you know, our constituents are pretty intelligent, they understand a lot of these things, and one of the things that constantly came up during the August break at my town meetings was the fact that people are aware that we have this huge debt out there that keeps collecting interest. You brushed upon that. I mean we have been mainly talking about why this Republican tax proposal is wrong because of Social Security, but you could also look at it from the other point of view, which is that we still have this huge debt that we are paying back. When we are told by whatever that there is a surplus this year, that is only a surplus for general revenues for this fiscal year. There is still all this money that we owe from previous years that has to be paid back. So you could use that argument as well to justify why there should not be a tax, why this tax proposal should not go forward.

Mr. ADAM SMITH of Washington. Or, I will emphasize this, or any dramatic increases in spending, because there are certainly a lot of programs; you know, Head Start, a variety of other ideas out there. But if the revenue is not made up somewhere, we should be very cautious about doing that as well, because that too will contribute to the debt. And right now the interest that we pay on the debt is 14 percent of our budget. That means 14 percent of the money that we are spending is simply going to service the debt, it is not going to provide health care for seniors or children in poverty, it is not going to give middle class children access to education, it is not going to protect the environment, it is not going to give us a stronger defense. It is going straight into pay our debt.

And so as that number keeps going up, that 14 percent number keeps going up as well, and that basically puts us in a real bind.

Mr. PALLONE. Sure. And then the last thing I wanted to say, and I think is sort of the true irony, is that the Republicans, of course, during this balanced budget debate over the last few years posed themselves as the conservatives. And the bottom line is that the two of us and others that have taken the position we are talking tonight are the true conservatives from a fiscal point of view.

In reality what the Republican tax proposal is essentially, you know, I do not want to use the term ''liberal,'' but it is just basically fiscally irresponsible. And if you are really concerned about fiscal responsibility and you really are conservative, you take the point of view that you are taking tonight. I think that is ironic, but I have to say it because it is true.

Mr. ADAM SMITH of Washington. Well, I had a friend of mine in college who was a Republican, but he used to say, you know, Democrats are tax and spend, Republicans are just spend. And I think the truth in what I see the Democrat Party becoming and why I am so proud that we supported the balanced budget agreement from last year is spend responsibly. I mean, that is what it is about. There are things in this country that people want done. We want to make sure that our seniors have an adequate pension, that they have adequate health care, that our young people have access to education. Well, let us do it in a responsible manner. Let us make the programs as efficient as possible, and let us pay for them. Let us not just run up a debt to please people in the moment at the expense of the future. And that is really what it is about is just, okay, well, gosh, I make this person happy right now, and you know maybe I will even be out of Congress by the time we have to pay that bill so I will not have to worry about it. But that is a disservice to the country.

And you are right. Part of being conservative to my mind is a pay-as-you-go philosophy, is being fiscally conservative, and I am still optimistic that enough colleagues on the other side of the aisle, having made this same argument that we are talking about here so repeatedly in the past, will rise up to the challenge, make it again in the future even if we are 7 weeks from an election and will make the responsible choice for the future.

Mr. PALLONE. Well, I think you are pointing out another point as well tonight, and I appreciate your bringing it up, and that is that to some extent, I think to a large extent, this is just being done by the Republicans for political purposes because the election is a few weeks away. Because I think we have already heard pretty much from the other body, from the Senate, that they are not going to take this up. And so this is not a proposal that is likely to go anywhere, it is just going to be passed in the House so that Republicans can go back and say, oh, they did this and somehow benefit from it on election day.

Mr. ADAM SMITH of Washington. And I will tell you what my experience has been with my constituents, and we get into this all the time as we come up towards the election. We want to give stuff away. We think that is what is going to make people happy. We will give them a new spending program, we will give them a new tax cut, we will basically, you know, pretend like it is Christmas and pass all kinds of stuff out.

What I found with my constituents is what makes them happy is if we are making sound decisions up here, if we are spending the money wisely, paying as we go, being fiscally conservative and responsible. So I do not even think the tactic of passing out the goodies, as it were, I do not think it works. I think the people are fed up with, you know, record high deficits and record high debt, will want to get back to an age of responsibility, and, like I said, I am optimistic that ultimately that philosophy will win out.

Mr. PALLONE. I think you are right, and I think that we are going to hear more about this over the next few days, but I am glad that we are able to spend some time tonight on it because this is going to be a major part of the debate over the next few days and the next few weeks here.

So thanks again.

GOVERNMENT OVERSIGHT RESPONSIBILITIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, let me state at the beginning here a couple of entry points.

One, I talked last night and earlier tonight a little bit on this particular subject, and I do not want to give the impression that that is all that I am focusing on or anybody else here is focusing on. All day long we have been debating multiple bills. I spoke on the juvenile justice bill, on the medicinal use of marijuana bill. We also passed Congressman SESSIONS' methamphetamine bill, many other pieces of legislation. I met for several hours with the Higher Education Conference Committee. We do many things. But one of the things we do have a charge of is government oversight.

It is also very difficult, and I know it seems kind of curious as we discuss some of these matters, that we are under very tight and wise rules about what we can and cannot say, and it is like having a hundred or a thousand or a million pound gorilla out there on one subject right now that we cannot talk about. And we have to be very careful about what we say about the highest leaders in our land and about other Members, and I think those rules are good.

So sometimes if it seems we are a tad evasive at this point, it is not that we are in general, but on this House floor I think we have high standards to meet, we have weighty matters before us, as we have had before in this country's history. And I know many Americans wish this would just go away and that we would not have to deal with these subjects. But in fact we do, that it is not just a question of moral outrage. I have been outraged for an extended period of time, and, like others, I have called for resignation on what I believe is the lack of moral leadership in this country.

But we have high standards that we have to go through here in multiple ways, and it is not just about one aspect of anything, and for those who say cannot you just get this over with, there are lots of questions that we have to explore here.

We need to know whether our government has been for sale. A lot of people think all the matters that have gone on in Washington are related to sex or even about whether or not individuals have told the truth in front of a jury or tried to influence others. But it goes

far beyond that, and we need to get to the bottom of the truth, and any kind of interim measure is not going to work because the fact is that it would shut off other questions that need to be investigated as well; questions, as I tried to illustrate last night, that have been stonewalled.

We have had 116 people either flee this country in order to avoid questions, or have pled the fifth amendment. As I illustrated last night, if we put those names across the front, they would cover this entire well, and by House rules I was not able to do that because it would violate House decorum because it would block the whole front of this with the names of people who will not participate in oversight investigation of their country because they might go to jail if they talked.

We have had, and it is a frightening trend, and it is hard to tell where it goes and who, but we have to get to the bottom of this. We cannot have what is in effect like the TV movies, or last night I used an example from the Twilight Zone, where a whole town refuses to talk because if nobody talks, then you cannot ever get to the bottom of the truth.

Earlier tonight we talked about whether there should be a special prosecutor for campaign finance. We cannot just try to lock up the little people and not get to the big people. We had that debate today in juvenile justice, we had that debate, and we will again tomorrow in our drug laws. At what point do you say you are not going to just lock up every end user, if it is against the law you are going to be punished, but that we have got to get to the people who are selling them and the people who are selling them. The question is who is making the decisions that have compromised the integrity across the board in many cases enough that we have five special prosecutors looking at Cabinet members, or have had, we have them looking at White House officials. We have a former second-ranking official in the Justice Department who has been in prison. We have the legal counsel at the White House has committed suicide. We have deep troubles in this country that we need to pursue, and I want to go through tonight, which I only started last night, some of the individuals that we are trying to get to talk and some of the questions.

I want to start with a man named Johnny Chung.

On June 20, 1998, the Washington Post reported stunning allegations made by DNC donor Johnny Chung that he knowingly received $300,000 from a Chinese Army officer, an aerospace official, for the purpose of making political contributions. In March of 1998, Chung pled guilty to orchestrating illegal conduit contributions and other related charges, is now reportedly cooperating with Justice Department officials.

Johnny Chung gave $366,000 to Democrats in the 1996 campaign. Following the 1996 elections, the DNC returned all of these contributions because of doubts about the origins of the money. According to the Washington Post, Chung has told the Justice Department that at least $80,000 of the money he contributed came from Liu Chao Ying, a formal lieutenant colonel in the Chinese Army. Chung further alleged that top DNC officials such as Richard Sullivan, the former DNC Finance Director, continued to solicit donations from him, despite having good reason to believe that the donations were illegal. Chung became prominant as a DNC contributor and frequent White House visitor during the 1995–96 campaign cycle when he presented a $50,000 check to the First Lady's chief of staff, Maggie Williams, on March 9, 1995, inside the White House. This contribution paved the way for Chung to bring a delegation of high-level Chinese business executives to the weekly radio address. Just prior to making this contribution, Chung received a $150,000 wire transfer from the Haomen Beer Company in China. After the event, Chung was informed by Richard Sullivan of the DNC that the photographs that were taken with high officials and Chung's business associates would not be released to him due to the objections of the National Security Council. One NSC official even referred to Chung as a hustler.

The photos were eventually released to Chung, but only after he contributed an additional $125,000 at an April 1995 DNC fund-raiser in China. Chung has been quoted as saying, quote, the White House is like the subway, you have to put coins in to open the gates, end quote.

Chung's success at a DNC fundraiser gave him unfettered access to the White House. The White House WAVE records show that between February 1994 and February 1996, Chung was admitted into the White House 49 times. In October 1995 Chung escorted the chairman of China Petrochemical Corporation, Mr. Chiang to a series of high-level meetings in Washington.

□ 2130

Arranged meetings for him with the Energy Secretary Hazel O'Leary, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury Lawrence Summers, and DNC Chairman Donald Fowler. Chung then donated $25,000 to Africare, a favorite charity of O'Leary, and introduced him to let us say a high-ranking official at the dinner.

Chung invoked the Fifth Amendment in response to a subpoena to testify before the committee in November 1997. He gave a partial briefing to committee members, including me, behind closed doors on the condition that his statements be kept confidential.

Questions we would like to ask Johnny Chung: Did you donate up to $100,000 to democratic campaigns that came from Liu Chao Ying the head of China Aerospace International and the lieutenant colonel in the People's Liberation Army?

Was Liu Chao Ying hoping to get something specific in return?

Of the $366,000 that Chung donated to the DNC, how much originated outside of the United States of America illegally?

Why did Chung bring senior executives from China Petrochemical Company to meet with the Energy Secretary O'Leary and Assistant Secretary Lawrence Summers in October 1995?

It would be nice if we could ask those questions.

John Huang is a naturalized U.S. citizen. He was a senior executive at Lippo Bank in Los Angeles where he reported to James Riady. He and his wife personally donated over $20,000 to the DNC and DSCC during the 1992 election cycle. He also donated $86,000 to the Presidential Inaugural Committee in January of 1993. One week later, he was reimbursed of the $86,000 by Lippo Bank. Huang left Lippo in June of 1994, after a successful lobbying effort by James Riady to place him in the administration. Internal DNC memorandum show that he was listed as a ''must consider'' for such appointments at either Commerce, Treasury or State Departments. John Huang was approved for a position as Deputy Assistant Secretary for East Asia and the Pacific at the Commerce Department by the President.

He received a ''interim top secret clearance'' 6 months before he began his job at Commerce. In his new position, he kept close ties to officials at Lippo Bank in Indonesia, telephoning at least 70 times from his Commerce office, all while receiving at least 37 classified briefings. He also visited the White House at least 78 times between July 1, 1995 and July 3, 1996.

On September 13, 1995, he had attended a meeting in the Oval Office with the highest ranking officials in this country and also staff, including Bruce Lindsey, James Riady, and Joe Giroir. At this meeting, a decision was made to move Huang from the Commerce Department to the DNC where he would target his fund-raising efforts primarily on the Asian American community. Three months later, in December of 1995, he resigned to become a fund-raiser for the DNC. He raised between $3 and $4 million while at DNC. He was a primary contact for Charlie Trie and Pauline Kanchanalak, both of whom have been indicted by the Justice Department in its ongoing campaign finance probe. The DNC has returned more than $3 million he raised. These contributions were returned because they were either illegal or suspicious.

He invoked the Fifth Amendment on February 18, 1997 in response to a House subpoena dated February 13, 1997. Here are some questions we would like to ask him:

It is clear that you and Charlie Trie were working together at some level to raise money for the DNC. We would

like to know if you were aware of Charlie Trie's numerous conduit contributions.

We would like to know if John Huang was aware that the $450,000 that he solicited for the Wiriadinatas came directly from Indonesia.

We would like to know if John Huang was aware that the donation by Pauline Kanchanalak came directly from Thailand.

We would like to know if John Huang solicited contributions while he worked at the Commerce Department.

We would like to know if John Huang passed on information he received during classified briefings to anyone at the Lippo Bank, since, while he was receiving the classified briefings, he made 70 calls to Lippo Bank.

We would like to know if John Huang used his influence within this administration to benefit the Riady family in any way.

And once again, as I pointed out last night, remember, it is that family that had concerns about the drilling in the parts of the Escalante wilderness area that had concerns about China, that had concerns about Vietnam.

Ted Sioeng, his family and business associates, contributed over $700,000 into the American political process from 1995 to 1996. The committee has determined that the majority of this money was derived from foreign sources or otherwise legally impermissible. Sioeng's contributions, either personally or through his business associates and family members, were given to a variety of Federal, State and local political organizations and candidates. The largest beneficiary of his contributions was the DNC. The DNC received $400,000 from his business associates and family members, $150,000 of which was also given to Republican causes.

Over 28 witnesses relevant to the committee's investigation of Ted Sioeng have asserted their Fifth Amendment right against self incrimination, left the country, or refused to be interviewed.

He is an Indonesian-born businessman who travels on the Belize passport. His major business is the production and distribution of China's number 1 selling cigarette brand, Red Pagoda Mountain. The committee believes Sioeng improperly directed illegal foreign contributions to the DNC and other political entities and candidates.

The Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs concluded that he had ''worked, and perhaps still works, for the Chinese government.'' The committee has developed substantial evidence to support the Senate's conclusion.

Ted Sioeng left the country in early 1997. Since that time, he has refused to cooperate with the investigations being conducted by the House and the Senate. He is believed to reside in Hong Kong or the People's Republic of China.

Questions we would like to ask him:

Did you ask your daughter to donate $100,000 to the DNC in February 1996?

Why have more than 20 members of your family or circle of business associates either taken the Fifth Amendment that you would incriminate yourself if you testified, or fled the country?

Did Sioeng arrange a scheme in which at least $300,000 in contributions to the DNC were funded from bank accounts in Indonesia and Hong Kong?

James Riady is an Indonesian-based banker and son of Mochtar Riady, chairman of the Lippo Group, a $500 billion Asian business empire. James Riady is a permanent resident of the United States. In 1977, he met our current President when he was serving as Arkansas's State Attorney General. James was sent by his father to Arkansas to learn the banking and finance business at Stephens, Inc.

In its report on campaign finance, the U.S. Senate suggests that the Riady family has had a ''long-term relationship with the Chinese Intelligence Agency.'' James Riady is the deputy chairman of the family's main business, the Lippo Group. The Riady family, including its business and partners, donated more than $700,000 to the Democrats between 1991 and 1996.

Mochtar Riady and his son James have told close associates that they ''helped get Huang his Commerce Department position in return for their political support for the President.'' Other reports have indicated that James Riady has claimed Huang was ''my man in the American government.'' James Riady visited the White House on 19 occasions, 6 of which were to see the deputy White House Chief of Staff Mark Middleton. He lives in Indonesia and has refused to be interviewed by this committee in January 1998.

Questions we would like to ask Mr. Riady:

Did you lobby the President to get John Huang's job in the Commerce Department?

Did you ask the top leaders of our country, did you or your father, were you asked by the top leaders of our country to pay $100,000 fee to Webb Hubbell while Hubble was under investigation?

Let me repeat that, because I tripped over that. We want to know whether he or his father, since they paid $100,000 fee to Webster Hubble, which helped in our opinion possibly to keep Webster Hubble from cooperating, did he get asked by anybody at the White House. But we cannot ask him that, because he will not cooperate.

Did the Lippo Group receive any classified information from January Huang while he was at the Commerce Department who we have already documented called that group from the Commerce Department?

What were the Riadys hoping to get in return for the hundreds of thousands of dollars they gave to the Democratic party in the early 1990s? They are very a prominent, practical and capitalist company. It is doubtful they were just throwing their money away.

Ng Lap Seng is a Macao businessman and Charlie Trie's business partner. They jointly owned a Macao company, through which, according to the FBI, Ng wired Trie more than $900,000, part of which Trie donated to the DNC.

Maria Shaw is being investigated for one of the classic cases that we have ever seen: a bunch of Buddhist nuns who gave $100,000 each, but do not understand where the money came from, and where prominent officials of the United States participated in that period where that money was transferred and apparently knew it was a fundraiser. That is under investigation.

Charlie Trie is a long time friend from Arkansas of people in this administration where he ran a Chinese restaurant in Arkansas. He served as a trustee to the Democratic national party and was afforded liberal access to the White House and the top leadership at the White House. Trie was admitted to the White House on at least 45 occasions to visit with Mark Middleton and others. Mr. Trie is believed to have used members of his own family and other associates to funnel over $600,000 in illegal conduit payments to the Democratic National Committee during the 1996 campaign cycle. President Clinton was once quoted as saying, ''Charlie has been a close friend of mine for 2 decades.''

Trie brought $645,000 in contributions to the President's legal defense fund. Many of them were in sequentially numbered cashiers checks. All were returned after it was learned they were connected to a Buddhist cult in Taiwan.

Trie came into possession of $200,000 in travelers's checks that came from Jakarta, Indonesia. At least $50,000 of this money was used for conduit contributions.

Trie received over $1 million in wire transfers from his patron in Macau. Again, much of this money was used for conduit contributions. In April of 1996, Trie was appointed by President Clinton to the Commission on United States Pacific Trade and Investment Policy, which advised the President on ways to ''achieve a significant opening in Japan, China and other Asian and Pacific markets to U.S. businesses.''

After his named surfaced in the press in connection to the illegal fund-raising scandal, Trie fled to China. He was reportedly living in Shanghai. In June 1997, NBC news interview with Tom Brokaw, Trie boasted he could stay in China for 10 years. He ultimately did return to the United States following his indictment. Trie quipped, ''congressional investigators will never find me.''

Charlie Trie initially left the country for a year in 1997. He invoked the Fifth Amendment on May 11, 1998, in response to a March 25, 1998 committee subpoena.

Questions we would like to ask Charlie Trie:

Why did you use conduit donors to make contributions to the Democratic party?

Did the $200,000 in travelers checks come from the Riady family in Indonesia and clearly trying to influence the foreign policy of this country? Why did Trie flee the country in the wake of the campaign finance scandal?

Why was Ng Lap Seng giving Charlie Trie hundreds of thousands of dollars to make illegal contributions here in the United States?

Did the top people in this government who knew Trie from Arkansas ever question where he was getting the hundreds of thousands of dollars that he was giving to their party? They knew him, they knew he did not have the money.

Pauline Kanchanalak, citizen of Thailand, was one of the most prominent witnesses to have fled this country. She recently returned to the United States after she was indicted by a Federal grand jury in Washington on charges of funneling at least $679,000 in illegal foreign contributions to the DNC and State Democratic parties.

The Justice Department has also indicted Kanchanalak's business associate and sister-in-law, Duangnet Kronenberg, who has taken the Fifth Amendment. According to the indictment, Kanchanalak and Kronenberg served at conduits for contributions for foreign companies and individuals into American campaigns. The Justice Department itself has alleged that Kanchanalak and Kronenberg gained access to the top leaders, I will not say who, because of House rules. This access was intended by defendants to impress clients and help their business ventures. In fact, Kanchanalak visited the White House at least 26 times, Kronenberg at least 9 times. Kanchanalak donated $32,000 to the DNC in October 1994, 2 days after the Commerce Department trade officials and John Huang helped arrange the inaugural ceremony for a U.S. Thailand business council at the White House. The 2 also gave a total of $135,000 to the DNC on the same day that Kanchanalak and Huang escorted 3 businessmen into a White House coffee. One businessman did most of the talking about the People's Republic of China.

The DNC has returned $253,000 in illegal contributions from Kanchanalak, but has not returned any of the $105,000 in contributions from Kronenberg. Both were also charged with obstruction of justice shortly after the campaign finance scandal broke. The 2 removed boxes of files from their offices and hired someone to erase the memories of their computers.

A point I want to make about what we were talking about tonight. You have heard me in a number of these cases refer to people who have been indicted. The question is, and this is what was at the core of our insisting on a special prosecutor, because we heard the FBI director and Mr. Labella tell our committee that you cannot get a fair investigation, and to suggest strongly that Democratic appointed officials, as the Attorney General is, cannot be neutral, and that, in fact, there are questions whether they have been going individually after these cases.

□ 2145

Much like what would happen sometimes in a drug bust in Fort Wayne or in Kendallville or in Huntington we can get excited in our district because it is a big drug bust there, and we close it down. Instead of getting to the next level and the next level.

What I have been suggesting and you have been watching the pictures is this is massive. Let me remind you again, there 116 people; 79 have plead the Fifth Amendment, the rest have fled the country or in one way or another dodged subpoenas.

If I put their names up here 10 at a time, it would cover this whole stage. If I stacked them up here 10 on a board at a time, it would go clear to the top of this ceiling.

This is a massive problem that we are facing. People say, why can you not close this down? Why can you not get to the truth? You are hearing we cannot get fundamental questions answered because people will not cooperate. It is like a whole city being in on something saying we are not going to talk.

We need a few Americans who know the truth to stand up and say what they know so we can continue to move, or we need to start offering immunity to these people. It cannot be done under a partisan Justice Department. That is what the FBI director is saying, and that is what the Justice Department's own career people are saying. And it has to be done.

This is not about sex. The whole country is abuzz about sex. But there are other matters here, too. We have seen a pattern. As we heard last night in the Teamsters, the same names are showing up. The same names are showing up when we start to look at the Indian casino questions. The same names show up in scandal after scandal after scandal.

When are we going to get to who is coordinating this and at what level and who knew about it and when, the basic questions that we heard in Watergate years ago?

A man known as Antonio Pan is a former high-level Lippo executive based in Hong Kong. He was involved in Lippo's business ventures during China. He became an associate of Charlie Trie and was indicted along with Trie on charges related to illegal fundraising on January 28, 1998.

In October of 1995, Trie and Pan invited then Commerce Secretary Ron Brown to attend a fund-raising dinner while on a Trade Mission to China. At this dinner, Trie asked many of the attendees, many of whom were not United States citizens or permanent residents, to contribute to the DNC.

During February 1996, Pan was also active in soliciting conduit contributors for the DNC and reimbursing them with cash on behalf of Trie. Pan sent $25,000 in cashier's checks, via overnight delivery, to Trie's sister, Manlin Foung, in order to reimburse her for contributions to the DNC.

The money is believed to have originated with the travelers checks Trie received from Indonesia. Pan also allegedly received $80,000 in cash in August 1996 from Ng Lap Seng and used most of the money to reimburse straw contributors in Los Angeles that he had persuaded to write checks to the DNC for the President's 50th birthday party in New York City. Pan has left the country and cannot be located.

Questions we would like to ask Mr. Pan: Why did Pan open a savings account at the Amerasia Bank in Flushing, New York with $25,200 in cash, within minutes withdraw $25,000 and then send it to Charlie Trie's sister and her boyfriend in California?

Why did Pan share a bank account with Charlie Trie?

Witnesses have told the House Committee on Government Reform and Oversight that in 1996, Pan withdrew $80,000 in cash and delivered portions of it to individuals in Los Angeles who then sent it to the Democratic Party.

Where did this money come from originally? Who asked him to generate these contributions? Were Antonio Pan and Charlie Trie working on behalf of the Riady family of Indonesia, or were other foreign entities behind their activities?

These are grave questions. I am sure in future days we will be going through other names illustrating this point in other ways. But tonight, I wanted to give my colleagues an idea of the depth of the problem we are facing in this United States government.

The problems that we have been abuzz about over the last few days are not going to just go away. In fact, we have special prosecutors in addition to Judge Starr being appointed; times extended. We are going to have some more.

There is only one way that the problem can go away. But we need to get to the bottom of this. We cannot do any slap on the wrist, any verbal gymnastics here to try to avoid the tough questions.

We have to know, has this government been for sale at the highest levels, especially possibly to foreign influences? Have there been patterns of cover-up throughout this entire government, not knowing what level it gets to? I don't know that. We have 116 people that will not talk to us. And they may turn up other names, if some of them start to talk, of other people we need to go to.

But we have been inching up and inching up. It is clear there is a pattern that is far beyond the political appointee of this White House to solve. We need a special prosecutor. We need to hear that investigation. We need to hear what the gentleman from California (Mr. COX) turns up in his investigation. We need to see what the Committee on the Judiciary turns up. We need

to see what the Teamsters investigation of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA) turns up. We need to see how these things come together. If necessary, this House will have to do whatever it needs to do.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. HARMAN (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today, on account of official business in the district.

Mr. EHRLICH (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for after 7 p.m. Today, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MCNULTY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. GEPHARDT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. LANTOS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MINGE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CONYERS, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DREIER) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. DELAY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WOLF, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PAPPAS, for 5 minutes, on September 16.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MCNULTY) and to include extraneous material:)

Mr. KIND.

Mr. MENENDEZ.

Ms. SLAUGHTER.

Mr. HAMILTON.

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts.

Mr. BLAGOJEVICH.

Mr. UNDERWOOD.

Ms. NORTON.

Mr. LANTOS.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

Mr. SKELTON.

Mr. BONIOR.

Ms. DELAURO.

Mr. FILNER.

Ms. STABENOW.

Mr. CONYERS.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DREIER) and to include extraneous material:)

Mr. GILMAN.

Mr. DAN SCHAEFER of Colorado.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

Mr. MICA.

Mr. EVERETT.

Mr. CAMPBELL.

Mr. GILMAN.

Mrs. EMERSON.

Mr. HANSEN.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SOUDER) and to include extraneous material:)

Mr. PARKER.

Mr. BROWN of California.

Mr. DELAY.

Mr. BLUNT.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

Mr. OBERSTAR.

Mr. RYUN.

Mr. PACKARD.

Mr. BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado.

Mr. PICKERING.

Ms. STABENOW.

Mr. GOODLATTE.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 2112. An act to make the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 applicable to the United States Postal Service in the same manner as any other employer.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, September 16, 1998, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

10885. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule— Kiwifruit Grown in California; Relaxation of Pack Requirements [Docket No. FV98–920–4 IFR] received September 9, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

10886. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Milk in the Southwest Plains Marketing Area; Suspension of Certain Provisions of the Order [DA–98–08] received September 9, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

10887. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule—Uniform Financial Reporting Standards for HUD Housing Programs [Docket No. FR–4321–F–03] (RIN: 2501–AC49) received September 2, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

10888. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule—Public Housing Assessment System [Docket No. FR–4313–F–03] (RIN: 2577–AB81) received September 2, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

10889. A letter from the Deputy Executive Director and Chief Operating Officer, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule—Allocation of Assets in Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Valuing Benefits [29 CFR Part 4044] received September 9, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

10890. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards; Occupant Crash Protection; Anthropomorphic Test Dummy [Docket No. NHTSA–98–4358](RIN: 2127–AG75, 2127–AG80, 2127–AG94) received August 26, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

10891. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plans; California State Implementation Plan Revision; Ventura County Air Pollution Control District [CA 009–0090a FRL–6142–3] received August 13, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

10892. A letter from the AMD—Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Ashton, Idaho and West Yellowstone, Montana) [MM Docket No. 97–200, RM–9144, RM–9313] received August 28, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

10893. A letter from the AMD—Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Albion, Honeoye Falls and South Bristol Township, New York) [MM Docket No. 98–8, RM–9178] received August 28, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

10894. A letter from the AMD-Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Implementation of Section 309(j) of the Communications Act—— Competitive Bidding for Commercial Broadcast and Instructional Television Fixed Service Licenses [MM Docket No. 97–234] Reexamination of the Policy Statement on Comparative Broadcast Hearings [GC Docket No. 92–52] received August 28, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

10895. A letter from the Acting Secretary, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Trade Regulation Rule Regarding Use of Negative Option Plans by Sellers in Commerce [16 CFR Part 425] received August 26, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

10896. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule— 1998–99 Refuge-Specific Hunting and Sport Fishing Regulations (RIN: 1018–AE68) received August 28, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

10897. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Species in the Rock Sole/Flathead Sole/''Other Flatfish'' Fishery Category by Vessels Using Trawl Gear in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands [Docket No. 971208298–8055–02; I.D. 081498A] received August 26, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.