

the Republicans done about children's health? Nothing. What have the Republicans done about education? Nothing, nothing, nothing.

Mr. Speaker, 100 days of nothing is enough. It is time to address the concerns of American working families. It is time for this do-nothing Congress to do something. Get to work.

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 112 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

##### H. RES. 112

*Resolved*, That it shall be in order at any time on Wednesday, April 16, 1997, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules. The Speaker or his designee shall consult with the minority leader or his designee on the designation of any matter for consideration pursuant to this resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my friend, the gentlewoman from Fairport, NY [Ms. SLAUGHTER], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

(Mr. DREIER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

□ 1130

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, in a statement that is more prophetic than he might have imagined when he made it at the time, President Woodrow Wilson said,

"It's not far from the truth to say that Congress in session is Congress on public exhibition, while Congress in committee rooms is Congress at work.

It is the work of Congress that we hope to accomplish with adoption of this rule. It makes in order at any time today, Wednesday, April 16, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules. The rule further requires the Speaker or his designee to consult with the minority leader or his designee on the designation of any matter for consideration pursuant to the rule.

The bills that will be considered under suspension of the rules as a result of adopting this rule are non-controversial and very narrowly tailored, thus making it impractical to bring them up under the order of business resolution from our Committee on Rules. However, scheduling them for consideration today is necessary to ensure that our colleagues are here to do very important committee work.

The Committee on Banking and Financial Services is holding an important markup on public housing reform. The Committee on the Budget members are in important negotiations with the administration over the outlines of our balanced budget proposal. The Committee on Commerce is marking up the Leaking Underground Storage Tank Trust Fund Amendments Act. Even our own Committee on Rules will have a hearing tomorrow on improving civility in the House, which is critical, as we all know, to the proper functioning of this institution.

Mr. Speaker, for those of our colleagues who are concerned with the pace and direction of our agenda in the House, adoption of this rule is a precondition to ensuring a productive and successful first session of the 105th Congress.

Also, Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to note that for 2 years during the 104th Congress, we constantly heard complaints from our friends in the minority that the committee system was being bypassed to expedite major legislation. We now have the opportunity to let our committees deliberate openly and do their work, and they are able to have the full participation of the members of their committees.

Mr. Speaker, this is obviously a totally noncontroversial rule. I hope that, unlike last week, we will proceed in a very, very amicable and non-controversial way as we proceed with this. I urge adoption of the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the rule serves no purpose other than to require the Members of the body to spend another day voting on measures which are non-controversial and which could easily have been disposed of on the regular suspension days of Monday and Tuesday. Meanwhile, the real business of the House remains neglected.

As we all know, Federal law requires Congress to produce a budget resolution by April 15, 1997. That was yesterday. Well, yesterday came and went without the majority having even proposed a budget or holding a single committee vote on a budget. Nor has the majority taken any steps whatsoever toward enacting campaign finance reform.

Our constituents might wonder what has Congress been spending its time on? Well, the answer is precious little. Today marks the end of the first 100 days of the 105th Congress. Yet the House has barely been in session. This year the House has taken 2 days off for every day it has worked. In fact, the House has been in session for only 33 of the first 100 days of this Congress. Essentially, we took 2 of the first 3 months off. Hardworking families all over the country must look at us and

wonder who we think we are. Is this really what we were elected to do?

Since the 105th Congress began, more than 300,000 children have lost their private health insurance. Yet the majority has refused to act on legislation to help families get health coverage for their children. More than 200,000 students have dropped out of high school. But what is our leadership doing to improve public education? More than 1,000 children have been killed, and yet the majority has yet to schedule any floor action for legislation on juvenile crime and drugs.

This Congress took only 60 votes, that is 60, in the first quarter of 1997, 60 votes in the first 90 days. Less than a vote a day, and that is counting all the votes on noncontroversial measures like those to honor democracy gains in Guatemala and Nicaragua and to thank former Secretary Warren Christopher for being Secretary of State and 11 votes for various States for voting term limits.

Now, I am not saying that those measures were unworthy of our votes, only that they do not really constitute heavy lifting. Yet the majority insists on dragging out for consideration these noncontroversial measures day after day, week after week.

Mr. Speaker, why could we not have considered the suspension bills scheduled for today on Monday or Tuesday of this week? Why are we not using the remainder of the week to work on more meaningful legislation like a budget resolution and campaign finance reform?

The rule is disrespectful of the voters we represent and their tax dollars. The majority spent a lot of time on the floor this week talking about taxes. Well, I remind my colleagues, as I did last week when this House considered an identical rule, that it costs the taxpayers of the country \$280,000 each week to bring all of us back to Washington. We ought to at least give them their money's worth and get on with the business of passing a budget and enacting campaign finance reform.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question, and if the previous question is defeated, I intend to offer an amendment that would require the House to consider campaign finance reform before Memorial Day, May 31, so that a final campaign finance reform bill can be sent to President Clinton before July 4.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WISE].

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, here we are, another suspension day. This is one body that just seems to be in constant suspension. I do not know exactly what that means except nothing is being done. We have got some significant bills, as the gentlewoman just said. This Congress has passed bills honoring Warren Christopher for his service as Secretary of State, commending Guatemala for possibly venturing toward democracy; a whole list of things. Yes,

they are nice things and they are important, but they are not the guts of legislation.

So what exactly are we here today for, Mr. Speaker? So that we can approve another suspension day doing the same kind of lifting we have been doing? If this were a weight lifting class, I think it would definitely fall under lightweight training. There is no bulking up that is going on around here. There is no heavy lifting taking place. There is not even weight training. It is not cardiovascular. I am trying to figure out what the exercise regime is in this Congress.

But I will tell Members what is not being done when there is no heavy lifting going on in this Congress: There is no Medicare that is being restructured that is supposed to go belly up by the year 2001. There are no education opportunities being created for the many hundreds of thousands of young people that are trying to get to college. There is no pension reform taking place for the thousands, actually millions of Americans who are counting on that pension when they retire. There is no work being done on the budget.

Oh, the budget. Budget negotiations are taking place, I heard. In fact, the previous speaker on the other side talked about the outline of a balanced budget deal. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that is all there is from the Republican leadership, is an outline because they have not brought a budget down. Yes, I know that Democrats did not bring it down on April 15 either, but I also know that Democrats had a budget. The interesting thing is that in these budget negotiations it is the White House negotiating with itself.

"How much do you want to cut Medicare, Mr. President?"

"Well, I'll cut it this much, because they do not have a budget to cut from." Yet here we are today in another suspension day where we deal only with noncontroversial bills.

Let me suggest something that could be worked on, and that is why I will vote to defeat the previous question. How about campaign finance reform? Just as there have been significant allegations against the Democratic Party, so have there been significant allegations against the Republican Party as well. No side comes out with clean hands on this. In fact today I saw in the newspaper, in one of the local papers, allegations against yet another Republican leader. And so it seems to me that campaign finance reform could be worked on today. But if it cannot be worked on today, could we work on it tomorrow or perhaps could we set a goal that there will be a campaign finance reform bill on this floor by Memorial Day? That would be a Memorial Day worth memorializing.

And so, Mr. Speaker, why are we doing more suspensions? Because there is not anything else to do, because the leadership will not bring anything to the floor. So let me suggest something: Medicare, education, balanced budget,

pension reform and campaign finance reform. Campaign finance reform by Memorial Day. That is why I would urge my colleagues to vote against the previous question so that we can get that agenda up.

If my colleagues want to do some real heavy lifting around here, we are going to have to defeat the previous question. Otherwise, we are just into cardiovascular.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Smyrna, GA [Mr. BARR].

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from California for yielding me this time. This is really amazing, Mr. Speaker, to hear folks on the other side get up here and beat their chests and be so sanctimonious about no work being done. One time I had a lady from Georgia who called our office and complained that I was not earning my pay because I was not on the floor of the House where she could see me on C-SPAN. I explained to her, to her satisfaction at least, and maybe some folks on the other side will understand this now, the bulk of the work of the Congress of the United States takes place in two institutions with which folks on the other side may not be familiar, committees and subcommittees. There are today, just as one example, Mr. Speaker, House committees and subcommittees debating and considering very specific measures of legislation and very important issues for the American people so that they can indeed be brought to the floor with a minimum of rancor and debate, and so forth, on the floor: Trade with Europe, commodity exchange, the appropriations bills, the small business and economic development, more appropriations bills, the ballistic missile programs, arms control, employment programs, public housing markup, storage tanks involving the public safety, OSHA, nursing home fraud, EPA rule-making, postal service reform, refugees, bankruptcy system, defense review, patent legislation. The list goes on and on and on.

So it is rather disingenuous or evidences a great ignorance for what goes on here in the House for folks on the other side to beat their chests and complain about nothing being done in the Congress. There is in fact a great deal of work being done where it ought to be done, and that is in our House committees and subcommittees.

If I am not mistaken also, Mr. Speaker, these are the very same folks who in the last Congress complained and complained and complained and complained about us moving too quickly, doing too much without deliberating. And here we are trying to accommodate their wishes from the last Congress and be more deliberative, work these matters through the committee, and what happens? Not surprisingly, we get whipsawed and we get criticized for being more deliberative, working through the committees, and so forth,

where there is a great deal more opportunity for debate and input on both sides of the aisle.

Then we have, Mr. Speaker, this smoke screen of, oh, we must have campaign finance reform. One really has to wonder, with the daily allegations that are coming out in the media concerning this administration, one wonders where the notion that clean hands are involved here. I mean, good heavens, Mr. Speaker, with the allegations that are coming out that require, that cry out for study, which the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight is trying to do but for, of course, the intransigence on the other side, which delayed for days and days and days and weeks the funding of that committee.

There is a great deal that does need to be done to look into these allegations, to get to the bottom of it, to clean this mess up, and one has to wonder whether this effort to say, oh, we have to have the matter of campaign finance reform generally brought to the floor by Memorial Day, rather a strange day it seems to me to do campaign finance reform, that this may be a smoke screen and an effort to divert the public's attention from the very serious allegations arising out of this administration's activities and the efforts by this body through its Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, exercising its proper jurisdiction, to get to the bottom of those things.

That is what would be very, very enlightening and very positive to hear from the other side about, what can we do about the tremendous current erosion of our political system and the public's faith and confidence in that system by the allegations involving the sale of our election process to foreign governments, foreign individuals, individuals with a lot of money, and so forth. That is really where the focus ought to be, Mr. Speaker.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR].

□ 1145

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from New York for yielding me the time.

Today, Mr. Speaker, this is the fourth time this Congress that the Democrats are demanding that we have a vote on campaign finance reform, and as my colleagues have said on our side of the aisle already this morning, we will once again vote to defeat the previous question in order to bring up campaign finance reform to the floor of this House so we can have a bill that eventually will reach the President's desk by the designated time that he requested, the Fourth of July.

Now let me say to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle that the American people are watching what we do on this issue. We have had votes on this campaign finance reform on the 7th of January, the opening day of this

Congress, on the 13th of March, on April 9, and not one Member on this side of the aisle has joined us in support in bringing to the floor this debate.

We are not asking for a specific vehicle to be debated. There are many vehicles, some of them from this side of the aisle, that have merit, some from this side of the aisle; but what we are asking for is a debate. Our way of financing political campaigns in this country is broken, and the American people know it, and although some have proposed spending even more on campaigns, as the Speaker has suggested, the American people think that we ought to do just the opposite. More than 9 out of 10 believe that too much money is spent on political campaigns.

We need to fix the system, we need to limit the amount of money in political campaigns, we need to stop the negative advertising, and we need to get people voting again.

In 1996, I had 20,000 fewer people voting in my election, in the Presidential election, than we had 4 years earlier in 1992. Something is happening. Somewhere along the line, Mr. Speaker, our Nation's political discussion has gotten disconnected from the American people. They no longer see the link between their lives and politics, the link between their work and the forces controlling our economy and the link between their community and the challenges that face our Nation, and as a result, if we talk to them, they will tell us they feel powerless, they feel frustrated, they feel alienated.

We need to have a debate about the fundamental nature of politics in this country, questions like what is the role of our Government, what is the meaning of citizenship in a modern democracy, what is political participation? Let us have that debate.

As my colleagues know, it is no secret why the Republican leadership refuses to schedule campaign finance reform. The wealthy donors who contribute to the Republican Party want tax breaks. The Speaker just the other day said we ought to do away with \$300 billion of tax giveaways to the wealthiest 5 percent of people in our country, and according to an article I have here in the Washington Times, last week they have told the Republican leadership, the wealthiest individuals and contributors, that they can forget, the party can forget, about more money unless tax cuts are enacted.

Now, that is what is going on here. Unless they get these big huge tax cuts for the wealthiest individuals in this country at the expense, I might add, of the rest of America, the other 90, 95 percent who need health care for their kids, who need educational tax breaks so they can afford to send their kids to college or to have a program like school to work where 70 percent of our kids do not go on to finish college and they participate in our society and our economy, unless they get theirs, then they are not going to contribute again

to their party. So instead of meeting the needs of working families, this leadership on this side of the aisle would rather cater to the wealthy special interests.

We need to get back on track. We need to correct the situation that exists today in this country. We need to erect firewalls between the money and the politics in this country.

So the vote today is not about a particular bill, as I said, or a solution. It is about setting up a process to debate campaign finance reform. There are a lot of good ideas out there, and we simply are asking that we have a chance to debate these ideas.

Now my friend from West Virginia suggested that this has been a Congress that we really have not done much. Oh, we have praised the Nicaraguans on their election, and we have allowed the armored car people to go across the border with weapons. As my colleagues know, we have done things like that. We have praised the Ten Commandments. But we really have not done the work of this Congress. We have not put a budget out, the budget deadline passed the other day, no budget, no proposed budget by my Republican colleagues, no campaign finance reform, no questions that deal with the real issues, no movement on the issues that affect people who are struggling to make it for their families today in America, nothing on education moving, nothing for the 10 million American kids who do not have health insurance in this country, and that is increasing, by the way, by 3,300 each day; 3,300 American children lose their health insurance because their family loses their insurance. Nothing on that.

So I say let us use this time productively, let us use it to clean up our political system, and let us get on with the task of making people believe in their Government once again.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to respond to the remarks of my very good friend.

The fact of the matter is, if we look at the need for campaign finance reform, I think virtually everyone recognizes that some change needs to take place in the area of campaign finance reform. I strongly support it. I am in the process of drafting legislation right now which will empower the voter to have greater knowledge on where people gain their support. I have a number of other provisions. There are lots of things that are being discussed around here. But let us look at where we are today.

The argument is being made that we should rush to the floor immediately with campaign finance reform legislation so that we can debate this, but we need to look at what it is that has led to this very high level of frustration among the American people today. The fact that we read headline stories in virtually every major newspaper in this country on the issue of campaign finance reform, it has to do with viola-

tions of current law that are continually reported, and I think we should take a moment to review some of those things that have come to the forefront that have led to this hue and cry for change in the campaign finance law which is simply violations of the present law that now exists today. We have seen \$3 million in foreign contributions that have been returned by the Democratic National Committee, 158 fundraisers reportedly held in the White House; they have been called coffees or teas or receptions, but the documents show that they were fundraisers designed to raise between \$300,000 and \$400,000.

Over \$100,000 was raised in my area in southern California in a Buddhist temple at an event the Vice President attended among people who have taken a vow of poverty. The Washington Post reported that John Huang had tried to funnel a quarter of a million dollars in illegal donations to the Democratic National Committee through an Asian-American business group.

It seems to me that what we need to look at here, Mr. Speaker, as we have this cry for a rush to look at this thing of campaign finance reform, we need to first find out exactly what has happened under current law. And that is our goal here. But to argue that some do not want to do anything to change this system is preposterous because I know that Members of Congress very much do want to bring about a compliance.

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

Mr. DREIER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding, and I thank him for his generous allocation of time. Well, that is exactly my point. We ought to look at what is happening out there and then have a full debate. But the problem is the committee that is investigating this in the House is not looking, they are just looking at the executive branch, and there are problems there. We know that, you have read them out.

But the fact of the matter is that particular committee and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] has refused to deal with the questions of this Congress, it has refused to deal with—

Mr. DREIER. If I can reclaim my time—

Mr. BONIOR. Of the Republican Party as well. It has refused to do the things that Senator THOMPSON is doing over in the Senate.

Mr. DREIER. If my friend will let me respond, I would like to respond to what my friend just said. It is totally untrue to say that the committee is not going to expend any amount of time whatsoever looking into this. If there is evidence of any kind of wrongdoing on this side of the aisle, it clearly will be addressed, and so I mean the fact that they are focusing on this litany of items that continue to be the

front page news stories time and time again, that that is their focus, it is understandable because this is what is happening.

Mr. BONIOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DREIER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BONIOR. There were more front page stories in the paper today about the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] and his connection with the Sikh community; why is that not being looked at? There were front page stories for 3 months on the Speaker. The Speaker collected between \$10 and \$20 million when he was in charge of GOPAC. We have no accounting of that. Why is that not being looked at? We just had the whole investigation with respect to the 501(3)(c)'s; why is that not being looked at?

Mr. DREIER. If I can reclaim my time, I am trying to be as generous as I can. We have Members here who want to speak, and I know the gentleman has time on his side of the aisle.

Let me say that if there is evidence of wrongdoing, it is very apparent that they will be looked at on this side of the aisle, but it is so obvious with these things that have taken place from the leadership of their party they desperately need to be addressed, the American people want us to look at those, and then, then we will look at reforming the campaign finance system to take these obvious violations into consideration.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from St. Clairsville, OH [Mr. NEY].

Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker, let us look at what is really going on here today. The Democrats are trying to pull a fast one. They want to rush a campaign finance bill, and that will help kind of cloud over a few of the things that the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] did not get a chance to mention here, key figures in this scandal who have fled the country. We cannot talk to them. We cannot talk to them about their activities. Charlie Trie gave \$640,000 in suspicious checks; he has fled the country, we cannot serve a subpoena on him. Pauline Kanchanalak gave \$235,000 in foreign funds to the DNC that had to be returned; she has fled the country so we cannot talk to her. Relatives of the Riady family, the Lippo bank, gave \$450,000 to the DNC that had to be returned because it was not earned in the United States; they are no longer in the country. This is the real scandal. We can look at the Congress. But as far as rushing a bill today there is so much work to do here we are not going to be able to rush through this process and set a time frame of May or June. We ought to comprehensively look at campaign finance; sure we should. It should have been looked at the last 12 years by the U.S. Congress. But let us not try to rush through a debate on campaign finance reform legislation before we have all the facts. That is important.

That is what we are looking for is all the facts.

And let me just say, Mr. Speaker, that they are right. We support campaign finance reform. I know they support campaign finance reform. But we should have a full and informed debate. Let us not try to say, well, we passed a bill, we do not need to talk about anything or look at anything. There is enough information here and enough to look at with the White House, and it was mentioned by the other side that there should be fire walls. For what is going on down on Pennsylvania Avenue we need a fire truck.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT].

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues know, with each passing day of this Congress more and more Americans are realizing that this Gingrich House is doing less and less to address the real concerns of their everyday lives. The millions of American families who are out there struggling and cannot get health insurance for their children know that this Congress is offering no answer. The millions of Americans who are out there struggling to find the resources as the cost of going to college escalates, who need some assistance, some support, a tax break for them to help them get their kids the educational opportunity they need, they know this Gingrich Congress is not doing anything for them.

Why is that? Why is it that this Congress meets occasionally for a few hours to discuss suspension bills? Well, my colleagues, the problem is not the suspension bills but the desire of the leadership of this Gingrich Congress to suspend reality. They would suspend the reality of what it is like out there to try to struggle to make ends meet and to hope that the government would be on their side instead of dealing with some of the issues that this Congress has on occasion in its part-time sessions talked about, congratulating the Nicaraguans instead of being concerned with congratulating and supporting all those Americans who are out there trying to struggle up the economic ladder.

Why does this happen? Why is this Congress so aimless that people on both sides of the aisle recognize it is accomplishing very little? Well, clearly one of the reasons is that we have largely been leaderless throughout this House since day one.

□ 1200

But there is another explanation, and that is the influence of money and politics on this Congress, and it affects everyone in this House. When we have to raise hundreds of thousands, indeed, hundreds of millions of dollars in each congressional election, Members of Congress begin devoting more time to raising money than tending to the Nation's business, and that begins to even affect the donors.

Indeed, as my colleague from Michigan pointed out, the Washington Times

reported last week, "Donors tell Republicans they are fed up. Tax cuts to talks as chiefs gather." The basic outline of the story was if we do not get our crown jewel, our big tax breaks, we are not going to be giving any more money. That is the kind of influence that I am talking about that distorts the priorities of this Congress, that allows folks to attempt to suspend reality rather than to deal with the real problems of the American people.

Of course, it is not just that this Congress has been doing very little over the last few months; it is when it does act, it does the wrong thing a good bit of the time, and one of those examples is the issue of campaign finance reform. How amusing it would be were it not so serious to hear my colleague from California and my colleague from Ohio tell the American people they want reform, they just do not want to rush into it.

Well, what do my colleagues think we have been doing around here for the last three or four months, rushing to do anything? Rushing to get out of here occasionally to go home after a day and a half of work dealing with measures that have very little to do with the real needs of American families.

We proposed on day one of this Congress that we address the issue of campaign finance reform, not in a rush but in a thoughtful and considered manner, and that effort on day one was voted down on a party-line vote.

So we came back a couple months later, not in a rush or a panic, but realizing that there are real problems that ought to be addressed in a bipartisan fashion and we were again voted down. We came back a third time and were again voted down on the issue of whether or not we would have the very type of thoughtful debate that the gentleman from Ohio says we need to have.

Today we are here for a fourth time, and for the fourth time some Members of this Congress will have an opportunity to reject reform.

The question is not whether we are going to point fingers at one party or another, but whether we will come together, not looking at somebody else's house down Pennsylvania Avenue alone. That needs to be looked at, and my friends on the other side can look at it to their heart's content. But look right here in Congress and what is happening in this Congress, when donors tell Republicans they are fed up, if we do not get our tax breaks we are not going to be contributing to these congressional campaigns.

This issue needs to be addressed by this Congress and addressed today.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from Winter Park, FL [Mr. MICA], the dynamic subcommittee chairman.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, I am trying to remember back now. Let us

see. I came in 1992, in that election. 1993, I was here in 1994. I think the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] was here in 1993, 1994. I see my colleague on the floor, the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON], was here in 1993 and 1994. In fact, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON] and I, I remember we came trying to get campaign finance reform brought before this House. In fact, I am trying to remember, was there ever, when the other party controlled the House, the other body, and the White House, any consideration on this floor of campaign finance reform. That was 24 months.

Now, I do recall when we took over the majority, the things that we did. We did bring to the floor campaign finance reform, and I do not think it was a good bill. In fact, I thought it was a terrible bill. I thought the Republicans had a terrible proposal and the Democrats had a terrible proposal, but it was debated, it was heard fairly and squarely.

What did the Republicans do? They passed a gift ban. In fact, we passed a pretty awesome gift ban. What else did we do? We talked about lobby reform that was long overdue. We not only talked about it, we passed legislation here on the floor. So we talked about these problems and we did something about them.

What we are hearing today is an attempt to speak against a rule that is a fair rule to proceed in an orderly fashion with the business of the House and the business of the Congress. What we are hearing is an attempt by the other side to blur the issue.

I serve on a subcommittee of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight. We passed a protocol; in fact, we passed a protocol almost immediately, a fair protocol, to consider just about any problems that are brought to our attention, including this, even though we have committees of other areas of jurisdiction to deal with campaign finance. So those issues will, in fact, be heard and the important issues will be heard.

We also heard them say we go too fast. Last year we were going too fast. Now they are saying we are going too slow. We are trying to take the people's business in an orderly fashion, and our actions speak louder than our words.

We brought the Nation's finances into some balance. We cut \$53 billion in spending without hurting Medicare, without hurting education, without hurting the environment. So we are on our way. Do not be misled, and we will get the job done.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCGOVERN].

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from New York [Ms. SLAUGHTER] for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I did not anticipate participating in this debate today, but as

a new Member of this House, as a freshman, I want to rise to express my frustration over the fact that we have not been able to put real campaign finance reform on the agenda.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot pick up a newspaper without reading about another scandal. Bipartisan scandals, scandals in the White House, scandals in the Republican National Committee, scandals involving a certain chairman to investigate other scandals.

What is frustrating to me is that there are a number of good and solid proposals dealing with campaign finance reform that have been introduced in this House in a bipartisan way, and yet we cannot get a date certain in which we can debate these issues, in which we can vote on these issues, up or down.

Every major editorial board in this country has editorialized on the need for this Congress to move fast on the issue of campaign finance reform. The American people, if my colleagues read the polls, overwhelmingly believe that the time has come for us to move forward on campaign finance reform, and yet we cannot get a date, we cannot get a commitment from the leadership on the Republican side to bring this issue up and to do what the American people want us to do.

The previous speaker, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MICA], raised the issue that in previous Congresses the Democrats did not ever bring up the issue of campaign finance reform. Well, it is my understanding that in the 102d and the 103d Congress campaign finance reform passed this House twice. It was vetoed by President Bush and then it was filibustered by the Republican majority in the U.S. Senate.

But that is beside the point in many respects. The issue here is not which party is involved with the most scandals, the issue here is not who can do the most finger-pointing, the issue should be how do we fix this broken system. There is too much money involved in politics, and we need to take the money out of the system.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to my good friend from Savannah, GA [Mr. KINGSTON], the hard-working leader of our 1-minute effort.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I share the Democrats' concern for some movement on campaign finance reform. As a Member of Congress, I have supported campaign finance reform, but to hear them talk about it is similar to hearing Al Capone talk about the need to crack down on organized crime. The hypocrisy is absurd.

Let us talk about enforcement of the existing laws, Mr. Speaker, \$3 million in foreign contributions have been returned by the Democrat National Committee. Where is their outrage? Where are they on this? They are not calling. The 158 fundraisers at the White House. The documents show that there have

been over \$300,000 to \$400,000 raised at each fundraiser. Of course, they are calling them teas and coffees. I guess Starbucks would be so proud.

Over \$100,000 raised by the Vice President of the United States at a Buddhist temple where everyone is sworn to a vow of poverty. Where are the Democrats? Where is there righteous indignation there? The Vice President makes fundraising phone calls from Federal Government property. Where are the Democrats? Silent again.

The Washington Post reports that John Huang tried to funnel \$250,000 in illegal donations to the Democrat National Committee through an Asian American business group, and where are the Democrats? Where is their outrage? Nothing but silence.

Let us continue. Pauline Kanchanalak. Now, I might be mispronouncing that name, Mr. Speaker. I am not as intimate with foreign donors as my Democrat friends are. But Pauline Kanchanalak gave \$235,000 in foreign funds to the Democrat National Committee and they had to be returned. Now, we wanted, as Members of Congress, to subpoena her and ask her about this. She has fled the country. Where are the Democrats? Where is their outrage?

Relatives of the Riady family, which of course owns the Lippo Bank, they gave \$450,000 to the Democrat National Committee, which again had to be returned. By the way, did they pay interest on that? I mean because it could be a loan, I do not know. But they are no longer in the country either. Again, no subpoena, and again, I ask, where are the Democrats?

Key figures have fled the country because of their activities. Charlie Trie gave \$640,000 in suspicious checks to the President's legal defense fund. He has fled the country, cannot be subpoenaed. Where are the Democrats? Cuban drug dealers and Chinese arms merchants wined and dined at the White House. Where are the Democrats? Where is their outrage?

Webster Hubbell given hundreds of thousands of dollars to keep apparently silent when he was under investigation by the independent counsel. Was this hush money? Mr. Speaker, where are the Democrats?

Mr. Speaker, what I am interested in is although it sounds good and it is a great diversionary tactic for the Democrats to say we need campaign finance reform, why do the Democrats not join us on campaign law enforcement? Why do the Democrats not spend just a little bit of their energy having this same outrage at the folks over at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue instead of this side-show, instead of these diversionary tactics. Let us look ourselves in the mirror and say, we have some good laws on the books right now and why do we not enforce those?

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO].

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule because in fact

we ought to be using this time to consider campaign finance reform. We all know that the system is broken, and we need to vote on campaign finance reform and we need to do something about reconnecting with the American people.

Let me have just a little stage-setting if I might. The rule before us today would allow us to consider what we call suspension bills here, today, which is a Wednesday. Suspensions are noncontroversial items and are considered on Mondays and Tuesdays, so that in fact this House of Representatives can get down to business for the rest of the week and talk about those issues that the public truly does care about, such as fixing our campaign finance system.

It is hard today to open a newspaper without reading about the lack of accomplishment of this Congress, the do-nothing Congress. But the worst of it is that the Congress is doing nothing when the issue of campaign finance reform cries out for action. RECORD sums of money, \$2.7 billion, were spent in the 1996 elections, and the American people rightly are asking and saying that there is too much money in the process.

Yes, in fact, we have investigations, investigations which I support, which my side of the aisle supports and they ought to go forward. However, it is interesting that in the other body we have an investigation that is proceeding in a bipartisan way to look at how we look at the Executive Branch, and in fact how we look at the Congress and how they spent their money in the last campaign.

□ 1215

However, on this side of the aisle, on the Republican side of the equation, there is an investigation, but the chairman refuses to allow the investigation to be broadened to the Democrats and Republicans and the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, my colleague just before me talked about where is the outrage. I am outraged. I am outraged by the amount of money that is in this system. Let us open up the investigation on the House side to what the Congress did in the last elections. One of the reasons why my colleagues do not want to do this, let me just tell the Members a little bit about how the majority here, the Republicans, have put special interests before the public interest.

Members will see, that "Donors Tell GOP They Are Fed Up". "Tax Cuts the Talk as the Chiefs Gather." They do not want to deal with campaign finance reform because they are frightened to death that these folks are not going to give them the money that they want.

Let us talk about the last session of the Congress. Tobacco gave the RNC, the Republican National Committee, \$7.4 million. The GOP passed favorable legislation, a bill that would have saved the tobacco companies millions

and millions of dollars. The NRA, National Rifle Association, gave \$2 million, and Members may remember that the GOP worked hard and tried to kill the assault weapons ban.

The GOP Congress let big business help to write the workplace safety bill. January 1995, big business lobbyists wrote up a 30-point item wish list for limiting certain workplace safety regulations. Life and death for American men and women in the workplace. 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 bill.

GOP lawmakers let lobbyists rewrite environmental legislation. The Republican whip admitted that he let a group of big business lobbyist contributors write the plan to place a freeze on environmental legislation: clean water, clean air, safety, and health of our families in this country; that he allowed the lobbyists to write the legislation, and this is a quote from him, he says, "because they have the expertise." And many of the lobbyists had helped to funnel corporate money to Republican campaigns.

The list goes on. This is a book called the NRCCC, National Republican Congressional Campaign Committee, the tactical PAC project. If we go down the list here, we will find that every single political action committee has a rating of friendly or unfriendly in it, and this was used by the chairman of that committee to determine who would get a hearing, who could be let in the door. If they were unfriendly, in fact, they could not come in to have a conversation because they had not given enough. Friendly translates into special interest money.

Nonlegislative outrages. The chairman of the National Republican Committee threatened to limit access of business who gave to Democrats. GOP leaders kept a friendly and unfriendly PAC list of who gave to the Republicans and to the Democrats. "Two-hundred and Fifty Thousand Donors Promised Best Access to Congress by the RNC"; money bought access.

Let me just conclude by saying that in fact we have a problem in the money that is involved in our politics. We are investigating. We are open to the investigation. I, for one, as a Democrat stand here and say, open the House investigation to Republicans and Democrats in the Congress. I am not afraid. Why are you afraid? That is what we ought to be doing.

In fact, what we ought to do is get down, buckle down, get campaign finance reform legislation on this floor to debate and go through, and for the American people, to win that trust back, pass campaign finance reform before Memorial Day.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, let me first say I very much appreciate seeing the Washing-

ton Times regularly quoted by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. I hope it will not be, as often is the case, maligned when Members on this side hold up articles from the Washington Times in the future.

I should also say to my friend, the gentlewoman from Connecticut, Mr. Speaker, that as we look at this issue, if there is evidence of wrongdoing on this side, there is nothing whatsoever that prevents the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight from looking at that. But every shred of evidence that we have of wrongdoing happens to emanate from the other side of the aisle. I think that is really understandably where the focus will continue to be.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from Scotsdale, AZ [Mr. HAYWORTH].

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today without venom or vitriol to respectfully suggest to my liberal friends that the debate we should be having today in fact is misnamed by my colleague, the gentlewoman from Connecticut, for it is not a debate about campaign finance reform.

Instead, Mr. Speaker, we stand on the precipice of a major debate concerning our national security, a question that should engage everyone, regardless of partisan label or political philosophy, because the question before us, raised not only in the Washington Times but in the Washington Post, the New York Times, the Los Angeles Times, Time, Newsweek, U.S. News and World Report, all the outlets of the main extreme media is this question: In an attempt to win an election, was access to our executive branch conferred upon foreign interests?

Mr. Speaker, it brings me no joy to have to bring this up. This is a question of concern to every American. While I understand and to a certain degree appreciate the political tactic of trying to muddy the water, the observation is clear that the first step to genuine campaign reform is to obey existing law; is for those who now freely admit that they violate Federal law and who use the interesting term that their legal counsel informs them there is no controlling legal authority, let me simply say to those folks in the executive branch, Mr. Speaker, yes, there is a controlling legal authority; Mr. Speaker, yes, there is a controlling legal authority. It is called the Congress of the United States, in its oversight power conferred upon it by the people of the United States, who over 200 years ago ratified the Constitution of the United States.

So the challenge before us today, Mr. Speaker, again is not a question of campaign finance. The challenge that will confront this Congress, indeed that will confront every city of this Republic, is a question of national security

brought to light under existing campaign finance law. It is a serious question. The question remains: Was the executive branch rewarding access to foreign interests in a pursuit of the almighty dollar for campaign activities, to hang onto the executive branch of Government?

It is a serious question we must answer.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. TAYLOR].

(Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I had hoped to sit this one out, but a previous speaker, the gentleman from Georgia, asked where is the outrage. I think after 90 days of session it is high time some of us expressed our outrage.

See, for 40 years a group of people much like the previous District of Columbia City Council said, if we could just govern, give us a chance, we will fix it. But they have discovered, much like the D.C. City Council, that either they do not want to or they cannot. Now, 90 days into the session, I would like you to tell me what you have done about any of America's major problems.

What have you done about the drug problem? The answer is absolutely nothing. What have you done about our Nation's \$5.7 trillion debt, \$222 billion annual operating deficit on your budget, \$360 billion interest payment on that debt for your budget?

You come down here and you cry crocodile tears and say we need a tax break. We need to give the wealthiest Americans a big tax break so they can turn around and instead of paying taxes, they can lend more money to the Government at 8 percent and 9 percent, so the average Joes who live in States like Mississippi will get less in return, because the biggest expense of the Government is not those bureaucrats they blast, it is not welfare, it is not food stamps, it is not defense or health care, it is interest on the national debt, and it is getting worse by the day, and you are doing nothing about it.

What have you done to improve our Nation's defense? Defense spending is down about 10 percent since George Bush left office. Yet you all run the Congress. There are 30-year old helicopters right now flying around. Which one is going to crash next?

You have not done anything on defense. You have not done anything on the deficit. You have not done anything on drugs. When given the opportunity to set a good precedent on funding, you secretly sneak through an 8 percent increase on funding for congressional committees. You do not even tell us you are doing it. A reporter has to tell Congress after it is done that you have increased that budget by 8 percent.

The outrage is that now we are trying to take one step in looking at some

of the wrongs that are happening. I would like to know how NAFTA passed. Do Members remember the approximately \$15 million the Mexican Government spent in Washington promoting the passage of NAFTA? Where did it go, I would ask the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER]? Do Members not think we ought to know that as well?

The gentleman has made some very legitimate concerns. I agree with the gentleman on every single one of those concerns.

Please, you are being rude, Mr. DREIER.

What about the money the Mexican Government spent passing NAFTA in this town?

If we are concerned about what foreigners are doing to influence our Congress, to influence our administration, should we not know that?

Should not the folks who used to work at those five garment plants just in one 435th of the country that happens to be the Fifth Congressional District of Mississippi, who lost their jobs as a result of NAFTA, do they not deserve to know? Do Members not think the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] ought to look into that?

We are asking for just one thing today. You will not do anything about the deficit, you will not do anything about the debt, you will not do anything about drugs. Let us make a little step. Let us look at campaign finance reform so maybe in the future there will not be another Congress that makes such a blatant mistake like NAFTA, where we went from a trade surplus to a trade deficit; where the only thing we are exporting to Mexico are jobs.

That is why we need campaign finance reform. These folks are totally in the right. Give them a break for a change.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would say to my colleague who addressed me by name and then said I was rude, to ask him to yield time for me to respond that on the issue of campaign finance reform, we obviously are engaging in that debate as we proceed with this rule today. To argue that the only benefit from the North American Free-Trade Agreement has been to send jobs to Mexico is absolutely preposterous.

Anyone who looks at the record that we have on the benefits that have been accrued to this Nation from free trade with Mexico and other countries, we obviously have seen tremendous job creation here, and improvements in the standard of living in this country because of free trade.

The fact that people exercise their first amendment right to participate politically, that does not need to be investigated. What needs to be investigated is blatant violations of existing Federal law.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Winter Park, FL [Mr. MICA].

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I would just ask the gentleman if he is aware, regarding comments of the last speaker that this Republican Congress has done nothing on the drug issue, that in fact in the 103d Congress, again, when these folks controlled the House, the Senate, the White House, there was one hearing held. I was on the committee, the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, on national drug policy.

Since January, we have held more hearings than they held in the entire 103d Congress on drug policy.

□ 1230

We have had the drug czar before us. We have had the head of DEA before us. We spent much of the House's time talking about decertifying Mexico. I introduced that resolution with the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SHAW]. There has never been before a debate to decertify, to my knowledge, on the House floor a country.

The gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM] just held a hearing in Puerto Rico on how they gutted when they controlled all the interdiction around Puerto Rico that is bringing drugs in unprecedented quantity into my district, heroin, and we have held hearings and gotten reports from GAO.

Just in 90 days we have done more than they did in an entire session of Congress on the drug issue.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman, another point to add along with that is the fact that the much pooh-poohed statement of the former First Lady, Nancy Reagan, to just say no to drugs played a big role in decreasing the recreational use and the incentive for young people to use drugs, whereas we have from this administration seen very little focus on that issue. The byproduct of that has been a tragic and dramatic increase in the use of drugs.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Glendale, CA [Mr. ROGAN], former majority leader of the California State Assembly.

Mr. ROGAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague and friend for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I wish first to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Arizona, who made a very eloquent plea on behalf of Republicans in this Chamber to keep their eye on the ball.

I rise today not as a Republican, but as an American. The almost daily allegations engulfing the White House concern me not from a political standpoint as much as they do from a national standpoint.

Mr. Speaker, I like to think that, if these same allegations were revolving around a Republican administration, my loyalty to my country would be much higher than my loyalty to party. I would urge a thorough investigation of this sort of conduct.

When I was a new prosecutor in Los Angeles County, I first learned of a thing called the SODDI defense. There

was a certain criminal that I was prosecuting, who was clearly guilty, and he was claiming someone else had committed the offense. My boss told me, "He is raising the SODDI defense." I spent a day looking for the SODDI case to figure out what it was all about. My boss laughed at me later. He told me the SODDI defense was an acronym for when a criminal claimed "some other dude did it." I later discovered that the louder a criminal professed that "some other dude did it," typically there was a correlating increase in the amount of evidence against them.

Mr. Speaker, on a daily basis we are now being treated to a political version of the old SODDI defense on this floor. And there seems to be a correlation between the decibel level raised on the other side against the desire to keep a full and thorough investigation from occurring, and the mounting incriminating evidence respecting the alleged improper fundraising conduct of the White House.

We do not take oaths on this floor, Mr. Speaker, to our party. We take an oath to the Constitution of the United States of America. I would urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to remember that oath. It was an oath to country, not party.

When serious allegations are raised respecting foreign influence, foreign nationals and foreign corporations being able to reach into the White House and potentially affect the outcome of elections, that is not a partisan issue, Mr. Speaker. That is an issue respecting the sanctity of our electoral process.

This House has an obligation to the Constitution and to the country not to allow a SODDI defense diversion from precluding us from fully investigating these matters.

I thank my colleague for yielding to me.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The Chair advises that the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] has 30 seconds remaining, and the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. SLAUGHTER] has 45 seconds remaining.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The majority manager, the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER], will tell Members the previous question is a procedural vote on whether to close the debate and proceed to vote on the rule, but that is only half true.

If you tell the House you do not want to move on a vote on the rule, control of the House floor will revert to the opponents of the rule for a vote on an alternative course of action. We would use the opportunity to instruct the leadership by majority vote of the House to bring campaign finance reform to a vote under an open rule by the end of next month.

This is a substantive vote and the place where you can tell the leadership you want campaign finance to be a priority on the House agenda.

I include for the RECORD the text of the proposed amendment at this point,

along with a brief explanation of what the vote on the previous question really means:

H. RES. 112—PREVIOUS QUESTION AMENDMENT  
TEXT

At the end of the resolution add the following new section:

Section 2. No later than May 31, 1997, the House shall consider comprehensive campaign finance reform legislation under an open amendment process.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT  
IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the opposition, at least for the moment, to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's "Precedents of the House of Representatives," (VI, 308-311) describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

Because the vote today may look bad for the Republican majority they will say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution \* \* \* [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership "Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives," (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual:

"Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule \* \* \* When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

Deschler's "Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives," the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues:

"Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper

amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

The vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

To conclude my remarks, I remind my colleagues that defeating the previous question is an exercise in futility because the minority wants to offer an amendment that will be ruled out of order as nongermane to this rule and in fact they do not even have an amendment, they do not have a bill. So the vote is without substance.

The previous-question vote itself is simply a procedural motion to close debate on this rule and proceed to a vote on its adoption. The vote has no substantive or policy implications whatsoever.

I include an explanation of the previous question for the RECORD:

THE PREVIOUS QUESTION VOTE: WHAT IT  
MEANS

House Rule XVII ("Previous Question") provides in part that:

"There shall be a motion for the previous question, which, being ordered by a majority of the Members voting, if a quorum is present, shall have the effect to cut off all debate and bring the House to a direct vote upon the immediate question or questions on which it has been asked or ordered."

In the case of a special rule or order of business resolution reported from the House Rules Committee, providing for the consideration of a specified legislative measure, the previous question is moved following the one hour of debate allowed for under House Rules.

The vote on the previous question is simply a procedural vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution that sets the ground rules for debate and amendment on the legislation it would make in order. Therefore, the vote on the previous question has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. 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.

Pursuant to clause 5 of rule XV, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for electronic voting, if ordered, on the question of agreeing to the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 223, nays 199, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 79]

YEAS—223

Aderholt	Gilchrist	Packard
Archer	Gillmor	Pappas
Armey	Gilman	Parker
Bachus	Goodlatte	Paul
Baker	Goodling	Paxon
Ballenger	Goss	Pease
Barr	Graham	Peterson (PA)
Barrett (NE)	Granger	Petri
Bartlett	Greenwood	Pickering
Barton	Gutknecht	Pitts
Bass	Hall (TX)	Pombo
Bateman	Hansen	Porter
Bereuter	Hastert	Portman
Bilbray	Hastings (WA)	Pryce (OH)
Bilirakis	Hayworth	Quinn
Bliley	Hefley	Radanovich
Blunt	Herger	Ramstad
Boehlert	Hill	Regula
Boehner	Hilleary	Riggs
Bonilla	Hobson	Riley
Bono	Hoekstra	Rogan
Brady	Horn	Rogers
Bryant	Hostettler	Rohrabacher
Bunning	Houghton	Ros-Lehtinen
Burr	Hulshof	Roukema
Burton	Hunter	Royce
Buyer	Hutchinson	Ryun
Callahan	Hyde	Salmon
Calvert	Inglis	Sanford
Camp	Jenkins	Saxton
Campbell	Johnson (CT)	Scarborough
Canady	Johnson, Sam	Schaefer, Dan
Cannon	Jones	Schaffer, Bob
Castle	Kasich	Sensenbrenner
Chabot	Kelly	Sessions
Chambliss	Kim	Shadegg
Chenoweth	King (NY)	Shaw
Christensen	Kingston	Shays
Coble	Klug	Shimkus
Coburn	Knollenberg	Shuster
Collins	Kolbe	Skeen
Combest	LaHood	Smith (MI)
Cook	Largent	Smith (NJ)
Cooksey	Latham	Smith (OR)
Cox	LaTourette	Smith (TX)
Crane	Lazio	Smith, Linda
Crapo	Leach	Snowbarger
Cubin	Lewis (CA)	Solomon
Cunningham	Lewis (KY)	Souder
Davis (VA)	Lewis	Spence
Deal	Livingston	Stearns
DeLay	LoBiondo	Stump
Diaz-Balart	Lucas	Sununu
Dickey	Manzullo	Talent
Doolittle	McCollum	Tauzin
Dreier	McCrery	Taylor (NC)
Duncan	McDade	Thomas
Dunn	McHugh	Thornberry
Ehlers	McInnis	Thune
Ehrlich	McIntosh	Tiahrt
Emerson	McKeon	Upton
English	Metcalf	Walsh
Ensign	Mica	Wamp
Everett	Miller (FL)	Watkins
Ewing	Molinari	Watts (OK)
Fawell	Moran (KS)	Weldon (FL)
Foley	Morella	Weldon (PA)
Forbes	Myrick	Weller
Fowler	Nethercutt	Whitfield
Fox	Neumann	Wicker
Franks (NJ)	Ney	Wolf
Frelinghuysen	Northup	Young (AK)
Gallely	Norwood	Young (FL)
Ganske	Nussle	
Gibbons	Oxley	

NAYS—199

Abercrombie	Brown (CA)	DeGette
Allen	Brown (FL)	Delahunt
Andrews	Brown (OH)	DeLauro
Baesler	Capps	Dellums
Baldacci	Cardin	Deutsch
Barcia	Carson	Dicks
Barrett (WI)	Clay	Dingell
Becerra	Clayton	Dixon
Bentsen	Clement	Doggett
Berman	Clyburn	Dooley
Berry	Condit	Doyle
Bishop	Conyers	Edwards
Blagojevich	Coyne	Engel
Blumenauer	Cramer	Eshoo
Bonior	Cummings	Etheridge
Borski	Danner	Evans
Boswell	Davis (FL)	Farr
Boucher	Davis (IL)	Fazio
Boyd	DeFazio	Filner

Flake	Lofgren	Rivers
Foglietta	Lowey	Roemer
Ford	Luther	Rothman
Frank (MA)	Maloney (CT)	Royal-Allard
Frost	Maloney (NY)	Rush
Furse	Manton	Sabo
Gejdenson	Martinez	Sanchez
Gephardt	Mascara	Sanders
Gonzalez	Matsui	Sandlin
Goode	McCarthy (MO)	Sawyer
Gordon	McCarthy (NY)	Schumer
Green	McDermott	Scott
Gutierrez	McGovern	Serrano
Hall (OH)	McHale	Sherman
Hamilton	McIntyre	Sisisky
Harman	McKinney	Skaggs
Hastings (FL)	McNulty	Skelton
Hefner	Meehan	Slaughter
Hilliard	Meek	Smith, Adam
Hinchey	Menendez	Snyder
Hinojosa	Millender	Spratt
Holden	McDonold	Stabenow
Hoolley	Miller (CA)	Stark
Hoyer	Minge	Stenholm
Jackson (IL)	Mink	Stokes
Jackson-Lee	Moakley	Strickland
(TX)	Mollohan	Stupak
Jefferson	Moran (VA)	Tanner
John	Murtha	Tauscher
Johnson (WI)	Nadler	Taylor (MS)
Johnson, E. B.	Neal	Thompson
Kanjorski	Oberstar	Thurman
Kaptur	Obey	Tierney
Kennedy (MA)	Olver	Torres
Kennedy (RI)	Ortiz	Towns
Kennelly	Owens	Traficant
Kildee	Pallone	Turner
Kilpatrick	Pascrell	Velazquez
Kind (WI)	Pastor	Vento
Kleczka	Payne	Visclosky
Klink	Peterson (MN)	Waters
Kucinich	Pickett	Watt (NC)
LaFalce	Pomeroy	Wexler
Lampson	Poshard	Weygand
Lantos	Price (NC)	Wise
Levin	Rahall	Woolsey
Lewis (GA)	Rangel	Wynn
Lipinski	Reyes	Yates

NOT VOTING—10

Ackerman	Istook	Waxman
Costello	Markey	White
Fattah	Pelosi	
Gekas	Schiff	

□ 1256

Mr. COYNE changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5, rule I, the Chair announces that he will postpone further proceedings today on each motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 4 of rule XV. Such rollcall votes, if postponed, will be taken after debate has concluded on all motions to suspend the rules.

HOMEOWNERS INSURANCE PROTECTION ACT

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 607) to amend the Truth in Lending Act to require notice of cancella-

tion rights with respect to private mortgage insurance which is required by a creditor as a condition for entering into a residential mortgage transaction, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 607

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Homeowners Insurance Protection Act".

SEC. 2. PROVISIONS RELATING TO PRIVATE MORTGAGE INSURANCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 6 of the Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act of 1974 (12 U.S.C. 2605) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (f), (g), (h), (i), and (j) as subsections (k), (l), (m), (n), and (o), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (e) the following new subsections:

“(f) DISCLOSURES RELATING TO PRIVATE MORTGAGE INSURANCE.—

“(1) DISCLOSURE AT SETTLEMENT RELATING TO EXISTENCE OF PMI.—With regard to any covered mortgage loan, the lender shall disclose, in writing at or before the settlement of such covered mortgage loan, whether any private mortgage insurance will be required to be obtained or maintained with respect to such mortgage loan, including any lender-paid private mortgage insurance, and the period during which such insurance will be required to be in effect.

“(2) DISCLOSURE AT SETTLEMENT RELATING TO TERMINABILITY OF PMI.—If the lender requires, as a condition for entering into a covered mortgage loan, the borrower to assume an obligation to make separately designated payments toward the premiums for private mortgage insurance with respect to such loan, the lender shall disclose, in writing at or before the settlement of such covered mortgage loan any of the following notices which are applicable with respect to such loan:

“(A) PMI OBLIGATIONS TERMINABLE UPON REQUEST.—In the case of a loan described in paragraph (3), that—

“(i) the borrower's obligation to make separately designated payments toward the premiums for private mortgage insurance may be able to be terminated while the mortgage is outstanding (including a cancellation permitted before the date of automatic termination under subsection (g)); and

“(ii) the borrower will be notified by the servicer not less frequently than annually of an address and a toll-free or collect-call telephone number which the borrower may use to contact the servicer to determine—

“(I) whether the borrower's obligation to make separately designated payments toward the premium for private mortgage insurance may be terminated while the mortgage loan is outstanding (or before the date of automatic termination); and

“(II) if such obligation may be terminated while the loan is outstanding (or before such date), the conditions and procedures for such termination.

“(B) PMI OBLIGATIONS TERMINABLE BY OPERATION OF LAW.—That the borrower's obligation to make separately designated payments toward the premiums for private mortgage insurance will be terminated by operation of law under subsection (g).

“(C) NONTERMINABLE PMI OBLIGATIONS.—In the case of a loan not described in paragraph (3), that the borrower's obligation to pay any amount to be applied to any portion of the premiums for private mortgage insurance will not be terminated at the request of the borrower.