

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