good idea last night. When the Senate faced this issue last week, Republican Senators at least had the good sense to say wait a minute before approving the investigation. Here we are rushing to a vote despite the fact that the committee has never even voted on the investigation's scope or procedures. The committee has never met on this issue. Think how this is going to look. You are jamming a funding bill through without debate or votes on the investigation's most basic foundations.

Yesterday the Washington Post, which wants an investigation, an aggressive one, warned that if we do not postpone this vote, the investigation runs the risk of becoming its own cartoon, a joke and a deserved embarrassment.

The only thing that I would add is that it would be a joke that cost over 6 million taxpayer dollars, and that is a high price for partisanship. What the Senate did should be our model. They set forth fair rules, and yet the House leadership asks you to vote for more money than the Senate on a narrower scope that is focused just on Democrats and extraordinary power in one Member.

Mr. Speaker, there is an alternative. Vote against this bill, bring to the

floor a simple extension for all committees and when we return, we can at least vote on the scope and procedures before setting the funding. If you care about campaign finance reform, if you care about an aggressive, comprehensive and fair investigation, if you care about our credibility as an institution, then you will vote against this bill.

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

(Ms. KILPATRICK asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, as a new Member of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, I accepted my responsibility with great enthusiasm as our leader appointed me to this committee. Now that I have sat in those committee meetings for the last two or three times now, I am wondering why I am there.

I come from a legislative body in Michigan, of serving 18 years there. I understand power in politics and when you are in charge and have the majority, you rule. What I do not understand, Mr. Speaker, is how we cannot allow those of us who have been elected by the people who sent us here to be involved in the process.

It is amazing to me, and I served on the Committee on the Budget in that House for 14 years, and I understand budgets. The committees of this House deserve adequate budgets. I would be the first to say that. But I am troubled by a committee that would need \$15 million over and above, or should I say \$7.9 million over and above their committee allocation, with no parameters, where they investigate just the President, not the entire Congress.

I am in favor of the investigation, but I want it for the President, for the Congress, for Democrats and Republicans. I think the American people deserve that. The last election said the American people want campaign finance reform. I do not think they said they want \$15 million in a slush fund, as someone said earlier. For 15 million Americans, that would be \$1 an American; for 30 million Americans, they would pay 50 cents an American, to go after the President. Let us investigate the entire Congress, Republicans and Democrats.

I take my assignment on the House Committee on Government Reform and Oversight very seriously. I want us to get down to the business of the people, which is good jobs, a clean environment, health care, Medicaid, and pensions. That is what the American citizens want, and that is what I hope this Congress will get to.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. CUMMINGS].

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

Mr. Speaker, as I travel throughout my home district of Baltimore, MD, I am often asked by my constituents what are some of the greatest challenges we face as Members of Congress.

There is one issue they seem to approach me about now more than ever, the absolute lack of a bipartisanship spirit in this Congress.

I must say, Mr. Speaker, that I agree wholeheartedly with my constituents. Today we are considering a measure to fund the standing committees of the House for the 105th Congress, and the ugly specter of partisanship has once again raised its head. We are poised to approve a budget for the committee on which I serve, the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, that is larger than any other committee's budget, and all in the name of a highly partisan investigation of the executive branch. By contrast, the Senate is appropriately looking at all abuses, both by Republicans and Democrats.

The greatest travesty of all is the waste of taxpayers' dollars. Last night this House said no to increases in funding for House committees, and I commend my colleagues on the other side of this aisle who voted against this resolution.

This morning we are considering a compromise that the majority crafted late last night. But I am puzzled. How can my colleagues on the other side of the aisle who joined us in voting against the resolution last night vote to freeze committee levels for 1 month and grant the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight the entire extraordinary budget that they desire and still contain an \$8 million slush fund.

If there have been fund-raising abuses, let us explore the charges in a bipartisan fashion. We need a balanced, fair investigation that will produce answers rather than more controversy. I do believe I am not overstating the matter when I say that the integrity of this House is at stake. If we are to be taken seriously, we need to conduct and set budget parameters that reflect the bipartisan effort.

Mr. Speaker, the American people are the real losers in this process. I urge my colleagues to vote against this resolution and call for a budget that is fair and just and results in a meaningful bipartisan investigation.

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

Mr. Speaker, we are committed to offering with our motion to recommit a real motion of a freeze, and that is what we are going to do here. Hopefully, as soon as we get through these speakers, we can do that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LAMPSON].

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I would like to say good afternoon, Mr. Speaker, and good afternoon to my colleagues assembled here today. At this very moment I am supposed to be addressing a group of eighth graders in my district and after last night's debate and subsequent floor maneuvering, I cannot help but wonder if they would be a more mature audience.

I returned from the retreat in Hershey optimistic that the rhetoric of bipartisanship would become a reality. Well, this afternoon I ascribe that optimism to my naivete as a freshman Member of the House.

The majority is determined to spend an exorbitant amount of money through the House Committee on Government Reform and Oversight to investigate alleged fund-raising improprieties by the White House last year. My question, Mr. Speaker, is, Why do we not investigate alleged improprieties that occurred in campaigns in this body?

In late October 1996, vicious television advertisements attacking me personally were purchased by a group calling itself Citizens for the Republican Education Fund. Similar ads appeared in the final days of my December runoff election as well. This group, along with Citizens for Reform and Coalition for Our Children's Future, purchased advertisements attacking Democratic congressional candidates across this land. These front groups were used to dump anonymous, unregulated money into these races on behalf of Republican candidates.

On the board of directors of Citizens for the Republican Education Fund is former Reagan White House aide Lyn Nofziger, a man indicted and convicted of influence peddling.

We all know that too much money was spent on campaign 1996. It is ridiculous that I personally raised and spent \$1.6 million to win my election. If we are going to spend millions of taxpayer dollars investigating campaign finance improprieties, then let us investigate everyone. Let us be comprehensive. Let us be bipartisan, and let us bring campaign finance reform to the floor of this House.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO].

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this resolution for three important reasons. First, the funds requested by the majority are three times the amount authorized by the other body. We could match the other body's authorization and still provide 4,500 kids in this country with health care insurance next year with the funding that this resolution would provide.

Second, the scope of this investigation makes it clear that this committee plans to conduct a blatantly partisan probe. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle have refused to let this investigation examine any Republican fundraising practices. Again, I advocate that we follow the example of the other body and vote to look into improper fundraising activities by members of both political parties. No one is challenging the right to investigate.

Finally, the chairman of this investigation has requested unprecedented unilateral power to issue subpoenas without the consultation of any other member of the committee. No Member should be granted such unilateral authority, much less a Member who has

himself engaged in very questionable fundraising practices.

Spending taxpayer money on blatant partisan politics and partisan probes will further erode the reputation of this body with the American people. Vote against this resolution.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. RYUN was allowed to speak out of order.)

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR
OF H.R. 586

Mr. RYUN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 586.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. LATOURETTE]. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I think we only have a couple of speakers and try to keep people on their schedule. I would just say that we are going to offer a motion to recommit. We are going to give both Democrats and Republicans an opportunity to vote for a freeze at last year's levels, to get rid of the slush fund. If you really want to have a freeze, which is what a lot of your people thought they were voting on when they came here today, we are going to give you a real freeze. That is going to be our motion to recommit.

□ 1230

We can come back here and work on ground rules for real, a proper investigation, but as far as the funding, our proposal will be a real freeze. Instead of going out and borrowing \$8 million and putting it aside for a slush fund, we are going to get rid of that, we are going to have a real freeze, and give the people of this country a chance to see a House work together to come up with a process by which we can have an investigation that Mr. MILLER indicated will hopefully lead to real campaign finance reform.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I believe I only have one additional speaker. The gentleman has two, I believe, and he gets to close. Would he like to take one of them?

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SCHIFF].

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

Mr. Speaker, I believe there are two issues here. The first issue is the amount of money that will be spent on committees, including the investigation in this proposal.

The amount we are proposing is still, even with the investigation, even with the reserve fund, at least \$45 million less than our Democratic colleagues spent for committees in the 103d Congress when they were the majority, and I think those Members who have been saying money should be spent elsewhere than on committees should come up here and explain what they did with \$223 million in the 103d Congress.

Second, the allegation has been made that this is an investigation of Democrats only. No, it is not. It is an investigation of illegal activity involving campaign fundraising in executive branch agencies, because our committee, the Government Reform and Oversight Committee and its predecessor, the Committee on Government Operations, of which I was a member for 6 years under our Democratic colleagues' majority, only investigated executive branch agencies. I do not remember any investigation of the Congress for any purpose.

Now there is room, first of all, to look at Republicans, if there is an area where the committee believes any agency under the Clinton administration or any individual has engaged in illegal activity, if that individual agency says, well, the Reagan or Bush administrations did the same. I think that is a fair inquiry for the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight in this investigation.

Second of all, if there is any allegation, any serious allegation, that any Member of Congress, Democrat or Republican, has committed illegal acts in terms of fundraising, I believe that that can be and will be and should be investigated through the appropriate committee of the House of Representatives.

But given the fact, given the fact that we have individuals taking the fifth amendment, which is their privilege, about executive branch fundraising, that apparently we have individuals fleeing the country, that we have questions about the FBI advising the White House of certain matters that the White House denies, that we have possible compromise of the Central Intelligence Agency, I submit it is time to get on with this investigation.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume because our final speaker is not here, and I guess I will just close at this stage and say that again my colleagues are going to have a choice in the motion to recommit whether they want to spend an additional \$18.5 million this year or do they want a real freeze. That is going to be the choice in the motion to recommit. We could not get any amendments; debate here has been limited by the rule. We are going to give the people of this institution an opportunity to really freeze spending.

My colleagues can talk about what happened in history, but what we are offering is a freeze from last year's levels. Save the taxpayers \$18½ million when it is offered; vote for the motion to recommit.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I would say that there has been some discussion on this side of the aisle, and if my colleague from Connecticut is willing to amend that to include a hard freeze across all Government spending, I might have trouble

holding my troops over here. But since it is directed only at this particular area, we may not.

Mr. Speaker, we understand the issue, and, with that, I would ask for an "aye" vote on House Resolution 91.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to House Resolution 91, a resolution which funds the operations of the committees of the House through May 2.

Clearly, we must provide the moneys necessary to allow this House to do the people's work. I support that section of this funding resolution. My objections are to the size of the funding being presented to the Government Reform and Oversight Committee and the scope of its pending investigations.

The reports of campaign fundraising irregularities and scandals coming from the White House are serious and must be investigated fully. In fact, Congress has a constitutional imperative to do so.

However, since we are not establishing a joint House-Senate investigative committee, we should be taking the lesson of the Senate and widening the scope of this oversight work to include illegal and improper activities in congressional campaigns as well.

Yet, this resolution provides the Government Oversight Committee twice the moneys that the Senate has given to its committee for an investigation of wider scope—a probe that will look at improper activity at the White House and congressional campaigns. Is this not a violation of prudent fiscal practice?

Also, in my opinion, the chairman has been exercising unprecedented and imprudent authority in issuing subpoenas.

Mr. Speaker, as a fiscal conservative, I cannot vote to throw money at any investigatory committee. As a government reformer, I cannot vote to limit the scope of this investigation when I know improper activity stretched beyond the White House.

This whole episode is proof positive of the need for genuine, comprehensive campaign finance reform. Without it, the foundations of our democracy will continue to be eroded.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 91 to authorize temporary funding for the basic operations of 18 House committees and funding for the Government Reform and Oversight Committee's investigation into possible illegal campaign fundraising.

As Congress continues to wrestle with the important issue of campaign finance reform it is imperative that we provide constructive contributions to this debate. The investigation proposed by Chairman BURTON will accomplish this endeavor by focusing on possible abuses of the White House and executive branch agencies and resources for political gains.

As chairman of the International Relations Committee it is, I believe, appropriate for Congress to determine how sensitive foreign policy matters may have been impacted by the unusual access of campaign contributions to executive branch officials and resources.

Moreover, as a senior member of the Government Reform Committee, I am confident that the findings of our committee's investigation will lead to a more positive and constructive approach to campaign finance reform.

As Chairman BURTON has made clear time and time again, any and all information obtained during our investigation will be shared with other committees of jurisdiction over campaign finance reform and ethics matter.

Accordingly, I urge all of our colleagues to support this important resolution.

Mr. FOGLIETTA. Mr. Speaker, why are we wasting time and resources on this duplicative, one-sided investigation? FRED THOMPSON and JOHN GLENN are conducting a broad investigation in the Senate, but, for purely political purposes, we are insisting on this off-off-Broadway show.

Let's think about the important things this Congress and members of the Government Reform Committee could be doing, instead of this rerun, reread sideshow.

Our distinguished ranking member, HENRY WAXMAN, a respected expert on health care, could be helping us devise ways to make Medicare more effective and cost efficient and how to provide health care for the kids who don't have it.

CHRIS SHAYS could be concentrating on the issue of genuine campaign finance reform.

We could be focusing on our consensus agreement that we must balance our budget and provide a balance of Federal aid to help the most vulnerable people in America.

We could be taking up President Clinton's challenge to all of us that we make America's schools the very best they can be as we head in the next century.

But instead we'll be wasting precious resources of time, money, and congressional expertise on this partisan, one-side investigation that won't look at Members of Congress who aggressively exact contributions from lobbyists and raise money using the rooms of this Capitol.

Let's do what the people sent us here to do. Let's stop fighting one another and fight for them.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 105, the resolution is considered read for amendment, and the text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed as House Resolution 102 is adopted.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

SECTION 1. CONTINUING EXPENSES OF STANDING AND SELECT COMMITTEES.

There shall be available from the applicable accounts of the House of Representatives such amounts as may be necessary for continuing expenses of standing and select committees of the House (other than the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight) for the period beginning on April 1, 1997, and ending on May 2, 1997, on the same terms and conditions as amounts were available to such committees for the period beginning at noon on January 3, 1997, and ending at midnight on March 31, 1997, pursuant to clause 5(f) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 2. EXPENSES OF COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM AND OVERSIGHT FOR ONE HUNDRED FIFTH CONGRESS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—With respect to the One Hundred Fifth Congress, there shall be paid out of the applicable accounts of the House of Representatives, in accordance with this section, not more than \$20,020,572 for the expenses (including the expenses of all staff salaries) of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

(b) FIRST SESSION LIMITATION.—Of the amount provided for in subsection (a), not more than \$11,702,573 shall be available for expenses incurred during the period beginning at noon on January 3, 1997, and ending immediately before noon on January 3, 1998.

(c) SECOND SESSION LIMITATION.—Of the amount provided for in subsection (a), not more than \$8,317,999 shall be available for expenses incurred during the period beginning at noon on January 3, 1998, and ending immediately before noon on January 3, 1999.

SEC. 3. VOUCHERS.

Payments under this resolution shall be made on vouchers authorized by the committee involved, signed by the chairman of such committee, and approved in the manner directed by the Committee on House Oversight.

SEC. 4. REGULATIONS

Amounts made available under this resolution shall be expended in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Committee on House Oversight.

SEC. 5. RESERVE FUND FOR UNANTICIPATED EXPENSES.

There is hereby established a reserve fund of \$7,900,000 for unanticipated expenses of committees for the One Hundred Fifth Congress. Amounts in the fund shall be paid to a committee pursuant to an allocation approved by the Committee on House Oversight.

SEC. 6. ADJUSTMENT AUTHORITY.

The Committee on House Oversight shall have authority to make adjustments in amounts under section 2, if necessary to comply with an order of the President issued under section 254 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 or to conform to any reduction in appropriations for the purposes of such section 1.

SEC. 7. OFFSET OF INCREASE IN COMMITTEE EXPENSES.

Any net increase in the aggregate amount of expenses of committees for the One Hundred Fifth Congress over the aggregate amount of funds appropriated for the expenses of committees for the One Hundred Fourth Congress shall be offset by reductions in expenses for other legislative branch activities.

Pursuant to House Resolution 105, the previous question is ordered on the resolution, as amended.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. GEJDENSON

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. GEJDENSON. Yes, I am, Mr. Speaker, in its present form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. GEJDENSON moves to recommit the resolution to the Committee on House Oversight with instructions to report a resolution promptly back to the House which: Freezes the funding for each House Committee at 1996 levels; and does not include a "Reserve Fund for Unanticipated Expenses"; except as may be subsequently ordered by the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

Pursuant to clause 5 of rule XV, the Chair will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device, if ordered, will be taken on agreeing to the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 176, nays 214, not voting 42, as follows:

[Roll No. 70]
YEAS—176

Abercrombie	Hall (OH)	Murtha
Ackerman	Hall (TX)	Nadler
Allen	Hamilton	Neal
Baesler	Harman	Neumann
Baldacci	Hilliard	Oberstar
Barrett (WI)	Hinchev	Obey
Becerra	Hinojosa	Olver
Bentsen	Holden	Ortiz
Berry	Hoolley	Pallone
Blagojevich	Hoyer	Pastor
Bonior	Jackson (IL)	Payne
Borski	Jackson-Lee	Peterson (MN)
Boswell	(TX)	Pomeroy
Boyd	Jefferson	Poshard
Brown (CA)	John	Price (NC)
Brown (FL)	Johnson (WI)	Rahall
Brown (OH)	Johnson, E. B.	Rangel
Capps	Kanjorski	Reyes
Cardin	Kennedy (MA)	Rivers
Carson	Kennedy (RI)	Roemer
Clay	Kennelly	Roybal-Allard
Clayton	Kildee	Rush
Clement	Kilpatrick	Sabo
Condit	Kind (WI)	Sanchez
Costello	Kleczka	Sanders
Coyne	Klink	Sandlin
Cramer	Kucinich	Sawyer
Cummings	LaFalce	Schumer
Danner	Lampson	Serrano
Davis (FL)	Lantos	Sherman
Davis (IL)	Levin	Sisisky
DeFazio	Lewis (GA)	Skaggs
DeGette	Lofgren	Skelton
Delahunt	Lowey	Smith, Adam
DeLauro	Luther	Snyder
Dellums	Maloney (CT)	Stabenow
Dicks	Maloney (NY)	Stenholm
Dingell	Manton	Stokes
Dixon	Markey	Strickland
Doggett	Martinez	Stupak
Dooley	Mascara	Tanner
Doyle	Matsui	Tauscher
Edwards	McCarthy (MO)	Taylor (MS)
Engel	McCarthy (NY)	Thompson
Eshoo	McDermott	Thurman
Etheridge	McGovern	Tierney
Evans	McHale	Towns
Farr	McIntyre	Turner
Fattah	McKinney	Vento
Fazio	McNulty	Visclosky
Filner	Meek	Waters
Foglietta	Menendez	Watt (NC)
Ford	Millender-	Waxman
Frost	McDonald	Weygand
Furse	Miller (CA)	Wise
Gejdenson	Minge	Woolsey
Gephardt	Mink	Wynn
Gonzalez	Moakley	Yates
Goode	Mollohan	
Gordon	Moran (VA)	

NAYS—214

Aderholt	Bateman	Bryant
Archer	Bereuter	Burr
Armey	Bilbray	Burton
Bachus	Bilirakis	Callahan
Baker	Billey	Calvert
Ballenger	Blunt	Camp
Barr	Boehert	Campbell
Barrett (NE)	Boehner	Canady
Bartlett	Bonilla	Cannon
Barton	Bono	Castle
Bass	Brady	Chabot

Chambliss Houghton Portman
 Chenoweth Hulshof Pryce (OH)
 Christensen Hunter Quinn
 Coble Hutchinson Radanovich
 Coburn Hyde Ramstad
 Collins Inglis Regula
 Combust Istook Riley
 Cook Jenkins Rogan
 Cooksey Johnson (CT) Rogers
 Cox Johnson, Sam Rohrabacher
 Crane Jones Ros-Lehtinen
 Crapo Kelly Roukema
 Cubin Kim Royce
 Cunningham King (NY) Ryun
 Davis (VA) Kingston Salmon
 Deal Klug Sanford
 DeLay Knollenberg Saxton
 Diaz-Balart Kolbe Scarborough
 Dickey LaHood Schaefer, Dan
 Doolittle Largent Schaffer, Bob
 Dreier Latham Schiff
 Duncan LaTourette Sessions
 Dunn Lazio Shadegg
 Ehlers Leach Shaw
 Ehrlich Lewis (CA) Shays
 Emerson Lewis (KY) Shimkus
 English Linder Shuster
 Ensign Livingston Skeen
 Everett LoBiondo Smith (MI)
 Ewing Lucas Smith (NJ)
 Fawell Manzullo Smith (OR)
 Foley McCollum Snowbarger
 Fowler McCrery Solomon
 Fox McDade Souder
 Frelinghuysen McHugh Spence
 Gallegly McInnis Stearns
 Ganske McIntosh Stump
 Gekas McKeon Sununu
 Gibbons Metcalf Talent
 Gilchrest Mica Tauzin
 Gillmor Miller (FL) Taylor (NC)
 Gilman Molinari Thomas
 Goodlatte Moran (KS) Thune
 Goodling Morella Tiahrt
 Goss Myrick Trafficant
 Graham Nethercutt Upton
 Granger Ney Walsh
 Greenwood Northup Wamp
 Gutknecht Nussle Watkins
 Hansen Packard Watts (OK)
 Hastert Pappas Weldon (FL)
 Hastings (WA) Parker Weldon (PA)
 Hayworth Paul Weller
 Hefley Paxon White
 Herger Pease Whitfield
 Hill Peterson (PA) Wicker
 Hilleary Petri Wolf
 Hobson Pickering Young (AK)
 Hoekstra Pitts Young (FL)
 Horn Pombo
 Hostettler Porter

NOT VOTING—42

Andrews Franks (NJ) Pickett
 Barcia Green Riggs
 Berman Gutierrez Rothman
 Bishop Hastings (FL) Scott
 Blumenauer Hefner Sensenbrenner
 Boucher Kaptur Slaughter
 Bunning Kasich Smith (TX)
 Buyer Lipinski Smith, Linda
 Clyburn Meehan Spratt
 Conyers Norwood Stark
 Deutsch Owens Thornberry
 Flake Oxley Torres
 Forbes Pascrell
 Frank (MA) Pelosi Wexler

□ 1251

Messrs. QUINN, BONO, and GREENWOOD, and Ms. MOLINARI changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. DELAHUNT, HOYER, and DINGELL changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 70, recommittal motion, I was unavoidably detained and missed the vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 213, noes 179, not voting 40, as follows:

[Roll No. 71]

AYES—213

Aderholt Gibbons Packard
 Archer Pappas Pappas
 Gilchrest Gilchrest
 Gillmor Gillmor
 Paul Paul
 Paxon Paxon
 Goodlatte Goodlatte
 Pease Pease
 Peterson (PA) Peterson (PA)
 Petri Petri
 Pickering Pickering
 Pitts Pitts
 Pombo Pombo
 Porter Porter
 Portman Portman
 Pryce (OH) Pryce (OH)
 Quinn Quinn
 Radanovich Radanovich
 Ramstad Ramstad
 Regula Regula
 Hilleary Hilleary
 Riggs Riggs
 Riley Riley
 Rogan Rogan
 Rogers Rogers
 Rohrabacher Rohrabacher
 Ros-Lehtinen Ros-Lehtinen
 Royce Royce
 Salmon Salmon
 Sanford Sanford
 Saxton Saxton
 Scarborough Scarborough
 Schaefer, Dan Schaefer, Dan
 Schaffer, Bob Schaffer, Bob
 Jones Jones
 Sessions Sessions
 Shadegg Shadegg
 Shaw Shaw
 Shays Shays
 Shimkus Shimkus
 Shuster Shuster
 Skeen Skeen
 Smith (MI) Smith (MI)
 Smith (NJ) Smith (NJ)
 Smith (OR) Smith (OR)
 Snowbarger Snowbarger
 Solomon Solomon
 Souder Souder
 Spence Spence
 Stearns Stearns
 Stump Stump
 Sununu Sununu
 Talent Talent
 Tauzin Tauzin
 Taylor (NC) Taylor (NC)
 Thomas Thomas
 Thune Thune
 Tiahrt Tiahrt
 Trafficant Trafficant
 Upton Upton
 Walsh Walsh
 Wamp Wamp
 Watkins Watkins
 Watts (OK) Watts (OK)
 Weldon (FL) Weldon (FL)
 Weldon (PA) Weldon (PA)
 Weller Weller
 White White
 Whitfield Whitfield
 Wicker Wicker
 Wolf Wolf
 Young (AK) Young (AK)
 Young (FL) Young (FL)

NOES—179

Abercrombie Baldacci Becerra
 Ackerman Barcia Bentsen
 Allen Barrett (WI) Berry

Blagojevich Hinchey Neumann
 Bonior Hinojosa Oberstar
 Borski Holden Obey
 Boswell Hooley Olver
 Boyd Hoyer Ortiz
 Brown (CA) Jackson (IL) Pallone
 Brown (FL) Jackson-Lee Pastor
 Brown (OH) (TX) Payne
 Capps Jefferson Peterson (MN)
 Cardin John Pomeroy
 Carson Johnson (WI) Poshard
 Clay Johnson, E. B. Price (NC)
 Clayton Kanjorski Rahall
 Clement Kennedy (MA) Rangel
 Condit Kennedy (RI) Reyes
 Costello Kennelly Rivers
 Coyne Kildee Roemer
 Cramer Kilpatrick Roukema
 Cummings Kind (WI) Roybal-Allard
 Danner Kleczka Rush
 Davis (FL) Klink Sabo
 Davis (IL) Kucinich Sanchez
 DeFazio LaFalce Sanders
 DeGette Lampson Sandlin
 Delahunt Lantos Sawyer
 DeLauro Levin Schumer
 Dellums Lewis (GA) Serrano
 Dicks Lofgren Sherman
 Dingell Lowey Siskiy
 Dixon Luther Skaggs
 Doggett Maloney (CT) Skelton
 Dooley Maloney (NY) Slaughter
 Doyle Manton Smith, Adam
 Edwards Markey Snyder
 Engel Martinez Stabenow
 Eshoo Mascara Stenholm
 Etheridge Matsui Stokes
 Evans McCarthy (MO) Strickland
 Farr McCarthy (NY) Stupak
 Fattah McDermott Tanner
 Fazio McGovern Tauscher
 Filner McHale Taylor (MS)
 Foglietta McIntyre Thompson
 Ford McKinney Thurman
 Frost McNulty Tierney
 Furse Meek Towns
 Gejdenson Menendez Turner
 Gephardt Millender Vento
 Gonzalez McDonald Vislosky
 Goode Miller (CA) Watt (NC)
 Gordon Minge Waxman
 Hall (OH) Mink Weygand
 Hall (TX) Moakley Wise
 Hamilton Mollohan Woolsey
 Harman Moran (VA) Wynn
 Hefner Murtha Yates
 Hill Nadler
 Hilliard Neal

NOT VOTING—40

Andrews Franks (NJ) Rothman
 Berman Green Scott
 Bishop Gutierrez Sensenbrenner
 Blumenauer Hastings (FL) Smith (TX)
 Boucher Kaptur Smith, Linda
 Bunning Kasich Spratt
 Buyer Lipinski Stark
 Clyburn Meehan Thornberry
 Conyers Norwood Torres
 Deutsch Owens Velazquez
 Everett Oxley Waters
 Flake Pascrell Wexler
 Forbes Pelosi
 Frank (MA) Pickett

□ 1301

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Bunning for, with Ms. Kaptur against.
 Mr. Oxley for, with Mr. Deutsch against.

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, March 21, 1997, I was unable to vote due to personal reasons. Thank you for taking notice of this matter.