

Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 278, On Agreeing to the Pence of Indiana Amendment (House Resolution 2745), had I been present, I would have voted "no."

Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 279, On Agreeing to the Gohmert of Texas Amendment (House Resolution 2745), had I been present, I would have voted "no."

Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 280, On Agreeing to the Stearns of Florida Amendment (House Resolution 2745), had I been present, I would have voted "no."

Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 281, On Agreeing to the Lantos of California Amendment (House Resolution 2745), had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 282, Final Passage of H.R. 2745, the United Nations Reform Act of 2005, had I been present, I would have voted "no."

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of inquiring of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) regarding the schedule of the week to come.

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

Mr. HOYER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the distinguished whip yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, Monday the House will convene at 12:30 p.m. for morning hour debates and 2 p.m. for legislative business. We will consider H.R. 2863, the Department of Defense Appropriations Act for fiscal year 2006, and any recorded votes requested will be rolled until 6:30.

On Tuesday, the House will convene at 9 a.m. for morning hour debates and 10 a.m. for legislative business. We expect to consider several measures under suspension of the rules, as well as H.R. 2475, the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006.

For the rest of the week, the House will consider several additional bills under a rule: H.J. Res. 10, the Flag desecration amendment; the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act of Fiscal Year 2006; and the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services and Education Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2006 some time later in the week.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for that information. If I may inquire, Mr. Leader, the Labor-Health bill was marked up yesterday, and the legislative branch bill was marked up as well. What days does the gentleman expect those bills to be on the floor?

Mr. DELAY. First, let me repeat what I mentioned in my statement. This is rather unusual, but we will be considering the Department of Defense appropriations bill on Monday afternoon. We will roll votes until 6:30 p.m., but Members should know that we will

be having very important debate Monday afternoon, including amendments.

In terms of the rest of the week, I would expect us to consider intelligence authorization, Flag amendment, and legislative branch appropriations on Tuesday and Wednesday, and Labor-HHS would be reserved for Thursday and Friday.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, the Flag constitutional amendment is on the calendar as well. Within the framework of the other bills, would that be left until Friday, or when will that be considered?

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I would expect the Flag amendment would follow right after the intelligence authorization bill, and then legislative branch right after that.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, reports indicate that there has now been some agreement as it relates to the ability of the national intelligence director to move personnel. That obviously was a problem we had. The gentleman from California (Chairman HUNTER) did not feel that was appropriate. Apparently, there has been some discussion and that matter has been resolved. Would it be the gentleman's expectation there will be an amendment to the bill because that provision is still in the bill; or do you expect to have a provision in the rule itself which would be self-executing to remove the constraint from the intelligence authorization bill?

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I think that the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HARMAN), the gentleman from Michigan (Chairman HOEKSTRA), and the gentleman from California (Chairman HUNTER), and the ranking member, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), will be all in sync on that particular issue. They have been working together and working well to come to a solution to that. I would imagine it would be in a manager's amendment, whatever solution they come to.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, what I understand the gentleman is saying is whatever is agreed to by those three will be how it is carried out?

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, as far as I have been advised, that is correct.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, two additional issues: campaign finance legislation, or Pence-Wynn, and CAFTA. Can the leader give us any thoughts as to when those might be considered as it relates to the July 4 break?

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, as far as campaign finance reform legislation, we have no plans right now to consider any legislation.

As far as the Central America Free Trade Agreement, the President has not transmitted any proposed agreement so we will not make any decisions about scheduling until he does.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, lastly, the gentleman from Texas (Leader DELAY) had to leave early right after the votes last week, and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) and I discussed that I am concerned, the gentleman is concerned, everybody is concerned and

everybody is talking about it in the papers, the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct is still not staffed and unable to proceed. The gentleman has expressed concern that that is the case. We have expressed concern that that is the case.

We believe, Mr. Leader, that under the rules the executive director and counsel need to be hired through agreement by both the Republican and Democratic members of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct. We believe that is what the rules says.

The impediment it seems, frankly, is that the chairman of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct is still focused on having his chief of staff, who may be an outstanding individual, no aspersions whatsoever on his character or his integrity in working on the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, but he has not been selected in a bipartisan fashion.

□ 1500

Could the leader advise me, the Speaker indicated he thought he ought not to get involved, but we appear to have an impasse. It seems to me as one of the leaders, I would certainly be prepared to work with you, with the Speaker, I think the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) would, in trying to resolve this impasse so we could as an institution select bipartisan personnel that both sides could have confidence in that could then proceed to have an operating, effective Ethics Committee. I frankly hope we could do that. I think both of us and probably the entire institution is frustrated by the fact that we cannot get by this impasse.

It is, however, from our perspective, as the gentleman knows, a very important issue because if both sides are going to have confidence in the impartiality of investigations, of Republicans or Democrats, it will be because both sides participated in and had confidence in those who were selected to, from a staff standpoint, proceed with those investigations.

I would be glad to yield to my friend for his comments.

Mr. DELAY. I appreciate the gentleman yielding. The gentleman is correct in saying that this gentleman is very interested in getting the Ethics Committee up and running. It is for the good of the institution. I do not agree with the gentleman in his assessment of the rules, because the rules also provide for other alternatives other than what he suggested.

I have to say that I think it is unfortunate that some—no one that serves on the committee am I saying this about—that some would use the Ethics Committee for political purposes. I think it is unfortunate. I think that the Democrats that serve on the Ethics Committee and the Republicans that serve on the Ethics Committee are more than capable of coming to some resolution.

The gentleman assumes and suggests that the leadership ought to get involved in it. I think the problem is that

the leadership has gotten involved in it. In the 20 years I have been here, the tradition of this institution to maintain the integrity of the Ethics Committee is that leadership should not be involved in these matters at the Ethics Committee level; that the Ethics Committee is a bipartisan committee set up to function as a bipartisan committee, and when leaders start dictating to the members on that committee, it undermines the credibility of that committee.

I would hope that the members of the committee could look at alternatives, and there have been alternatives suggested and allowed by the rules. For instance, if they can come to no resolution of one single director, you can have codirectors, allowed by the House rules. The ranking member can have a director hired by him, and the chairman can have a director hired by him, and the committee can function on the staff level as the committee is set up to function on the Members level.

I think the involvement of either leaders on both sides of the aisle should encourage, publicly or privately, for the members of the committee to work this out and not be involved in the decision-making, nor the discussion, nor negotiations. The leaders should stay out of it. I would hope that the Ethics Committee would come together and work together and function so that issues before this House protecting the integrity of this House and the credibility of this House as an institution can go forward.

Mr. HOYER. Reclaiming my time, the leader and I have a different perspective on this. He is correct in that observation. First of all, let me say that clearly the leadership ought to stay out of any determinations or considerations or reference to complaints raised or under investigation or determination by the Ethics Committee. I agree with the leader on that.

I do not agree with the leader on the fact that the leadership does not have a particular responsibility to ensure that the Ethics Committee is operating, is functioning, is performing the responsibilities of ensuring the public that we are maintaining the ethics of this institution and the democratic processes in a transparent and open and honest fashion. That is not any different, very frankly, than the leadership appointing the members of the Ethics Committee. It does not stay out of that. It appoints the members of the Ethics Committee on both sides of the aisle. It, in fact, removes members from the Ethics Committee. The problem has arisen here where for the first time since I can remember as a Member of this House, we have an impasse and a failure to, in a bipartisan fashion, agree on a single director.

Mr. Leader, very frankly, I will tell you that the initial problem was raised and our perspective is that the rules were changed to provide for impasse, for gridlock, where five people could not agree to proceed with the inves-

tigation, and it would not proceed. I know we differ on that perspective, but that was our perspective. Frankly, for whatever reasons, we have now gone back to the rules that we believe provide for proceeding with investigations without providing for the possibility of partisan gridlock or partisan veto. If you had codirectors, which is what has been suggested, you have one director for the Republicans, one director for the Democrats, you provide indirectly what you have now abandoned in the rule change that you made in January and gone back to the old rule. The whole purpose of having one director, selected in a bipartisan fashion, I suggest to my friend, was to provide and to have a confidence level in proceeding in a way that would provide for an effective operation of the Ethics Committee.

Mr. DELAY. If the gentleman will yield, I do not agree with anything he said, and I appreciate it.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY COMMITTEE ON RULES ON AMENDMENT PROCESS FOR CONSIDERATION OF LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2006

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, the Rules Committee may meet next week to grant a rule which could limit the amendment process for floor consideration of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act for fiscal year 2006.

Any Member wishing to offer an amendment should submit 55 copies of the amendment and 1 copy of a brief explanation of the amendment to the Rules Committee in room H-312 of the Capitol by 3 p.m. next Tuesday, June 21, 2005. Members should draft their amendments to the bill as reported by the Appropriations Committee on Thursday, June 16, 2005, which is expected to be filed with the House on Monday, June 20, 2005. Members are also advised that the text should be available for their review on the Web sites of the Appropriations and Rules Committees by Monday, June 20, 2005.

Members should use the Office of Legislative Counsel to ensure that their amendments are drafted in the most appropriate format, and should check with the Office of the Parliamentarian to be certain their amendments comply with the rules of the House.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, JUNE 20, 2005

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Monday next for morning hour debates.

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

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALL OF THE PRIVATE CALENDAR ON TUESDAY NEXT

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the Private Calendar be dispensed with on Tuesday next.

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

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

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

There was no objection.

DEMOCRATS PLAY HOUSE

(Mrs. BLACKBURN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post ran an article today titled "Democrats Play House to Rally Against the War."

"Play house," Mr. Speaker. That is all the far left leadership seems to think about these days. If you have not read the article, basically Judiciary Committee Democrats are angry they are not running the committee and they are not the majority, so they are playing dress-up. Literally.

To quote the article, they pretended a small conference room was the Judiciary Committee hearing room. The ranking member banged a large wooden gavel and got the other Members to call him "Mr. Chairman." He liked that so much he started calling himself "the chairman."

Mr. Speaker, here we are trying to reform the United Nations, trying to win the war on terror, and the far left leadership in the House is playing pretend. They have pretended winning the war on terror would be cost-free, and that raising taxes grows the economy. They need to stop playing dress-up, and they need to join us in moving forward on a positive agenda for the American people.

CAFTA

(Mr. BROWN of Ohio asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, quoting from Roll Call, Lawmakers who are seeking to trade their votes on CAFTA should be forewarned: Such deals don't pan out.

A Public Citizen report catalogs promises made to lawmakers by the Clinton and Bush administrations on