

# FUNDING FOR IMPORTANT PRIORITIES AND OBEYING EXISTING LAWS FOR CAMPAIGN FINANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH] is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Madam Speaker, there is much that the lady from North Carolina had to say with which I agree, and we are honored to serve in this Chamber where we can both agree and disagree about a variety of subjects. I would simply hearken back to one of the most poignant and pointed observations ever made in this city just down The Mall when Dr. King came here in the early 1960's and dreamed of an America where his children would be judged not by the color of their skin, but by the content of their character.

And, yes, the appropriations process is very important. That is why I hope the gentlewoman and many others on the other side of the aisle will join with Members of the new majority to appropriate funds to those who most need the funds.

One example of that will come later in our Labor-HHS appropriations bill with an amendment I offer to put an additional \$18 million into funding for Impact Aid school construction, because there is a Federal role to be played, both because of sacred and solemn treaty rights and obligations to native Americans, and also to the many children who are dependents of those in military service and who live on military bases both here in the United States and abroad.

To be sure, Madam Speaker, we confront many issues of great and grave importance in our constitutional Republic, but I would like to address one that I think has been discussed a great deal this morning during the morning hour, and that has to do with campaign finance reform.

Madam Speaker, it is ironic that so many of my liberal friends come to this floor now crying for campaign finance reform. Indeed, Madam Speaker, it is akin to having Bonnie and Clyde, during their heyday, call a press conference to demand that there be a cop on every block, on every street corner in America. That is the incredible irony.

Madam Speaker, there is one central truth with which we should all agree, and that is that everyone should obey existing laws. Indeed, Madam Speaker, as we read the revelations in recent headlines, it is becoming painfully apparent that there are serious questions involving members of the executive branch and the actions they have taken that appear to be in violation of those same campaign finance reform laws.

Indeed, Madam Speaker, one need only remember back a few months ago to hear the words of the Vice President of the United States when he deigned to claim that there was "no controlling

legal authority," end quote, to keep him from making fundraising calls on Federal property. Indeed, as records later revealed, the Vice President of the United States made several fundraising calls from his office on the White House grounds. That is in clear contradiction to existing law and to the precedents and the ethics of government where, Madam Speaker, as the gentlewoman from Missouri knows from her own experience, and indeed Members on both sides of the aisle know, we are told from day one that as Members of Congress, we are not here to solicit campaign funds on Federal property. We are not supposed to make use of the taxpayers' dollars to place money in the campaign till.

Campaign finance reform? Certainly. But reform begins with a recognition of existing law. That is why hearings continue in the other body; that is why hearings will take place under the aegis of this House, the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, to check and to examine the many disparate claims and the disturbing revelations which we read of almost daily. That is why, despite the great hue and cry for campaign finance reform, we need in this House, we need in this Nation, to take charge and to examine the deeds of those who perhaps have not obeyed existing law.

## CAMPAIGN FINANCE SYSTEM IS BROKEN AND OUT OF CONTROL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997, the gentlewoman from California [Ms. ESHOO] is recognized during morning hour debates for 1 minute.

Ms. ESHOO. Madam Speaker, 8 months ago the President asked the Congress to have a campaign finance reform bill ready for him to sign by the Fourth of July, Independence Day. I think perhaps the President should have then specified the year, 1997. What has happened? Nothing. No hearings, no markups, no bill, no reform, no action.

Our campaign finance system is broken. It is out of control. Hearings and news reports continue to expose a corrosive and insidious system, a system that has cast a shadow of public disrespect, of doubt, of disillusionment, not only on our system, but on this institution. And we know that we can do much better.

In fact, the American people insist on it; and they are right. They are ahead of this system, and they know that something can be done.

Yet despite the hearings, the headlines and the public pressure, the majority continues to defer action, deny a vote and disregard the will of the American people.

We insist that a campaign finance reform bill to ban soft money be brought to the floor of the House before the Congress adjourns this year.

## LET US FIX WHAT IS BROKEN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997, the gentleman from California [Mr. FARR] is recognized during morning hour debates for 1 minute.

Mr. FARR of California. Madam Speaker, what is really going on in Congress? We are hearing the Republican leadership, and the Republican committees in the House and the Senate are conducting hearings. They want to investigate and they want to smear.

However, Congress was elected to legislate. We are lawmakers. We can fix what is broken. Why is it that the Republican leadership does not want to fix what is broken?

The GOP has failed to meet every deadline on campaign reform. No hearings on the bills, either Democrat or Republican bills, no vote on the rules, no schedule, no nothing. We are elected to make the law. Every time the Democrats were in control, we passed campaign reform. It was either vetoed or filibustered before it got into law.

Why do the Republicans not want to use that power to pass campaign reform? The answer simply is, they want to hear and smear, not fix.

Madam Speaker, I ask one simple question: When do we get to vote on campaign reform?

## AMERICAN CITIZENS WANT ACCOUNTABILITY IN CAMPAIGN FINANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997 the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. THUNE] is recognized during morning hour debates for 2 minutes.

Mr. THUNE. Madam Speaker, I too am very interested in the whole subject of campaign finance reform. As a first-time freshman Member of this body, I found out how difficult it is to try and run a campaign and to raise money.

As we talk about trying to reform the law and trying to figure out exactly what would be the best framework and structure in which to govern campaigns in this country, one of the things that is clear is, we have to find out what things are not working today. We have seen a lot of evidence of late that through the various investigations there are a lot of things that were done that were not consistent with the existing law. We have to find those out.

People get up on the other side and say, well, we need to change the law. Frankly, I think they would much rather change the subject.

I would simply ask the question, what is it that my colleagues would have us to change? John Huang, Charlie Trie, Webb Hubbell, what are the things that my colleagues would have us change about all this process?

As I have traveled the State, my State of South Dakota, some 77,000

square miles, people want a government that is accountable. They want to know that when they elect people to these offices that they can, in fact, trust that the job that they have elected us to do will get done and it will be done in good faith and honesty and integrity.

I am a cosponsor of a bill which I would like to see considered in this body. It is very simple. It says simply, first, no foreign contributions. That seems to be a fairly straightforward assumption.

Second, it says that 65 percent of the dollars that we raise to run campaigns should come from the State or district in which we live or reside. In other words, the people that can contribute to campaigns ought to be the people who can vote for us. That too, to me, seems to be a very simple premise of campaign finance reform.

Third, it would limit PAC contributions to 35 percent of the dollars that go into a campaign.

Those are three very fundamental, simple reforms that I think would clarify what the rules are of this process, and would enable us to have a campaign system that is much cleaner, much fairer, and that the people of this country will know that they are getting accountability from the government that they deserve.

#### TRIBUTE TO JUDGE GEORGE CROCKETT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] is recognized during morning hour debates until 9:50 a.m.

Mr. BONIOR. Madam Speaker, it is with great sadness that I learned on Sunday of the death of our former colleague, Judge George Crockett. Martin Weil in his obituary today in the Washington Post I think captured it very well. This is one of the more remarkable men to have lived in this century.

Judge Crockett was a man who represented Detroit's inner city in Congress for 10 years after compiling a long and often controversial record as a defender of civil rights and unpopular causes. He was described as a kind of folk hero to his constituents of Michigan's 13th District.

Milestones in his career included his service as the defense attorney in the celebrated conspiracy trial of 11 Communist leaders in New York almost 50 years ago. Judge Crockett was cited by the trial judge for contempt of court and served a prison term.

On Capitol Hill he was known for demonstrating the same willingness to stand up for cherished beliefs in the face of withering criticism that had characterized his long career as a lawyer and a judge. In the words of the 1986 edition of the Almanac of American Politics it said, Judge Crockett was a man of steely self-assurance and has done what he considers his duty in

much less friendly environments than the House of Representatives.

While in the Congress, he was one of the first Members arrested at the South African embassy and protested against the white minority government. He was an enormously powerful man who had an incredible record in law and in labor work and as a judge. He raised a beautiful family.

My condolences go out to his wife and his children and his grandchildren. He will be sorely missed. He was a man who had a great impact on this country, and I extend the condolences of Members of this body to his family.

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 10 a.m. today.

Accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 50 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess until 10 a.m.

□ 1000

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. NEY] at 10 a.m.

#### PRAYER

The Chaplain, Rev. James David FORD, D.D., offered the following prayer:

We are grateful, O God, that we can be strong in our own faith, and yet be understanding of others; that we can express our own beliefs in word and deed, and yet be appreciative that all persons have the same freedom to express their faith; that we can be confident in our own convictions and yet be patient with those that see the world in different terms.

O loving God, who has given life and love to every person, we express our thanksgiving for the traditions of our Nation, that heritage of religious liberty that has blessed our faith and strengthened our Nation. Keep us all in Your grace, O God, now and evermore. Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Chair's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the Chair's approval of the Journal.

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

Mr. MILLER of California. 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. Pursuant to clause 5, rule I, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

#### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Colorado, Mr. BOB SCHAFFER, come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado 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.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain fifteen 1-minutes on each side.

#### MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged motion.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MILLER of California moves that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to adjourn offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

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

Mr. MILLER of California. 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 43, nays 347, not voting 44, as follows:

[Roll No. 371]

YEAS—43

Allen	Furse	Miller (CA)
Andrews	Gejdenson	Mink
Berry	Gephardt	Olver
Bonior	Hastings (FL)	Pallone
Coyne	Jackson (IL)	Pelosi
Davis (FL)	LaFalce	Radanovich
DeFazio	Lewis (GA)	Slaughter
DeGette	Lowe	Stark
DeLauro	Maloney (NY)	Stump
Dingell	Manton	Thurman
Doggett	Matsui	Torres
Eshoo	McDermott	Waters
Farr	McNulty	Woolsey
Filner	Millender	Yates
Ford	McDonald	

NAYS—347

Abercrombie	Bachus	Barrett (NE)
Ackerman	Baessler	Barrett (WI)
Aderholt	Baldacci	Bartlett
Archer	Ballenger	Barton
Army	Barr	Bass