popular in Washington. We know outside tobacco States very few people like us, even though there are 30 million people that smoke. We know that if we take a vote in here, most of the time we could very well lose because of what has happened throughout the country, a lot of it out of our hands; a lot probably brought on, justifiably, by certain testimony that has happened here in the House that I cannot defend.

But we further know that in Kentucky alone, we are going to sell 700 million pounds of tobacco this year, this year; 700 to 800 million pounds we will sell at $1.90 a pound. Math would teach me that that is close to $1.5 billion that is going to be turned over several times.

The question I ask, Why should we not, if we are going to have this product on the counter, which we are, why should we not let Kentuckians sell it, and North Carolinians, and Virginians sell it? That is what it is all about. They do not have to like us, but they need to understand that I think in this country it is best that we take care of our own, than try to export an industry that is so vital to us for the last 200 years.

We will be the first to acknowledge we have health problems. We know that. But that is not the issue. The issue is, if you are going to sell it, we should grow it and we should provide it, not folks from outside this country.

IN PREPARATION FOR HEARINGS IN THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM AND OVERSIGHT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from California [Mr. HORN] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, what I want to discuss today is some of the reactions that we have found on the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight as we prepare for witnesses at the forthcoming hearings. What Members see here and they will see in the next few minutes is 58 witnesses seem to be unavailable. We are going to break down, where are they.

Eleven of these witnesses have simply fled the country. Let us take them one by one. Charlie Trie. He was last seen in Beijing, China; a former restauranteur, old friend of President Clinton, who tried to give $640,000 in suspicious contributions to the President's legal expense fund.

Now, we cannot seem to find him. The U.S. Government cannot seem to find him. The Chinese Government cannot seem to find him. It is dubious whether the last two entities have even sought to find him. But Tom Brokaw, of NBC Nightly News, they can find him. Of course, the Government, with all the law enforcement forces available to them, with the CIA, the FBI, all the rest, they cannot seem to find him.

Pauline Kanchanalak in Thailand had $235,000 in Democratic National Committee contributions returned because she could not verify that she was the source of that money.

Then there is Ming Chen, a businessman in Beijing, China. He runs the new Ng Lap Seng's restaurant business in that city. He is the husband of Yue Chu.

Agus Setiawan, Indonesian employee of Lippo, that is a major firm in Indonesia, who signed many of the checks to the Democratic National Committee drawn on Lippo affiliates. Of course, that is a violation of the law, neither corporate money nor money from non-U.S. citizens.

Dewi Tirto, John Huang's secretary when he worked for Lippo, now believed to be in Indonesia.

Subandi Tanu Widjaja, in Indonesia, gave $80,000 to the Democratic National Committee for a dinner with Clinton which may have come from wire transfers from his father-in-law, Ted Sioeng, who lives in China.

Arief and Soraya Wiriadinata, an Indonesian couple who gave the Democratic National Committee $450,000 after the receipt of a half-a-million-dollar wire from Soraya's father, a cofounder of the Lippo Group, a prominent major corporation in Indonesia and throughout much of the Asian area.

□ 1545

John H.K. Lee, South Korean businessman, president of the Cheong Am Inc., Democratic National Committee had to return $250,000 to Cheong Am.

Antonio Pan, ex-Lippo executive, friend of Charlie Trie and John Huang, who delivered cash to individuals for conduit payments. And, of course, we have obviously traced where they went to here, here, here, and here and just mysteriously ended up in various bank accounts for sort of a little overnight session and then off to the committee.

And lastly of the group here who have fled, Ted Sieong, father of Jessica Elnitiarta, who donated $100,000 to the Democratic National Committee. He is reportedly connected to the Chinese intelligence community.

Now, we also have witnesses who have left, besides the ones that have left the countries, there are 11 foreign witnesses that have refused to be interviewed by investigators in those countries where they are now located, conveniently, presumably out of the reach of American congressional subpoenas or, if there is a special counsel, out of the reach of the special counsel's subpoenas.

Now, those individuals, again another 11, are the following: Stanley Hoe, wealthy Macao businessman, associate of Ng Lap Seng.

Suma Ching Hai, head of a Taiwan-based Buddhist cult that tried to funnel foreign contributions to President Clinton's legal expense trust through Charlie Trie.

Roy Tirtadji, Indonesian managing director of the Lippo Group, sent John Huang a laudatory letter for his efforts in money raising for the Democratic National Committee.

John Muncy, executive vice president of the Hong Kong Chinese Bank owned by the Riadys, major family in Indonesia and the Chinese Government.

And then there are the three Riadys, Mochtar, Stephen, and James. They are members of a very rich Indonesian family. Mochtar is the father of Stephen and James, and they own the Lippo Group, about which the newspapers and television stories on this investigation feature rather prominently.

They visited the White House dozens of times. They did not go through on the early morning congressional tour where you see the china and you look at the East Room and the Red Room and the Green Room. They got upstairs. They were able to sit down with the President of the United States and they have contributed hundreds of thousands of dollars to the Democratic National Committee, all illegal.

And then there is Ng Lap Seng, Mr. Wu, Macao businessman whose company wired $900,000 to Charlie Trie while Trie made large contributions to the Democratic National Committee.

Then there is Ken Hsui, a Taipei, Taiwan businessman who attended a July 30, 1996 dinner with President Clinton and gave the Democratic National Committee $150,000. He has dual United States-Taiwanese citizenship.

Then there is Eugene Wu, Taiwanese businessman, coowner of California's Grand Sunrise, Inc. He attended the July 30, 1996 dinner with President Clinton.

James Lin, Taiwanese businessman, coowner of California's Grand Sunrise, Inc. He also attended the July 30, 1996 dinner with the President.

Now, that sort of rounds out the 11 witnesses who have left the country that we cannot seem to get our enforcement agencies to find, or the cooperation of foreign governments to turn them over to us; and 11 foreign witnesses who have refused to be interviewed by the respective investigative bodies within their own country.

Now we get to the 36 House and Senate witnesses who are asserting their fifth amendment rights. These are essentially many U.S. citizens here, obviously. Now, let us go over them.

John Huang, very active in this whole setup, conspiracy you might say, former Democratic National Committee fundraiser, former Commerce Department official, cleared for top-secret, who just happened to go to an office outside the Commerce building and make telephonic reports back to Indonesia after he was briefed by some of the highest intelligence people in the country. And we would like to find out just what was he sending.

Now, he is a Lippo Group employee. He solicited more than $1 million in questionable contributions.

Then there is Jane Huang, wife of John. Her name appears on the Democratic National Committee documents

as a solicitor of some Democratic National Committee donations while Huang was at Commerce.

Then, of course, there is Mark Middleton, former White House Deputy Chief of Staff, who became an international businessman. He worked with the Riadys and Trie to deliver the bacon.

Maria Hsia, Taiwan born consultant who helped Huang organize the temple fundraiser. That was the one that Vice President GORE attended.

Manlin Foung, sister of Charlie Trie, was given thousands of dollars to donate to the Democratic National Committee in her name by Charlie Trie. Busy person.

Joseph Landon, Manlin Foung's friend, was given thousands of dollars to donate to the Democratic National Committee in his name by Charlie Trie.

David Wang made a $5,000 contribution to the Democratic National Committee at Trie's request.

Nora and Gene Lum, a fundraising couple who pled guilty to various violations of Federal election laws.

Webster Hubbell, one of the closest associates of the President of the United States, Rose law firm senior partner in Little Rock during the 1970's and 1980's, former Associate Attorney General of the United States, one of the most powerful positions in any administration, and he, of course, is now a convicted felon who received hundreds of thousands of dollars from Lippo after leaving the Justice Department.

Why did somebody pay him hundreds of thousands of dollars after he left? Why did people pay him after he was in prison? Are they trying to shut somebody up? And who are they that is doing the payments?

Well, Mr. Hubbell has asserted his constitutional right to take the fifth and not give us the answers to those questions.

Then there is Hsiu Luan Tseng, a Buddhist nun at a Hawaiian temple who contributed to the Democratic National Committee at the Hsi Lai Temple event.

And then there is Judy Hsu, Buddhist nun who contributed at the temple event.

And then Yumei Yang, Buddhist nun who contributed at the temple event.

Seow Fong Ooi, Buddhist nun who contributed at the temple event.

All of these people have written checks and they have taken the fifth so they do not have to explain a lot of it. Now, some will be probably granted immunity by the Senate committee or the House committee.

Jen Chin (Gary) Hsueh gave $2,000 to the Democratic National Committee, listed the address as home, owned by the temple, but does not live there. So much for home.

Jie Su Hsiao, Buddhist nun who contributed at the temple event.

You can see why so many people fly to southern California to raise money for their campaigns in the East or nationally.

Gin F.J. Chen, Democratic National Committee donor at a fundraiser at Washington's Hay Adams Hotel who may have been reimbursed by Hsi Lai.

Hsin Chen Shih, Democratic National Committee donor at a fundraiser at Washington's Hay Adams Hotel who may have been reimbursed by Hsi Lai.

Bin Yueh Jeng, Taiwanese national who, at John Huang's urging, gave $5,000 to the Democratic National Committee.

Hsiu Chu Lin, employee of Hsi Lai, who gave the Democratic National Committee $1,500.

Chi Rung Wang, a California man who gave Democratic National Committee $5,000 at the temple fundraiser.

Nolanda Hill, business partner of the late Secretary of Commerce Ron Brown.

Yogesh Ghandi, while receiving $500,000 in wire transfers from a Japanese bank, contributed $325,000 to the Democratic National Committee. Of course, we would like to know what happened to the other $175,000. He has taken the fifth, as have all these.

Jane Dewi Tahir, college student, related by marriage to the Riadys, who received $200,000 in wires from the LippoBank and gave $30,000 to the Democratic National Committee. Well, what happened to the other $170,000? We would be curious about that also.

And then Duangnet Kronenberg, sister-in-law of Pauline Kanchanalak, one of those that has fled back to south Asia, Taiwan area, attended a coffee at Vice President GORE's residence.

Maria Mapili, employed by Trie, familiar with the wires that he received from Ng Lap Seng.

Jou Sheng gave the Democratic National Committee $8,000, listing a Maywood, CA, Buddhist temple as his home address, but he does not live there.

Maria Mapili, employee at the Daihatsu International Trading Co., which is owned by Charlie Trie. Mapili reportedly has detailed knowledge of Trie's financial transactions.

Keshi Zhan, a welfare department employee who served as hostess for Trie's fundraisers, gave $15,000 to the Democratic National Committee. She has received immunity from the Senate.

Suh Jen Wu, abbess of the Hsi Lai Temple in Hacienda Heights, CA, immunized by the Senate committee. So they will not be able to take the fifth after that since they are immune from prosecution.

What we are after is the truth and the facts and, of course, as was noted by a speaker earlier this afternoon, we have a tremendous number of cases of amnesia, where people say I cannot recollect.

The gentleman from Florida [Mr. SCARBOROUGH] who made that point, and I have made it on other occasions, we are very worried, of course, as many are, about the Washington, DC, water supply. With all the metallic aspects that are in that supply since the Civil War, and the distribution system has not completely been renewed, we are worried that people that have any contact here just seem to have a great backup of amnesia and lack of recollections on some of the simplest things; like did you bring the half a million dollars hither or yon?

Now, maybe you would forget what you did with a dollar, maybe you would forget where your purse or wallet is, but I do not think you would forget where a half million dollars are. So we face some interesting situations there.

Now, the abbess of the Hsi Lai Temple in Hacienda Heights, as I say, was immunized by the Senate.

Man Ho, the Buddhist nun at the temple who gave the Democratic National Committee $5,000 has been immunized by the Senate.

Yi Chu, Buddhist nun at the temple who gave the Democratic National Committee $5,000 also has been immunized, and you saw some of that testimony when it occurred a few weeks ago.

Siuw Moi Lian, Buddhist nun at the temple who gave the Democratic National Committee $5,000 and was reimbursed by the temple, has been immunized by the Senate, as has been Man Ya Shih, the Buddhist nun in Texas affiliated with the temple.

And another one immunized by the Senate was Hueitsan Huang, Buddhist nun at the temple who gave $5,000 to the Democratic National Committee.

Then Yue Chu, the wife of Ming Chen, reimbursed for contribution to the Democratic National Committee at the temple fundraiser by money from a joint Ng-Trie account also immunized by the Senate.

Now, Xi Ping Wang, Ming Chen's cousin, reimbursed for contribution to the Democratic National Committee at the temple fundraiser by money from the joint account in which Trie was involved, immunized by the Senate.

And that takes care of most of the 36 House and Senate witnesses. There was some overlap. And now where in the world are the committees key witnesses?

Well, I think America was exposed to the testimony of Roger Tamraz, who was detained in Georgia, and that is Georgia, the former portion of the Soviet Union, now Russia, an independent, who was interested in building a pipeline. And he testified honestly, everywhere people asked him the question, either the Senate committee, where he had taken the oath, or news reports, TV programs, all the rest, he said sure I paid hundreds of thousands of dollars. I wanted to see the President. And he did. He had a chance to tell the President about the glories of his pipeline because a few hundred thousand dollars gave him access.

Now, a very courageous woman on the President's national security staff said the President should not see someone like that who was in flight and so forth and various other charges.

□ 1600

That is when somebody in the White House called Bob at CIA and said, you

know, can you help us get him into the White House? Now this is unheard of. This is the 50th anniversary of the Central Intelligence Agency. President Nixon tried to politicize it to save his White House where they ill-served the President, just as the current President is being ill-served by many of his friends. That often happens. It is no excuse. But we have got to watch our friends more than our enemies.

So what happens? The professional in the National Security Council gets overruled, and with whoever Bob is, maybe he works for the Democratic National Committee, the CIA, I do not know, but the fact is he admitted that he paid even more to see the President. Business is business. Whether he can take a tax deduction I do not know, but not under our laws.

Now Charlie Trie, of course we mentioned him a number of times. That is one Mr. Brokaw could find, but nobody else seems to be able to find. And Webster Hubbell, we know about him, one of the most powerful people in the Clinton administration. John Huang living in California, He is all over the place. Mark Middleton, a key Clinton aide, he is living in Washington, DC, and took the fifth. Then we have people living in Hong Kong; the Lippo Group; the Riadys living in Indonesia; and Pauline Kanchanalak living in Thailand.

Now where does this all get us in terms of the investigation and in terms of the various witnesses? Where it gets us is this: We have talked about the recollection problem in this town, and a lot of people have accused various Presidents in press conferences over the years of not being able to recollect. But now we have just sort of a plague on our hands, not as bad as the bubonic plague of the Middle Ages, but certainly bad for good government and bad for civility and bad for obeying the laws, because they just brazenly seem to have broken every law on campaign finance, some of which have been on the books a century, some from this century. And they just say, gee, I do not know, you know. Gosh, I just cannot remember.

And then, mysteriously, the papers they cannot find, they show up in previous investigations, either in the residence part of the White House, downstairs in some of the offices, and it is like Peter Pan to sort of flit his or her way, as the case may be, in this age through the residence, through the White House, and drops little important papers everywhere or hides little important papers so we do not find them for months.

And when our subpoenas go down for all the papers related to the White House, counsel now for 5 years has simply stiffed us. They say, ''We do not have to answer to Congress. We are above the law. You cannot have it. It is executive privilege.''

And when we followed them down each little rat hole that they are claiming it is executive privilege, as they did in Travelgate, Filegate, and all the rest that this committee has investigated, we find that the only thing that gets a reaction out of them is when we say, OK, you have held us off for about 5 months when the papers are right under your desk, right under your nose, and we will just have to get a contempt of Congress citation, which does carry criminal penalties. And so, that resolution starts moving.

Finally, at 8 o'clock at night, guess what? Boxes of paper appear, and we find interesting little things like ''Call Bob at CIA.'' So maybe they have not burned all the papers. We will be talking about other Cabinet officers down the line that have burned various papers not relevant to this investigation, but relevant to another investigation which will be underway.

And so, we have the recollection problem. And whether we can develop a pill in time and put in a couple million maybe in the budget for the National Institutes of Health to help us on recollection, and we can give all these people recollection pills, and they seem to just fade away until the heat is off.

Now, is there obstruction of justice in this case? You bet there is. How high does that go in the administration? We are not sure at this point, but it goes very high. It goes very high because this kind of a conspiracy to raise millions of dollars of money illegally in violation of every single law of the United States that relates to campaign finance, they say, ''Oh, well, everybody does it.'' That is a lie. And we do not need to take the oath to make that statement. That is a lie.

Most Members in this House, most Members in the Senate of the United States, they conform to the laws of the land when it comes to campaign finance because they know if they violate those laws, it is an issue for their opponent, and most people will want to do the right thing.

But the White House line is, ''Oh, everybody does it. We should pass some laws to do something about it.'' We have got the laws. We do not need to pass new laws that say aliens cannot give money in American political campaigns. We do not need to pass new laws that say, hey, we cannot use the telephone in a Federal office to make political calls for money raising, we have got to go somewhere else; like use your home, use your credit card at home, et cetera.

Now that little spin, which the White House publicists, which must take up half the White House now to explain away all these things, but I want to congratulate the American press. The major exposés so far, the House has not begun its hearings, the Senate has, it is doing a good job, the major exposés have been delivered by the print media in this country, the Washington Post, the Los Angeles Times, the New York Times, the Wall Street Journal, the Washington Times. When the Pulitzers are handed out this year, if they do not go to a number of those papers, then I do not have much confidence in the judges that run the Pulitzer Prize.

The L.A. Times months ago put together an investigative team of people that did know what they were talking about when it came to campaign finance money. They were experts on going through the Federal Election Commission's records, and they have written a number of stories that are worth reading and will be sort of the example of fine journalism in every journalism classroom in America.

So what we need, of course, in this case that we do not have and that we did have when President Nixon's administration was under examination, what we had was a tough Federal district judge, known as Judge Sirica; and he threatened to put the whole bunch of, quote, plumbers that had gone into the Democratic National Committee, put them in jail, prison. Well, that softened up a few, and people started talking. And when John Dean was fearful, the White House counsel at that time, of going to prison, he talked.

Now, it would be wonderful if the recollection pill could be given to the series of White House counsels. No White House in this century has had a turnover of White House counsels like this White House. It is just one a year. Now are they just overworked? Are they worn out? Or maybe they do not like what they see and they are tired of defending it.

There are some very distinguished people that have been in that job. But they ought to start cooperating with Congress and obeying the oath one takes in the courtroom and the oath one takes before investigating committees of the House so we can get at the truth of the matter.

Now, we tried that on Travelgate, and we found it all out. We tried it on Filegate, and we still do not have answers to some things. Why? Because some of their friends up here said, ''Hey, you do not have to answer them.'' We started on that when we were in the minority. They said, ''Yeah, you do not have to answer to them. Do not worry about it.''

When we were in the majority, we could hold the hearings and get the truth, and we did. And the jury involved in accusing people that should never have been accused of misdeeds cleared them, but at a personal expense to their own human relations, with all their friends, their family, the tremendous tension you are under when you are falsely accused, as the people in the White House Travel Office were.

And they had one lucky break. They worked for the press of the United States. Those people that covered the White House knew these were good people. And when they were thrown out of their jobs, hauled off and flattened in a station wagon one day, and political appointees and relatives of the President were put in charge, the press knew something was rotten here. And when we became the majority, we

could follow it up. Mr. Clinger, the then chairman of what was known as Government Operations, he was right. Nobody would listen to him, but he was right. And he was proved right, and the court proved him right.

So what we need is a few people that will not do their duties as citizens to start talking and not all of them, 36 of them, taking the fifth amendment. They have a right to take the fifth. Jimmy Hoffa took the fifth. There is a long line of distinguished people that have taken the fifth before congressional committees. But I think what we need are some tough Federal judges.

Now the question is, special counsel. A lot of us have written the Attorney General over the last few months to say, why do you not appoint a special counsel to look into this, to use the subpoena power, to bring people before a grand jury, to immunize some of them so they will talk and you can trace the conspiracy as far up the hierarchy as it ought to go, and it goes very high, and then bring the appropriate charges?

And, of course, the Attorney General, for whom I have very high respect, and I had met her 10 years before she became Attorney General, and when she came to this town and there was a dinner and the President would show up and she would show up, she would get more applause than anybody in the room because we had great respect for her integrity.

Now, most people have read a cartoon or two that shows the Attorney General sort of like see no evil, hear no evil, gee, I do not see any evidence out there. Now they are talking about, well, let us have a special counsel. Well, now the suspicion would be if we have a special counsel, maybe it is designed to shut us up on the House side as we are about to begin our investigation, because generally there is some cooperation between Congress and a special counsel, where we do not want the person to have revealed the situation under our particular procedures because we might want to immunize them to get them to do that, and maybe the special counsel does not think that is a very good strategy. If we can get someone to talk in the room with a grand jury, we can get something done and get at the truth here.

So there is a lot of unanswered questions. When our investigation starts under the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON], the chairman, we will get some answers to those questions because we have already immunized a few more witnesses that the Senate had not immunized, and we will be working on this diligently, because this country needs reassurance that the campaign finance laws of the United States will be obeyed, and there will not be a conspiracy going to the highest level of the administration to raise millions of dollars specifically outside the laws of the United States, particularly in Presidential campaigns.

Now, a lot of people say, oh, well nobody cares about campaign finance reform. I have heard that for years. I have been interested in this subject for 3 decades, and I have tried to do something about it as an elected Member of Congress. I tried to do something about it when I was a professor of political science. And the fact is, people do care.

That is why Mr. Perot rose to prominence in 1992. He had the right issue. That was campaign finance and how campaigns are conducted in America. People can just simply try to buy the seat. I was faced with a person that spent $1.2 million to my $400,000. I am outraged that I have got to raise $400,000.

Fortunately, I have got a good group of volunteers and they raise it, but we should not have to go through that unlimited bet where several million dollars are thrown at you. One person who was a Republican spent $29 million to seek the Senate seat in the State of California. His opponent, also a millionaire, probably spent about $9 million of her and her husband's own money.

But we do not need to turn this Nation over to plutocracy. We need to put the lid on campaign finance. What is stopping us here is a decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, known as Buckley versus Valeo. I think that Court ought to rethink that decision.

When I came here as a freshman in 1993, I got a bipartisan group of Democrats and Republicans to sign on to a proposed constitutional amendment which would permit the Congress to overthrow that kind of decision because they claimed that when you limit money in campaigns, you are limiting free speech. That is utter nonsense. All due respect to the nine justices of the Supreme Court, but that was a decision made over 20 years ago.

Let us pass the McCain–Shays-Meehan-Feingold bill, which started debate today in the Senate and, hopefully, will come over here next week. Let us pass a bill that gets at disclosure, deals with the soft-money scandals, and we have had them in both parties where political committees in the State get a lot of money from big donors like Charles Keating. You will remember him from the savings and loan debacle. Well, Mr. Keating gave $800,000 to the Democratic Party at the request of Senator Scranton, who was a very distinguished Senator in California and has served the people as hard as he could. He made one major mistake in that area, and that was getting the money for the Democratic Party in California, legal though it was, and put his son in charge of it. I would say that is a little bit of a conflict of interest.

But that kind of money gets access for a lot of people. We have got to stop that, and we have got to close that. That is why Mr. Perot got a lot of attention in 1992 and why politicians take their polls instead of doing the right thing, which you do not need a poll to do, and they say, well, gee, people do not seem to care that much about campaign finance.

□ 1615

I think our hearings, if the networks ever broadcast them, my colleagues will notice there is sort of a black out in America's television. They do not care too much about their public interest responsibility, except for Mr. Brokaw, who has done some very good stories on money and politics, and I would like to see the other networks match NBC. They should try.

And then we see people on weekly talk shows that say, oh well, they all do it. Well, that got my wife so irritated that she wrote a long letter to one of them last week, and she had never written a politician or a journalist in her life, and that is because she was outraged by that comment. That is the White House line, oh, they all do it and we have got to reform it. Hey, help us reform it. Years ago when we tried, and yet this Chamber, the Committee on Rules when it was under the control of the Democrats refused to give us a vote on the compromise bill put together by 5 Democrats and 5 Republicans, 10 in all.

The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEILENSON] and myself, neither one of us take political action committee money. We are from California. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], now chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, was the head of this. Mr. Synar, the very respected subcommittee chairman on Commerce, Democrat from Oklahoma. We put together a bill that would have passed, but they knew they could beat the Republican bill, which said let us get rid of political action committee money.

And I regret to say some of my colleagues in my party seem to love some PACs because they found out why the Democrats have stayed here for 40 years; they just pick up the PAC money every quarter by $5,000 a clip from a particular—during their election cycle from some of these committees.

Now they say, oh, we are not trying to influence the Congressmen, we just sort of want access. Now I have never known anybody that gives away $5,000 bucks or $100,000 that is just talking about access. They want their vote, and those of us that do not take PAC money, every night when we walk out of here at weird hours after signing the constituent mail, we all feel happy that we do not take PAC money. It is legal, we can do it, but a lot of people would love to get rid of PACs. I do not think we have the votes to do it this year, but an overwhelming number in this body want to get rid of soft money.

And what we need to do is let us put everybody to the test, and if the McCain-Feingold bill, MCCAIN being a Republican Senator from Arizona, FEINGOLD being the Democratic Senator from Wisconsin, if that bill will pass the Senate, and majority leader LOTT has scheduled that for today, Monday and Tuesday, and can come over to the House, we can have an up-

or-down vote on that measure, and if we are permitted to amend it, we got a lot of other good ideas, too.

The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. PRICE] Democrat, myself, Republican from California, have a bill called stand by your ad. That is to get at one of the uglier aspects of American politics, which is the negative campaign that is dumped on a lot of candidates in both parties by some in the other party, and that is saying usually twisted information, most of which is not true. I have had that happen to me. I had somebody dump $200,000 worth of mail in the last 3 days of my campaign last year.

Some of my colleagues have had million dollar campaigns against them that have run for 6 months, and there is no disclosure. And we are determined that everybody that gets into American politics and is going to have ads and try to do someone in, let us get disclosure. Who pays your bills? How much did they give? We have to do that when we receive campaign money up to $1,000 in the primary and $1,000 in the general. The people have a right to know.

Well, with Mr. PRICE's bill that I am a cosponsor with him, and the idea came from the North Carolina legislature, on negative campaigns a candidate would have to spend 10 percent of that mailer or that TV ad with their mug looking at the voter and saying, ''I am so-and-so, this is the film or videotape that I am going to tell you my opponent's record.'' Now if they had to say that, I do not use negative active campaigns, so I do not worry about it, but if they had to say it, maybe they would clean up their act that political consultants talk them into.

Now the American people say, ''Oh, I hate negative campaigns,'' but the consultant goes around in both parties and says, ''Oh, but you have to do it if you want to be elected.'' You do not have to do it. You need to educate your constituency that you want civil discourse, not this false charge. Like every Democrat I know seems to run against a Republican and say we cut Social Security. That is nonsense; we never cut Social Security. The Vice President one day got on Meet The Press, some very distinguished commentators were on it, and they did not call him on it. Well, I knew the minute he said it he was dead wrong, and the question was, was he lying or what? He said no Republican voted for Social Security in the 1930's. It is nonsense. House voted 75 percent, Republicans voted for social security; another one, 80 percent.

So I sent a letter to the hundred top journalists in town, that if the Vice President ever says that again, here are the facts, and they come from the Congressional Research Service, our bipartisan research arm.

So there are things we need to clean up without question, negative campaigns, soft money, disclosure. We also need to clean up who is an American citizen eligible to vote and who is not. And we have a bill in on that which is, if the registrar wants to check their rolls, they could have access to the Social Security information. Since 1982 Social Security has kept the citizenship status of individuals. And if they cannot get the proof there, they can access the Immigration and Naturalization Service roles and they can find out if the person has been legally naturalized. Obviously there are other ways to prove citizenship, affidavits from people who have known you in the community for 30 years, knew when you were born, family bible, all that. But we need help in this situation where some of the laws have been passed so they cannot purge people from the election rolls when they do not vote in four elections.

And that leads to real mischief when they do not clean up those rolls. If you are not going to be a citizen, a good citizen and go to the polls for four elections; in California it used to be if you just did it for 2, you would have to reregister, and that means you ought to be going doing your duty and the civic responsibility as an American citizen.

So there are a lot of proposals a lot of good people have dealing with television time to be made available so people can see the debate.

Now the television stations get very upset; that is tough. The fact is they are using the air waves licensed by the Federal Government and they can certainly contribute some time, as the chairman of our Committee on Commerce has advocated this for years. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLILEY] put a bill in in 1993, and he still believes in it, and perhaps that discussion will come to the floor.

So we need to do some things just in general in campaign finance, and that is the things that are changing existing laws. But with these investigations what we are dealing with are violations of existing laws, not changes. We are dealing with the fact that the laws of the United States have been shredded in the 1996 campaign and the attitude was something of the Wild West, and since I am a westerner I recall that. What did we do west of the Pecos? There was no law. Maybe one tough judge here and their, and that is what we need in this case, and we need to get the evidence out and we need to get a few of these people to start talking, and when we do that American politics will be better off and American government will be better off.

OMITTED FROM THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD OF WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 17, 1997

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House oversight, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 63. To designate the reservoir created by Trinity Dam in the Central Valley project, California, as ''Trinity Lake''; and

H.R. 2016. Making appropriations for military construction, family housing, and base realignment and closure for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes.

CORRECTION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD OF THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 25, 1997

Correction of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Thursday, September 25, 1997: On page H7893, the corrected version of the Rogers amendment is as follows:

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROGERS:

Page 51, line 5, after the dollar amount insert ''(increased by $1,500,000)''.

Page 51, line 11, after the second dollar amount insert ''(increased by $1,500,000)''.

Page 51, line 14, after the dollar amount insert ''(increased by $1,500,000)''.

Page 51, line 16, after the dollar amount insert ''(increased by $4,000,000)''.

Page 51, line 23, after the dollar amount insert ''(reduced by $2,500,000)''.

At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following new section:

SEC. . None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to issue or renew a fishing permit or authorization for any fishing vessel of the United States greater than 165 feet in length or greater than 3,000 horsepower, as specified in the permit application required under part 648.4(a)(5) of title 50, Code of Federal Regulations, and the authorization required under part 648.8(d)(2) of title 50, Code of Federal Regulations, to engage in fishing for Atlantic mackerel or herring (or both) under the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.).

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. REYES (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for September 23 and the balance of the week, on account of official business.

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

Mr. BARTON of Texas (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today, on account of official business.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today after 11 a.m. And September 29, on account of official business.

Mr. DICKS (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. LAZIO of New York (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today, on account of illness in the family.