

somebody's hide to the wall or not will not resonate with the public in terms of whether they believe we have done the kind of investigation, whether we have really cleansed this system of what I believe is such a corrosive level of special interest money that it is now distorting the processes by which this institution arrives at conclusions and I think is undermining our democratic institutions.

I would hope that when the gentleman starts his hearings tomorrow and the committee deliberates this, that there would be some fundamental understanding by the Republicans that this is larger than their party or our party, this is about the survivability of this institution in terms of the confidence of the American public, and that is very important.

That is very important because when this is all said and done, we have a lot of other issues where, if we do not have some level of confidence with the American public, the decisions about tax relief or the balanced budget or Medicare or Social Security were made without the corrosive influence of special interest money, then we are going to have a lot of trouble in terms of the future of this country and the future of this institution being able to make those difficult and tough decisions that are so necessary to our future.

And I just want to commend my colleague from California for his tenacity in this argument. I can appreciate that it appears that, this is simply prepared to overwhelm you, they are prepared to go on with business, as they view, as usual. And I want to thank the gentleman on behalf of one that serves in this institution and one who tries to represent to his constituents the democratic process in this institution for your efforts to try to balance out this investigation so that when we are all done, we can be clear with the public that we have done our very best, that we have been the fairest we can possibly be, that we have been bipartisan and we have arrived at some support and conclusion.

I want to thank the gentleman for his efforts.

Mr. WAXMAN. I thank the gentleman for his kind words.

This investigation is too important to play petty politics with. I think that the American public is thoroughly cynical about the role of special interest money and the way the candidates run after that money. We have got to reform the system.

This is an opportunity for us to understand the system, where it has been abused, where illegal actions have taken place, if any. But there are a lot of legal actions, as we all know, within the campaign finance area now, particularly with the opening of loopholes for soft money and independent expenditures, that are perfectly legal. Some of the most scandalous activities, I think, are some of the most legal activities in the campaign finance area.

The Speaker of the House, NEWT GINGRICH, spoke to a group the other day, and he said that he wants a thorough investigation about whether a foreign government is trying to influence American elections. How can you have an investigation about whether foreign governments may be trying to interfere in our elections but only for the Presidency, not for the Congress? If that is an important issue, let us put it all on the table. There are other members of my committee.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I know the gentleman wants to be kind, but I have to say that, you know, the ultimate irony in this whole idea of foreign governments is that, and one of the reasons that I believe that the chairman of your committee, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON], is not willing to open this up to include the House, both Democrat and Republican, and the Senate, is because he himself has been under investigation.

There have been allegations, as you know, that he in fact—

Mr. WAXMAN. Let me reclaim my time and just tell the gentleman, I hope he is incorrect, and I want us to work on our committee in a bipartisan basis and to go forward together legitimately to understand the system, find abuses, hold them out to public scrutiny, learn how to reform the system that no one, I think, can defend.

I know that there are members of my committee here that have taken out this opportunity for Special Orders.

Mr. TIERNEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WAXMAN. I am not going to yield to the gentleman. I will yield back my time to the gentleman from New Jersey and hope that he will yield to the other members of the committee that are here and others on our side of the aisle who want to express their views.

But I thank the gentleman for taking this opportunity on the House floor so that we can alert the public as to what is going on.

Mr. PALLONE. What I would like to do, with the indulgence of my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, is if I could yield back my time with the understanding that the Chair will grant that time to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TIERNEY].

CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TIERNEY] is recognized for the remainder of the hour.

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield at this time to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding.

Our Founding Fathers, the authors of our Constitution, created something that the world had never seen, a representative government based on the popular election of the legislative and

executive branches. It was a powerful idea whose time had indeed come.

Based on the study of the most advanced ideas of that date, it has taken us now more than 200 years to extend those basic ideas to include all of the people in this country, black, white, Hispanic, Asian, Native American, men and women; and I would like to add rich and poor to the list.

But, unfortunately, our democratic system has been attacked by a virus of virulence that our Founding Fathers could never have imagined, money. By some estimates, our last national elections cost \$2 billion. And according to a study by the Center for Responsive Politics, 9 out of 10 U.S. House races were won by candidates who outspent their opponents in the election, and in nearly 40 percent of the House races the winner outspent the loser by a factor of 10 to 1 or more.

In competitive races, House candidates are spending 50 percent more in real terms on TV and radio advertising than they did 20 years ago at the time of Buckley versus Valeo. Thirty years ago, the average sound bite on the TV news was 42 seconds. By 1992, that bite was trimmed to less than 10 seconds. Literally, money talks, and because money talks, and when it talks it drowns out almost all other political discourse, money has distorted, corrupted, and perverted our political system.

It is time to get back to the basic democracy of Benjamin Franklin, Elizabeth Stanton, Frederick Douglass, Susan Anthony, and Martin Luther King. We are past the time for halfway and halfhearted patches on the system. Belief that this closure alone will remedy the problem is akin to belief in the tooth fairy. Solving the problem by just regulating soft money is about as likely as expecting pigs to fly.

I believe that the basic principles of campaign reform, at a very minimum, should be these:

First, take money out of the equation; finance all Federal campaigns through voluntary full public funding; amend the Constitution to prohibit Federal candidates from using private funds; provide voters with enough unfiltered information to make informed choices; open up television, radio, and other media for a discussion of the issues by the candidates; shorten the election cycle; create a truly independent regulatory agency to monitor and make public the spending of public campaign moneys; require paid lobbyists to publicly report who and when they lobby; create universal voter registration; encourage experimentation with mail and electronic ballots and multiple day elections; require full disclosure of all independent expenditures.

The fact that most Americans indicate that they have lost confidence in the functioning of our democratic elections and that most do not vote should be both a warning and a summons to action. The time to act is now, before

the American public continues to erode its faith in our democratic process.

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I reclaim my time. I want to thank my colleague from Illinois and state, as a member of the Committee on Reform and Oversight, I would much rather be joining my colleagues debating and deliberating the issues you address than going down the avenue we are taking or seemingly going to take tomorrow.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague from New York, Congresswoman MALONEY.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight will soon vote on whether to hold a serious campaign finance investigation or to hold a narrowly focused, partisan, wasteful charade. The chairman of that committee has begun a blatantly partisan investigation of the White House to embarrass the President. He proposes, he has an unprecedented proposal, and that is to limit the scope very narrowly only to the actions of the executive branch officials and only to the Presidential election. Doing so, limiting it only to the 1996 Presidential campaign and the executive branch, means it will focus only on the Clinton campaign and executive branch officials, means it will be only democratic violations that will be looked at.

At the very least, if the chairman was serious about studying campaign finance violations, they would look at both campaigns; they would look at both the Democratic and the Republican campaigns. There have been published abuses in the Dole campaign and the Clinton campaign. We should study both campaigns if we are serious about finding solutions.

Likewise, it should be expanded to cover the Congress, both branches, in the Senate campaigns and the House campaigns, if you are really looking at finding what is wrong with the system and trying to change it and make it better.

The chairman plans to use \$15 million for his investigation. That is three times more money investigating the President than the Senate is spending to investigate both the President and the Congress. That makes absolutely no sense, and it is wasteful.

Mr. Speaker, the chairman has significantly broadened his own powers. He has issued more than 100 subpoenas without the committee's approval. Furthermore, the chairman is seeking unilateral authority to release the documents that he obtains by subpoena. The Senate, on the other hand, the Republican Senate, on the other hand, has voted unanimously and endorsed a bipartisan investigation of both Presidential and congressional campaigns regardless of party. They are looking at issues, not at politics.

Led by Senator FRED THOMPSON and the Republican leadership, the Senate is charged with an investigation of both illegal and improper campaign finance practices during the past elec-

tion. The scope is well defined and entirely appropriate to serve the public interest and to understand the full range of abuse. However, the House investigation which the chairman is proposing is not. The chairman's blanket authority to unilaterally issue subpoenas and release documents is without precedent.

I want to state, Mr. Speaker, that this is the view that has been taken by all the good government groups. They are all criticizing the proposals that the Republican chairman has before the committee tomorrow: Public Citizen, the League of Women Voters, Common Cause, NYPIRG; they have all come out in opposition to this.

□ 1545

The Perot party has come out in opposition to this. This is not partisan opposition; this is good government, commonsense opposition.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to quote from Common Cause: "This issuance of a formal subpoena is a serious matter subject to great potential abuse."

They go on, and I quote, "It is inappropriate for a committee chairman to have the unchecked authority to unilaterally issue a subpoena which could be intended to harass, to embarrass, or oppress the other party."

Deans of this House on both sides, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. Clinger, I served with him, a Republican who was the chairman of this committee, he would never, never do anything like this. I heard both Mr. Clinger and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] on our side of the aisle say that the best legislation is legislation that is bipartisan, that is thoughtful, that is intended to help public policy.

The proposal that the Republican chairman is putting forth before the committee, according to Common Cause, Public Citizen, the League of Women Voters is unprecedented, wrong, anti-Republican, anti-Democrat, anti-good government, anti-common sense, wasteful, and should not be done.

I would like to caution all Members of this body on both sides of the aisle that everyone should think very carefully before they would vote for a proposal that absolutely the entire country seems to be opposed to except the chairman of this particular committee. I hope everyone will read the documents he is putting forward and read the statements of the groups that have come forward in opposition.

Mr. Speaker, I am entering into the RECORD the statements of Common Cause, Public Citizen, NYPIRG, the League of Women Voters, and other government groups that have uniformly and with great force come out in opposition to the proposal that the chairman, Republican chairman, is putting forth.

STATEMENT BY TOM ANDREWS, NATIONAL PROGRAM DIRECTOR, CITIZEN ACTION—NEWS CONFERENCE, APRIL 7, 1997

When it comes to the way political campaigns are financed in this country, Ameri-

cans have two fundamental beliefs: 1) they are disgusted with the way things are and 2) they are highly cynical about the prospects of politicians cleaning it up.

Incredibly, it is possible that the House Committee on Government Reform and Oversight may exclude from its investigation into campaign fundraising practices illegal or improper campaign fundraising by members of Congress. Apparently Chairman Burton would like to restrict the scope of his Committee's work to only one party by probing only into the White House and the Democratic National Committee. Apparently we are to believe that there is nothing to worry about when it comes to any other politician's fundraising practices—certainly not the U.S. Congress.

In light of how disgusted Americans are with politics as usual, Chairman Burton's move needs to be entered into Ripley's Believe it Or Not. It is unbelievable that a House Committee would actually vote to begin an investigation of the campaign fundraising practices of politicians by systematically excluding the U.S. Congress. I know how out of touch some politicians can become from real people but you would have had to have traveled to Mars for the Congressional recess not to know how angry people are with big money in politics and how disgusted they will be with any investigation that attempts to sweep the truth under the rug before it even begins.

The issue here is clear. The Senate voted unanimously to open up their investigation to the entire campaign fundraising problem as it relates to all Washington politicians. To do anything else on the House side will render their investigation at best incomplete and, at worse, a partisan hatchet job that exhibits what Americans have come to hate most about politics.

The vote on this issue will become a marker for members of the Committee. Those who vote against a complete and fair investigation that includes Congress as well as the White House, will clearly identify themselves as a major part of the problem. Because every politician has learned to talk a good game on this issue, this vote will be very useful for citizens to know which side their member of Congress is really on when it comes to cleaning up our political system.

Every member of the committee needs to know that you can run but you cannot hide on this issue. Your vote will be counted and you will be held accountable. There is no excuse for anything less than a full and fair investigation of the mess and the scandal of the role of big money in our political system. Any member who votes against such a full investigation can expect to be asked by their constituents at home: "What do you have to hide?"

People are tired of the excuses, the inaction and the partisan manipulation. They want and deserve to have a democracy taken back from the monied special interests that bankroll candidates and returned it to its rightful owners—the American people.

STATEMENT BY BECKY CAIN, PRESIDENT, LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF THE U.S.—APRIL 8, 1997

CALLING ON THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM AND OVERSIGHT TO BROADEN THE SCOPE OF ITS CAMPAIGN FINANCE INVESTIGATION

Good afternoon, I'm Becky Cain, President of the League of Women Voters.

We are here today to call upon the House Government Reform and Oversight Committee to conduct a fair and comprehensive investigation into campaign finance practices. We are deeply concerned that the committee is poised to head in the wrong direction, to

conduct an investigation that will not have the confidence of the American people.

Last month the Senate voted to expand the scope of its probe into campaign finance to include presidential and congressional fundraising practices, both illegal and improper. That vote was unanimous. Senators understood that if their investigation was to have any credibility, it had to include congressional as well as presidential fundraising practices. They understood that the investigation had to be conducted with fair procedures.

Here on the House side, however, we face a very different situation. The chairman of the House Committee on Government Reform and Oversight has insisted on excluding Congress from the House investigation. This simply is unacceptable.

On Thursday, the full committee will vote on a "protocol" to guide the House investigation. We call upon the committee to vote for an investigation that explicitly includes Congress in its scope. We call upon the committee to vote for procedures that ensure fairness.

Simply leaving the scope undefined is not an acceptable option. The chairman has made abundantly clear his desire to strictly limit the scope, so the committee must make explicitly clear that the Congress is included.

If the House investigation is to have a dime's worth of credibility, members must send the chairman a simply message: expand the probe to include Congress, and adopt fair procedures. The Senate investigation provides a good model.

Under the chairman's proposal, members of the committee will be voting to exempt their own fundraising practices from investigation. Members of the committee who do not demand and vote for an expanded inquiry will be putting themselves beyond the reach of the probe. Congress must not exempt itself from investigation. Congress isn't supposed to be above the law. How can members of Congress exempt their own campaign fundraising from investigation? The American people won't buy it.

Anyone who believes that campaign finance abuses are limited to one branch of government simply isn't reading the papers these days. The system is a mess and needs to be examined from top to bottom.

An investigation focusing solely on presidential fundraising activities will be seen for what it is, just one more political game. Instead, Congress must be included in the House investigation.

Members who think that this vote will slide under the radar, think again. The New York Times reported today that nearly nine out of ten Americans said that hearings should investigate the fundraising activities of both parties. In voting to exclude Congress, the committee acts in defiance of the public's clear desire for a fair, bi-partisan investigation.

The decision lies in the hands of Republican moderates on this committee. Their votes will decide whether the House will conduct an investigation that is credible and fair. Their votes will decide whether the investigation goes after wrongdoing wherever it can be found. By voting for the chairman's proposal, these moderates would guarantee a continuation of the partisan games that have characterized the debate on campaign finance for too long.

We are relying on moderates like Chris Shays, Connie Morella, Steve Horn and Tom Davis to do the right thing.

Local Leagues are taking action and calling on their members who serve on this committee to stand up for a fair investigation.

The Senate faced this same question and voted for a comprehensive investigation that

looks into illegal or improper activities in connection with 1996 federal election campaigns, congressional as well as presidential. There is no good reason for the House not to do the same. We believe that members of this committee understand the importance of voting to broaden the scope of the House investigation. We trust they have the will to vote with their convictions.

Thank you.

STATEMENT OF ANN MCBRIDE, PRESIDENT OF COMMON CAUSE, REGARDING THE UPCOMING COMMITTEE VOTE ON THE HOUSE GOVERNMENT REFORM AND OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE'S INVESTIGATION INTO CAMPAIGN FINANCE ABUSES IN THE 1996 ELECTIONS

On Thursday, members of the House Government Reform and Oversight Committee are scheduled to decide whether they will spend the almost \$4 million in taxpayer funds the Committee has been allocated to conduct a partisan sideshow or a thorough, complete investigation of the campaign finance mess in Washington. The campaign finance abuses and violations in the 1996 elections represent far too serious a crisis of American democracy for this Committee's investigation to be used for partisan game playing.

The American public simply will not trust an investigation that gives one party a free ride. A New York Times/CBS poll published today found that 9 out of 10 Americans want these hearings to investigate the fund-raising activities of both parties.

Any congressional investigation of campaign finance practices to be conducted by the House Government Reform and Oversight Committee must be comprehensive, fair and bipartisan. Only an investigation which is comprehensive, fair and bipartisan will have public credibility.

To be comprehensive and bipartisan, the Committee must look at fundraising improprieties and possible violations of law by both the presidential and congressional campaigns as well as by executive branch officials. Excluding congressional campaign finance practices, as Chairman Burton proposes, means the Committee will see only a partial picture of the abuses with the existing campaign finance system. Among the activities missed will be the growing soft money fundraising and spending practices of the party congressional campaign committees, the influence and access provided to special interests and their lobbyists for campaign money, the use of non-profits for partisan political activities and the misuse of so-called independent expenditures by party committees in congressional campaigns. Any credible campaign finance investigation must include these and similar very serious practices.

Further, should the Committee narrow its scope to wrongdoing by only executive branch officials, and not by both 1996 presidential campaigns, it will fail to consider possible serious violations by the Dole campaign. Common Cause laid out last October in a letter to the Justice Department how both the Clinton and Dole campaigns also violated the applicable spending limit and misused soft money. In order to be bipartisan, the investigation must examine both campaigns.

The Committee hearings also must be scrupulously fair. Fairness will be insured only if the Committee follows congressional precedents for investigative procedures, and gives minority members a voice in the investigation. Chairman Burton has proposed giving himself apparently extraordinary powers including unilateral authority to issue subpoenas and make public disclosures of investigative documents without prior consent of, or

even notification to, the ranking minority member.

The issuance of a formal subpoena is a serious matter, subject to great potential abuse. While a ranking minority member should not be allowed to block a subpoena in order to obstruct an investigation of abuses by his party, it is also dead wrong for a committee chairman to have unchecked authority to unilaterally issue a subpoena.

If the Committee does not conduct its investigation in a manner that is—and that appears to be—comprehensive, fair and bipartisan, then not only will the House have squandered an important opportunity to understand the nature of this crisis in order to correct it, but the House majority will be seen by the American people as attempting to gain short term partisan profit at the expense of acting responsibly to address and solve these very serious problems.

The American people will be watching what happens in the Government Reform Committee on Thursday. Each member who serves on the Committee bears personal responsibility to stand up and be counted: To vote to ensure that both presidential campaigns as well as congressional campaigns are covered, and that the Committee's procedures are bipartisan and fair.

U.S. PIRG URGES HOUSE COMMITTEE TO BROADEN CAMPAIGN INVESTIGATION

The U.S. Public Interest Research Group (PIRG) today joined other reform organizations in calling on the House Government Reform and Oversight Committee to broaden the scope of its investigation into campaign finance reform practices. PIRG urged the Committee to include both Congressional and Executive Branch fundraising, as well as both improper and illegal activities, in its investigation. The Committee, chaired by Rep. Dan Burton (R-IN), has to date not decided to hold a broad investigation that includes congressional fundraising practices, in sharp contrast to the investigation of the Senate Governmental Affairs Committee, chaired by Sen. Fred Thompson (R-TN). The House committee will vote on the protocol for its investigation this Thursday, April 10th.

"Limiting this investigation is like wearing dark glasses to look in the shadowy corners of a dark house. Unless they turn on the lights, the committee will miss a huge part of the problem: fundraising practices in Congress itself," said Bill Wood, democracy advocate with U.S. PIRG. "We urge the House Committee to, at a minimum, rise to the level of the Senate investigation, and use their authority to illuminate all kinds of problems in our current political fundraising system," he continued.

REPUDIATE REPRESENTATIVE BURTON'S ONE-SIDED INVESTIGATION INTO CAMPAIGN FINANCING CONSUMER GROUP ASKS HOUSE MEMBERS

WASHINGTON.—Citizen Action, the nation's largest independent consumer watchdog organization, today called on the House Government Reform and Oversight Committee to vote for a full investigation of all illegal and improper campaign fundraising activities by both political parties, by the White House and Congress.

Citizen Action blasted the effort by Rep. Dan Burton (R-IN) to conduct a narrow investigation that only includes the White House and Democratic National Committee, but excludes fundraising activities by Members of Congress.

Joining with the League of Women Voters and other organizations supporting campaign finance reform at a press conference this afternoon, former Congressman Tom

Andrews, Citizen Action National Program Director, declared, "In light of how disgusted Americans are with politics as usual, Chairman Burton's move needs to be entered into 'Ripley's Believe it Or Not'. It is unbelievable that a House Committee would actually vote to begin an investigation of the campaign fundraising practices of politicians by systematically excluding the U.S. Congress," continued Andrews.

"It seems that Chairman Burton would like to restrict the scope of his Committee's work to only one party by probing only into the White House and the Democratic National Committee. Apparently we are to believe that there is nothing to worry about when it comes to any other politician's fundraising practices—certainly not the U.S. Congress.

"I know how out of touch some politicians can become from real people but you would have had to have traveled to Mars for the Congressional recess not to know how angry people are with big money in politics and how disgusted they will be with any investigation that attempts to sweep the truth under the rug before it even begins.

"The issue here is clear. The Senate voted unanimously to open up their investigation to the entire campaign fundraising problem as it relates to all Washington politicians. To do anything else on the House side will render their investigation at best incomplete and, at worst, a partisan hatchet job that exhibits what Americans have come to hate most about politics.

"The vote on this issue will become a marker for Members of the Committee. Those who vote against a complete and fair investigation that includes Congress as well as the White House, will clearly identify themselves as a major part of the problem. Because every politician has learned to talk a good game on this issue, this vote will be very useful for citizens to know which side their member of Congress is really on when it comes to cleaning up our political system.

"Every member of the Committee needs to know that you can run but you cannot hide on this issue. Your vote will be counted and you will be held accountable. There is no excuse for anything less than a full and fair investigation of the scandal that is the role of big money in our political system. Any Member who votes against such a full investigation can expect to be asked by their constituents at home: What do you have to hide? And there will be no excuse for anything less than action that will take our political system away from the monied special interests and returning it to its rightful owners—the American people," concluded Andrews.

REFORM PARTY DEFENDS PUBLIC'S RIGHT TO KNOW—JOINS COALITION URGING BROAD BRUSH IN CAMPAIGN FINANCE INVESTIGATION

"Citizens will not look kindly on an investigation that is artificially restricted to prevent political damage," states a letter mailed today to members of Congress. The letter represents the interests of millions of Americans in getting to the bottom of campaign finance abuses, once for all.

The Reform Party has joined five citizen action organizations, urging the Government Reform and Oversight Committee of the U.S. House of Representatives to approve a protocol for their investigation of campaign finance abuses that is fair and bi-partisan in its scope. The other organizations include the League of Women Voters, U.S. Public Interest Research Group, United We Stand America, Public Campaign and Public Citizen.

Addressing the members of the Government Reform and Oversight Committee of

the Congress, the letter urges them, as they vote on the protocol establishing the scope and procedures for their investigation, to "...broaden the scope of the investigation to include the fundraising practices of both parties' presidential and congressional campaigns." The Senate has set a precedent for such a move by voting to broaden the scope of their own investigation to look at presidential and congressional fundraising, both improper and illegal.

"The notion that the Committee's investigation should exclude congressional fundraising practices smacks of a self-serving disregard for the public's right to know," the letter states. "In addition, it is imperative that the investigation be conducted in a fair and non-partisan manner. Procedural rules that put one party or the other at a distinct disadvantage will cast doubt on the integrity of the investigation. Scope and procedures that are anything less than comprehensive and fair will completely undermine the credibility of the House investigation from the outset."

Reform Party Chairman Russell Verney says, "Every day, the public trust is further eroded by more news of possible improprieties and even illegal acts in both presidential and congressional fundraising, from the selling of access in exchange for big campaign contributions to the use of federal property for fundraising. We're looking to the Congress to do the people's business and conduct the fair, nonpartisan investigation the situation demands one that digs deep and lays out the truth, no matter what it is or who it touches. The people will settle for nothing less."

For more information on campaign finance reform or about the Reform Party, call the national Reform Party office at (972) 450-8800, or contact your state Reform Party headquarters.

STATEMENT OF JOAN CLAYBROOK, PRESIDENT, PUBLIC CITIZEN, HOUSE INVESTIGATION OF CAMPAIGN FUNDRAISING ABUSES

Public trust in our system of government is dangerously low. Political gamesmanship and partisan sniping are destroying voters' confidence in their lawmakers. So is the corrupting spiral of legalized bribery better known as special interest money.

Attempts to limit the scope of the House investigation are a transparent attempt to cover up the misuse of special interest money swamping Congressional races and the methods used to raise such sums.

Congressional candidates poured \$743 million into their 1996 campaigns. The disease of special interest corruption is not confined to the executive branch of our government, so why should the Government Reform and Oversight Committee's investigation be confined only to the executive branch?

The voters are demanding to know the full story behind the litany of fundraising abuses in both the Administration and Congress and by Democrats and Republicans alike.

The Government Reform and Oversight Committee investigation must not close its eyes to suspect activities like the Republican donor access programs, where those who gave \$50,000 were guaranteed at least three private meetings with GOP senators.

The Committee must not close its eyes to the Republican fundraising letter of 1995 promising that corporate contributions of \$25,000 or more would go "directly to fund House races"—an activity that would have been illegal.

And it cannot close its eyes to public demands for action. Today's poll in the New York Times shows almost nine of ten people wanting fundamental changes or even a complete overhaul of the political fundraising

system, and nearly nine of ten people wanting the Congressional investigations to cover fundraising abuses by both parties.

Chairman Burton must not be allowed to turn this investigation into a partisan vendetta against the White House that sweeps Congressional fundraising abuses under the carpet. Giving him the power to control this investigation is like appointing Pete Rose Commissioner of Baseball. Dan Burton must not be allowed to seize unilateral power of subpoena, and he must not be allowed to destroy the credibility of the House of Representatives by confining its investigation to one corner of a very huge problem.

The Committee as a whole, not its chair must decide what subpoenas are issued, or the power will become a partisan weapon. The Committee as a whole should also control what documents are released to the public. The Committee's probe is far too important for it to be controlled by one individual whose own activities are being investigated by the Justice Department for abuses but who wants to decide which abuses will be investigated and which will be ignored.

Representatives must choose between a wide-ranging, principled and fair investigation, or one that is conducted for narrow partisan purposes that shields the indefensible Congressional campaign finance system from scrutiny.

Last month, because a handful of Republican senators stood tall, the Senate voted unanimously to expand the scope of its probe into campaign finance practices to include Presidential and Congressional activities, both illegal and improper.

Today, the question is whether the House—and the Government Reform and Oversight Committee—also has the courage to listen to the American people and investigate the whole story.

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Speaker, at this point in time I would like to yield to my friend, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BLAGOJEVICH].

Mr. BLAGOJEVICH. Mr. Speaker, let me say that as a freshman this is my maiden voyage, this is the first time that I have addressed the House with regard to a question of an issue relating to procedure and an issue that relates to a committee.

Let me say that as long as we are talking about investigations, I must confess, Mr. Speaker, that I have to plead guilty. I have to plead guilty to naivete.

When I ran for Congress this last fall, I ran with the notion that Members of both political parties were going to try to work together to improve our country on the issues that are important to people in our respective communities. We were going to work to try to improve the quality of education; we were together to try to improve and repair our schools; we were going to try to fight crime and balance the Federal budget.

I thought Congress was going to operate under the rule of law. I believe then, and I still believe, that Members of both parties want to act in good faith together to solve these problems and many other problems that face our communities. I must confess, however, that I was somewhat naive, and I must confess to being somewhat demoralized by the fact that as a freshman member of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight what I have seen

thus far has been nothing but a political witch-hunt designed to embarrass the President of the United States and designed to embarrass one particular political party.

The American people, Mr. Speaker, recognize, rightfully so, that there is something wrong with the way our financing of campaigns is being presently operated in the United States. The American people, I believe, rightfully so, want us to reform the campaign financing laws.

This Congress must, in my judgment, act now to address these problems, and in doing so, we have to do it in a bipartisan manner, not only to look at transgressions of Members of both parties; not only to see where Members of Congress, Members who are Democrats and Republicans, as well as candidates for the Presidency, have failed and transgressed in laws. We have to make sure that we reform the financing system.

So as we investigate the transgressions, I urge this Congress, and in particular, the committee of which I am a member, the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, to make sure that when we investigate fundraising transgressions, we do so by addressing not only the White House, but also Members of Congress and Members of both political parties.

In the final analysis, Mr. Speaker, I firmly believe that Democrats and Republicans alike, Members of Congress, Members of the U.S. Senate, fundamentally love our country, love the democracy that we have the opportunity to serve. The fundamental integrity of this process is being called into question when our committee is not addressing these investigations in a fair-minded manner and does not seek to investigate all transgressions, and is merely looking to focus on one particular party, and in particular, the President of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that tomorrow when the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight meets we determine to hold a fair investigation and a nonpartisan investigation.

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to yield to my colleague from Michigan, [Ms. KILPATRICK].

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, with nearly 100 days now into the 105th Congress, I am puzzled and baffled that we have not yet begun to take care of the business of the people. Quality education, good-paying jobs, a clean environment, medical care for the people of this great country, all have not yet been addressed.

I want to give you an example of what can happen when a legislature works together in a bipartisan way. In 1993, President Clinton initiated and passed the Empowerment Zone Act. Since that time, there have been established 15 empowerment zones across America and 25 enterprise communities where jobs are created, where people are trained, where the displaced worker is put back to work.

I contend that this 105th Congress must get back on track. One hundred days and still no real issues, no real opportunity for children, for people. We have got to get back on track.

I am happy to report that Detroit, the city that I represent, among six other cities, was the No. 1 application put in and won that rightful first place empowerment zone designation. We have 2 billion dollar's worth of private investment; we have over 100,000 jobs committed and we are in the process of rejuvenating that.

I am happy to report that beginning next Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday, the White House will sponsor and hold in Detroit the first annual meeting of the empowerment zones and the enterprising communities. This will be the first time that the enterprising communities and the empowerment zones will come together to see what is working, how many they have employed, how many they have retrained, what has happened in terms of assistance to schools and education.

I am happy that Detroit is being selected, I am happy that President Clinton had the foresight to establish the empowerment zones, and what I want to see this 105th Congress do is to expand that opportunity. Let us put Americans back to work. Let us provide educational opportunities for our children. Let us have pensions and security for seniors who have worked so hard for this country.

We are now almost 100 days into the 105th Congress. How long will it be before we get back to work? I am asking our Republican leadership, let us deal with the issues of America. Let us put Americans back to work. Let us provide security for our children so that they too can have wonderful, exciting lives that we have all been blessed by.

One hundred days. Is it not time that this Congress, the 105th Congress under Republican leadership deal with the real issues? Enterprise zones, working Americans, sending children to school, providing health care, securing pensions, that is what the American people want to talk about.

I would hope that we begin the work of the people of this great Nation, that as we move to a new millennium we talk about those real issues, and let us get to work, Congress. We are 435 of the most powerful people in the world. People sent us to this Congress to do their work. Let us get started on it.

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KUCINICH].

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise to address an issue in which the credibility of Congress is at stake and the credibility of a congressional committee is at stake.

Our Government was set up, the Government of the United States was set up to provide for a separation of powers, and that separation of powers was to prevent the abuse of power, a system of checks and balances to prevent the abuse of power, a House and a Senate

to prevent the abuse of legislative power, a district, appellate, and Supreme Court to prevent the abuse of judicial power.

Democracy is the greatest form of government known to the world, and it works, as long as we do not abuse power. The American people are very aware of this. That is why they favor a system which distributes the power throughout the Government.

We have a situation on our committee, the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, which lends itself to the great concern of the American people as to whether or not power is being abused, because we have a condition set up which permits the chairman of that committee to be a policeman, a prosecutor, a judge, and a jury over matters relating to the investigation of campaign finance.

The American people have a right to know what is going on with respect to campaign finance, but they also have a right to make sure that it is done in an even-handed way, where power is not abused, so that there is credibility to any investigation.

Mr. Speaker and Members of the House of Representatives, we need to go very slowly on our efforts to investigate campaign finance if it is not being done in a bipartisan manner and if it refuses to recognize the demand and the requirements which the American people have for checks and balances and for the prevention of the abuse of power.

I implore the chairman of the committee to consider our requests so that we will have the committee make the decisions as a whole for the calling of witnesses, for the subpoena of documents, and for any other matters which come before our committee. I would ask the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] as a gentleman and as a Member of this House to consider the grave responsibility he has to protect this democratic process in this moment of great concern of the people.

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to yield to my distinguished colleague from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO].

□ 1600

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague for yielding to me. Also, I want to commend my colleagues for coming down this afternoon to talk about the issue of this investigation.

I wanted to be here as well to join in the commentary in order to support the efforts of my colleagues in calling for an open and a fair investigation of campaign finance issues, campaign finance reform, and of what our administration practice is. But I also believe that we ought to take a look at the Congress as well and what has happened, and look at what may be potentially there to have an open and fair investigation.

However, I would just say to my colleagues that I think that there are

clear motives on the part of the Republican majority to have a one-sided investigation, and the reason is what they do not want to do is to look into the practice that they were heavily engaged in in the last session of this Congress and during the election, of lobbyists writing the legislation in this body in exchange for campaign contributions.

Today on the floor of this House, the majority whip gave us his own revisionist history lesson on campaign finance reform. The majority whip, the gentleman from Texas, was widely criticized during the last Congress for allowing lobbyists to write legislation in his office. Article after article documented meetings where GOP donors were invited to draft bills on issues of concern to their special interests.

One such article from the Washington Post on March 12, 1995, and these are the words of the article and I am not making this up, this is documentation, documents an organization called "Project Relief" that included 350 industry members and lobbyists. Instead of just proposing legislation, the majority whip let them draft the laws directly. In other words, he would let paid lobbyists do what House Members, Members who are duly elected by the 500,000 or 600,000 people they represent in their districts to come here to carry the interests of those folks to this body, to craft that legislation in terms of good and meaningful public policy in the lives of American taxpayers, he would let the lobbyists do what House Members are elected to do.

The gentleman even admitted the practice, saying that the lobbyists have, and this is a quote, "They have the expertise." Today the gentleman from Texas claimed it never happened. Once again Republicans do not want an open investigation.

I will tell the Members the other items they do not want to look into. The tobacco industry gave the [RNC] Republican National Committee, \$7.4 million. They passed a product liability that would have saved the tobacco company millions of dollars. The NRA gave \$2 million. The GOP worked to try to kill the assault weapons ban in the last session of the Congress.

The GOP Congress let big business help write a workplace safety bill. In January of 1995 big business lobbyists wrote up a 30-item wish list for limiting certain workplace safety regulations. When the bill was finished in early June, virtually every single item on that wish list had been incorporated into the final version of the bill. Business lobbyists even worked closely in drafting the legislation.

There were other areas in terms of other non-legislative outrages. I am just going to hold up this book. This is the National Republican Campaign Committee, this is the tactical PAC project, PAC being Political Action Committees. These were folks who were given a friendly or unfriendly notation by their name. This was cir-

culated to the GOP representatives based on how much money these folks gave to Republicans or Democrats.

The majority whip, who was nicknamed "the Hammer," and is very proud of this appellation here, for his fund raising techniques, has been known to greet lobbyists with this book, thumbing through it, and saying, see, you are in the book, one way or the other.

The long and short of it, I think what we ought to do is to continue with a lot of this information, to get it out. The public ought to know this. We ought to try to get it out, so that the public has both sides. This needs to be a fair and open investigation.

No one is saying that we should not investigate. We should, because wrongdoing, wherever it occurs, ought to be stopped. Let us do the right thing by the American people. Let us open this investigation and make sure that both sides are heard. I thank my colleague for having this special order today and for allowing me some time to speak.

Mr. TIERNEY. I thank my colleague for taking the time to point out in the remaining 2 minutes that I have, Mr. Speaker, just to continue to point out some of the issues that the gentleman brought to light, and being that what we are really discussing here is the fact that this is a proposal by a committee and a committee chairperson to run a totally extraordinary and unusual type of campaign investigation that focuses only on one party, one office, instead of doing what the other body, the Senate, did in terms of broadening it out.

The fact of the matter is, as our minority leader, the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN], pointed out, the fact of the matter is that we can do better. We need not have two separate investigations, particularly when one of them is really compromised the way the one in the House pretends to be.

We ought to do what they have done over in the Senate side, or let them do it if we cannot work jointly with them, save the American taxpayer some \$14 million, and deal with both parties, all offices, and have a credible investigation, and not one where we have one individual unilaterally, without any constraints, issuing subpoenas.

In every other investigation that has been done by these bodies of any notoriety, the gentlewoman will note that there was never a case of the unilateral issuance of subpoenas by the chairperson, whether it be Watergate, Iran-Contra, the House Ethics Committee, or the proposed Senate investigation, nor have there been unilateral releases of privileged and confidential documents in any of those.

Yet our chairperson in the House purports to do both of them, but he purports to do it by silently not stating specifically the context of his investigation and the protocol, so those Members of his committees who profess to be moderate or profess that they would be embarrassed by such a

venture can hide behind that lack of specificity.

I want to thank all of my colleagues who came to the floor today to highlight this matter, and urge, Mr. Speaker, that we see some leadership on the other side of the aisle here, that we do something that will have credibility, that we move forward so the American people will know that this Congress is working for them.

ANNOUNCEMENT REGARDING THE PASSING OF THE HONORABLE CHARLES G. HAYES, FORMER MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RUSH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, I am saddened this afternoon, as I have the responsibility to announce to the Members of this body, to the Nation, and to the residents of the First Congressional District that on last evening our friend, our colleague, former Representative Charles G. Hayes, died last night.

Charlie Hayes, Mr. Speaker, as we know, was a man who was at the forefront of the struggle of poor people, minorities, women, trade unionists. He dedicated his entire life, Mr. Speaker, to promoting the interests of the disadvantaged, the downtrodden, the poor, the oppressed.

Mr. Speaker, those of us who served with Charlie Hayes during his tenure, beginning in the 90th Congress, recall affectionately and vividly his loud voice at the rear of the room when things got unruly here. He would call out "Regular order, regular order," in a distinctive manner, and everyone would be brought to attention because of his commanding voice.

Mr. Speaker, his commanding voice called "Regular order," indeed, in the affairs of this Nation, certainly as he saw injustices throughout the land, as he saw injustices in the union, trade union movement, as he saw injustices occurring in the city of Chicago and throughout the Nation.

Charlie Hayes was one of the giants of this Nation. America could not have produced a more sincere, a more dedicated, a more courageous leader than Charlie Hayes.

I knew Charlie Hayes on a lot of personal levels. I can recall moments when our community felt as though we were not being represented in the city of Chicago in a fair way, and Charlie Hayes was at the forefront, the leader of an organization, a committee, called the Committee to Elect a Black Mayor in the City of Chicago. The culmination of that committee's work was to elect Harold Washington mayor of the city of Chicago.

Charlie Hayes was a man who reached out to all races, to all elements in this society. All that you required in order to get Charlie Hayes' commitment to you was that you be