

can lead to a better future for our children and our grandchildren, because that is what it is all about, giving those kids hope for opportunities to live the American dream in this great Nation.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER
PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Ms. GRANGER]. The Chair will remind all Members to refrain from urging Senate action or inaction.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR THE CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE RESOLUTION 244, SUBPOENA ENFORCEMENT IN THE CASE OF DORNAN V. SANCHEZ

Mr. MCINNIS (during the special order of Mr. SOUDER), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 105-280) on the resolution (H. Res. 253) providing for consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 244) demanding that the Office of the United States Attorney for the Central District of California file criminal charges against Hermandad Mexicana Nacional for failure to comply with a valid subpoena under the Federal Contested Elections Act, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1127, NATIONAL MONUMENT FAIRNESS ACT

Mr. MCINNIS (during the special order of Mr. SOUDER), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 105-283) on the resolution (H. Res. 256) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1127) to amend the Antiquities Act to require an Act of Congress and the concurrence of the Governor and State legislature for the establishment by the President of national monuments in excess of 5,000 acres, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1370, REAUTHORIZATION OF THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

Mr. MCINNIS (during the special order of Mr. SOUDER), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 105-282) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1370) to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank of the United States, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2203, ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1998

Mr. MCINNIS (during the special order of Mr. SOUDER), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 105-281) on the resolution (H. Res. 254) waiving points of order against the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 2203) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

A RIDICULOUS THREAT FROM THE PRESIDENT TO CONGRESS REGARDING CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

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

Mr. SOUDER. Madam Speaker, I have found few things as ridiculous since I have been elected to Congress in 1994 as the headline that I saw last week in the Washington Times, repeated in various publications around the country in different ways. That headline says "Clinton Threatens to Recall Lawmakers to Hill. Campaign Finance Vote Demanded During Session."

Madam Speaker, I was trying to sort this through. My basic understanding of this was that the President of the United States, Mr. Campaign Finance himself, is threatening to call us into session for campaign finance reform; this, the President who has made more from Air Force One, the plane, than Harrison Ford made from the movie? He wants us to have a session on campaign finance reform?

Tonight, Madam Speaker, we are going to talk a little bit about this President and some of his friends. Additional Members will be joining me as we go through this. But I have been soliciting some information about different people's opinion on this, and what their reaction was to this headline.

Madam Speaker, I have a couple of comments that I want to share with the Members. We will be going through a number of these tonight.

I think that principle No. 1, and if I can, I am going to move down to the other microphone here so I can use these posters, rule No. 1, before we pass a bunch of new laws, is, how about we start in this campaign finance reform with follow the current law. Because it does not do a lot of good if in this country we pass a bunch of laws but then we ignore those laws.

As I suggested the other day, if the President wants to have a special ses-

sion, maybe we could have the first day with his friends who are in jail; the second day with his friends who have already been released from jail; maybe the third day would be his friends who have been indicted and are headed to jail. Then we could have a couple of days for his friends who have pleaded immunity, 1 day for those who pleaded partial immunity, 1 day for those who pleaded full immunity. Then we could have a couple days for his friends who pleaded the fifth amendment. There are I think 56 of those right now. Then we could have 3 days for his friends who have fled the country, possibly 1 day for each continent.

Madam Speaker, it is ridiculous. They are not following the current law. Why does he want us to come in and pass a bunch of new laws if we cannot get people to follow the current law?

We have the Vice President of the United States, and we will get into this more later, but who said that he was not following the existing law because he was not clear on the controlling legal authority. Madam Speaker, that is quite the explanation, that he was not sure of the controlling legal authority.

The sale of access by this administration is unprecedented. To be fair, the President does not discriminate where they are going to take the money from. If the money is green, they will take it. They have taken it from drug dealers, international fugitives, from arms dealers. Hey, it is an equal opportunity administration.

There are some things that you can buy, for example, if you tune into the Clinton Shopping Network. For \$100,000 you can become a managing trustee of the Democratic Party, which entitles you to two meals with the President, two with the Vice President, issue retreats, private impromptu meetings with administration officials, and your very own DNC staffer to assist with your personal requests.

For \$300,000, you can bypass the national security aides and get directly to the President, even if you are an international fugitive like Roger Tamraz. In his case, it was \$250,000 or \$300,000 to be able to talk to the President about a pipeline, and he did not even get it. I do not know what it would have cost if he was going to get the pipeline.

We cannot even make up a cast of characters like the contributors who wound up at the White House coffees, overnight in the Lincoln bedroom, or posing for photographs with the President. It is something like out of the bar scene from "Star Wars." It is such an odd conglomeration of different types of people.

The key, driving thing was, how can we raise more money so we can put more ads up. Do not worry about the details. Drop the background checks, in spite of the advice they were getting from different people regarding individuals that were coming. The key thing was, can they bring in money, will they give the party money.

One other thing in looking at this cast of characters, it is not clear because we have not at least found a memo regarding this yet, whether or not all these people who have been bringing the funds in, whether we have seen the exhaustive list.

For example, what exactly does it cost if you want to see the President and somebody from the Department of the Interior? Does that cost more money? What if you want to see the President and somebody from the Department of Treasury? What if you want to see two cabinet officials? What if you have a case pending in front? What if you are from a foreign country that maybe has minerals that you want an international exclusive on, and maybe you would like a wilderness area? It is not clear how these things interrelate, and a lot of documents are missing or have yet to come clear.

Hopefully we will have some people with the courage that we had under the Nixon administration, when clearly they were attempting to cover up. Democrats and Republicans joined together to try to find the truth. It was not a partisan event. Sure, the Democrats were very partisan against Nixon. We would expect them to be partisan against Nixon. Members might expect me and other Republicans to be partisan against the President.

But where are the Democrats speaking out against President Clinton, like the Republicans did against Nixon? Where are the staffers whose conscience goes to the country as opposed to their boss? Are they so intimidated? Are they so dulled to the sense of decency that they are not coming forth? Or have people learned so much from Watergate that maybe they did not leave as many messages as they did in the old days? Quite probably they did not tape the conversations at the White House like they did under Nixon.

But we need to have ways to find out, because it certainly is clear that the administration did everything they could to get as much money as they could. They backed off of the clearances of the people that were coming in. They clearly had coffees, for which they had a going price.

They took the Lincoln bedroom from the days of just a few people going there, friends, other dignitaries. I think, if I recall right off the top of my head, President Bush had maybe 8 to 10 major contributors there. And they took it to a system, a production line of people who could give the money to the President of the United States, and get to stay in the Lincoln bedroom. They took all these things to a new high effort.

In the foreign contributors, there is a lot of debate about what the lines are in foreign contributions. Can you do this? Can you do that? But there are some lines that are crystal clear. Foreign governments cannot put money into campaigns. Furthermore, you definitely cannot have somebody who is not wealthy give money on behalf of

somebody else. That is law violation No. 1.

Law violation No. 2 is if that person then gets refunded their money from somebody who is not an American citizen, from an overseas thing. And it is clear that that is what happened to this administration, because it had to give the money back.

For example, we have seen the concerted efforts by foreign contributors and governments to generously support Clinton-Gore. We have watched them use executive branch officials and fact-finding to raise money overseas. It is against the law, and it was supported with taxpayer dollars. President Clinton and the Democratic Party received more than \$75 million in Federal funds during the 1996 campaign, and the infusion of Federal matching funds provided additional fuel for their fundraising obsession. We have never seen this level of use and abuse of the system.

A friend of mine who is a historian, a former history professor, made a list for me of 10 reasons for a special congressional session on campaign finance reform to determine whether the Clinton administration has set a record for the largest number of officials under investigation in American history.

Runners-up, Grant, Harding, and Nixon. Harding just appeared not to know what was going on. He never claimed to be a detail-type person. General Grant had good days and bad days, depending on other things in his personal lifestyle. So while they were accountable for what went on under them, they did not claim to be micro-managing, like our current President and Vice President, who said they were going to reinvent government and were going to be hands-on President and Vice President. Of course, Nixon we all know about. And maybe Nixon was as bad as Clinton, but he does not have or did not have quite that number of people under investigation.

No. 2, of the 10 reasons for a special congressional session on campaign finance reform, to find out if the American timber industry is large enough to handle the paper needs of the special prosecutors, grand juries, and congressional committees looking into the deeds and misdeeds of the Clinton officials. After all, as an environmentalist, he needs to be concerned about all the paper we are using and all the trees that are being chopped down for all these investigators.

□ 2100

Maybe he could call a special session to enable Paula Jones to address us on sexual harassment at the workplace. That would make about as much sense as the President calling us into session on campaign finance reform.

No. 4, to commission Arthur Schlesinger, Jr. to conduct a government funded survey in which noted historians assess "distinguishing characteristics" of the 42 men who have been President.

No. 5, to ascertain why the administration has had such difficulties in per-

suading witnesses to return from safe havens in Beijing and other places committed to MFN, religious freedom, and human rights.

No. 6, to learn at long last who hired Craig Livingstone and who is paying the fees of his attorneys. I sit on the Government Reform and Oversight Committee. I got to actually ask questions of Craig Livingstone and ask him who hired him. It was quite the experience. He did not come in for a tour at the White House. He did not even come in to work at the receptionist desk. He came in to be charge of security at the White House. Yet he doesn't know who hired him.

He said under oath that it was the goal of his life to some day work at the White House, that he worked in many low level campaigns, got what a lot of people would consider to be dirty jobs in those campaigns in order to some day have a chance at working his way up and maybe working at the White House. So he finally gets to the White House and he does not know who hired him.

I asked him, because he had been saying all day he did not know what all of us know, who our early supporters were, especially if it was your dream to get to the White House, I said, who did you say thank you to. Are you so ungrateful that you never told thank you to anybody who hired you? And he hung his head down. And I want to say that I believe he felt badly. I do not know what intimidation was on him. I do not know why he would not give up the information. He just said, I do not know who hired me.

My next question was relatively simple as well. The American people are watching and they know, as visitors in the gallery know, that if you go to the White House and want to take a tour, they do checks on you. If we, as Members of Congress, want to go over, they do checks on us, if we take somebody through, they run background checks on us. He was coming in to be head of White House security and he did not know who hired him. I said, who let you in the door. He gave me the name of the receptionist.

I mean this is a joke. This is absolutely ridiculous. We kept the questioning up. And later one of the former counsels at the White House ventured that maybe Vince Foster hired him. Do you know what? Every time we came to a tough point in the travelgate hearing, every time we came to a tough point in whatever investigation we were going through, the FBI files, who hired Craig Livingstone, whenever the pressure got toughest, they blamed it on the dead guy. Either Vince Foster was carrying tremendous baggage or some people are really abusing Vince Foster, who is no longer with us to defend himself. So maybe we could learn in a special session who hired Craig Livingstone.

No. 7, to charge the civil Rights Commission with investigating whether Gennifer Flowers was actually retained

as an Arkansas State employee at the expense of a more qualified minority applicant.

No. 8, to permit Roger Tamraz to fuel all the automobiles retained by Members of Congress and their staffs in return for attending all the receptions held in the Rayburn building for a year with an overnight stay in Statuary Hall.

No. 9, to commission the printing of the motto "no controlling legal authority" on all letterhead charged to the House Ethics Committee, the Senate Judiciary Committee, and the Department of Justice.

No. 10, present the Congressional Medal of Honor to Mary Heslin, lately of the National Security Council, for daring to attempt to preserve the honor and integrity of the presidency from the corrosive clutches of its present occupant and to ban all Georgetown bar bouncers from obtaining access to her FBI file.

It is really scary, when we go through. In the Nixon administration, Chuck Colson went to prison because he had one FBI file. When we went through the FBI files in our committee and we started asking, I remember one of the early questioners asking one of the former attorneys at the White House if he knew Craig Livingstone and he looked around and said, I met him once. He reported to me but I did not really know him. Then they asked him if he knew Anthony Marceca. He looked down the thing, no, never met him, never saw him. He later, to another question, said, yes, the FBI files were under my office. The FBI files were never looked at by anybody. Nobody looks at these, these were under Livingstone and Marceca's control. So former Congressman Bill Martini asked the question, Mr. Nussbaum, under oath, you earlier said that you had met Craig Livingstone one time. You never met Anthony Marceca; you did not know him. Yet you also said under oath that all these files were never violated, nobody looked at them and does not that seem to be a contradiction? And Mr. Nussbaum said, the reason I can say that is I know nobody in our administration would stoop so slow as to look at any of those files.

It is like, come on, guys. If you have hundreds and hundreds of files scattered through various staffers, they had interns having these files with background information that they had checked on Republicans, people they had no business even investigating in the first place yet alone looking at their file. They do not know who hired the national security advisor who most of his qualifications were that he had been a dirty tricks person in large part in different campaigns. They have in Travelgate, when we got into that, you look at that and see that what the whole deal there was is first you have a girlfriend of a staffer getting a deal. Then you realize that a friend from Arkansas is trying to get, without White House security clearance, is wondering

around trying to get the contract for the travel office. What he really wants is the contract for travel for his agency for all the different branches of the Federal Government which, rather than just the small travel office budget, is now millions and millions of dollars. And we see this unfold first in the Travelgate. Because we are looking at the Travelgate, we find out about the files. And we are looking at the files and we find out about Craig Livingstone.

It is just like what is now starting to happen, when we start to unravel the money, part of the reason this is so confusing to the American people is you start, you go, wow, there is money from China here and some arms dealer and such-and-such, and the next thing you are over in Indonesia and next thing it is happening from Thailand. Oh, Taiwan, too. And pretty soon you have people confused because it is coming from about every major country in the world that has any business. You have all these different people pouring money in left and right. It is no wonder the American people are confused as to the particulars.

I have a couple of other charts here. This is a list of witnesses who have fled the country. Charlie Trie was last seen in Beijing, China. He is a former restaurateur and old friend of President Clinton who tried to give \$640,000 in suspicious contributions to the President's legal expense trust. Part of the reason it is hard for our committees to lay this out is it is not like China is cooperating and it is not like the banks in China are cooperating, and it is not like Charlie Trie is cooperating. So it is a little hard to get all this information.

I think you will see, as the House investigations start this fall and go through next year, that we will hopefully get more of this. Pauline Kanchanalak, in Thailand, had \$235,000 in DNC contributions returned because she could not verify that she was the source. In other words, we are already seeing this money being sent back. It is not like it is a dispute whether the funds were legal. He is telling us he wants campaign finance reform when rule No. 1 is this, follow the current law.

The current law seems to be, in the eyes of this administration, if the Senate investigators or the House investigators turn up the funds, send it back fast. That seems to be what is happening. We are seeing very little money sent back until we uncover it in one of the committees. Then they send it back. That is not the law. The law says, do not take the illegal money and send the illegal money back, not until Congress discovers it.

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

Agus Setiawan, Indonesian employee of Lippo who signed many of the checks to the DNC drawn on Lippo affiliates.

Subandi Tanuwidjaja, in Indonesia, gave \$80,000 to the DNC 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 Wiradinata, Indonesian couple who gave the DNC \$450,000 after the receipt of a \$500,000 wire from Soraya's father, a co-founder of the Lippo Group.

It knows no country. John H. K. Lee, South Korean businessman, president of Cheong Am America, Inc., DNC returned \$250,000 to Cheong Am.

Antonio Pan, ex-Lippo executive and friend of Charlie Trie and John Huang who delivered cash to individuals for conduit payments.

And then there is Ted Sioeng, father of Jessica Elnitiarta, who donated \$100,000 to the DNC. He is reportedly connected to the Chinese intelligence community.

Then there are the witnesses who have pled the fifth amendment to the House or Senate committees. John Huang, former DNC fundraiser, Commerce Department official and Lippo Group employee who solicited more than \$1 million in questionable contributions.

Jane Huang, wife of John Huang, her name appears on DNC documents as a solicitor of some DNC donations while Huang was at Commerce.

Mark Middleton, former White House Deputy Chief of Staff, who became an international businessman, worked with the Riadys and Trie. Maria Hsia, Taiwan-born consultant who helped Huang organize the temple fundraiser.

Manlin Fong, sister of Charlie Trie, was given thousands of dollars to donate to the DNC in her name by Trie.

Joseph Landon, Manlin Fong's friend, was given thousands of dollars to donate to the DNC in his name by Trie.

David Wang, made \$5,000 contribution to the DNC at Trie's request.

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

These are people to pled the fifth, remembering that rule No. 1, before we do campaign finance reform, is follow the current law. Do you know what? Generally speaking, I am not an attorney. I know some of my friends here tonight are attorneys. It does not mean you are guilty because you plead the fifth. But it means you are not being very cooperative in trying to find out the truth, and it does not look particularly good.

The next name on here, Webster Hubbell, already is coming out of jail, former Associate Attorney General, not the kind of person you want to see go to jail or that kind of ups your confidence in the President that he would put in an Associate Attorney General who goes to jail, received hundreds of thousands of dollars from Lippo after leaving the Justice Department. Hsiu Luan Tseng, a Buddhist nun at a Hawaiian temple who contributed to the DNC at the Hsi Lai temple event.

Judy Hsu, Buddhist nun who contributed at the temple event.

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

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

By the way, either nuns make a lot more money than I thought they did, or we have a serious problem here. Jen Chin Hsueh, gave \$2,000 to DNC, listed address as home owned by the temple but does not live there. Jie Su Hsiao, Buddhist nun who contributed at the temple event.

Gin F. J. Chen, DNC donor at a fundraiser at Washington's Hay Adams hotel who may have been reimbursed by Hsi Lai.

Hsin Chen Shih, DNC 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 DNC.

Hsiu Chu Lin, employee of Hsi Lai, who gave the DNC \$1,500.

Chi Rung Wang, a California man who gave DNC \$5,000 at the temple fundraiser.

Noland Hill, business partner of the late Secretary Ron Brown.

Yogesh Ghandi, while receiving \$500,000 in wire transfers from a Japanese bank, contributed \$325,000 to the DNC.

These are people who pled the fifth amendment. They do not want to talk to us about it. Jane Dewi Tahir, college student related by marriage to the Riadys who received \$200,000 in wires from the Lippo bank and gave \$30,000 to the DNC.

Duangnet Kronenberg, sister-in-law of Pauline Kanchanalak, attended a coffee at Vice President GORE's residence.

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

Jou Sheng, gave DNC \$8,000 listing a Maywood, CA, Buddhist temple as his address but does not live there.

I want to make it clear that these people at the Buddhist temple, they may or may not have known what the American laws are. That is the responsibility of the people soliciting the money. It is the responsibility of the Democratic National Committee, the Vice President of the United States, the President of the United States to know the law.

And I personally want to make it clear that it would be very easy to make this seem like somebody is anti-Asian or anti these countries. That is not the case here. The question is what were the leaders of this country doing when they know the law, as every one of us know the law, soliciting money and taking advantage of people who think that that is how the U.S. Government works?

It is an insult to our Nation and a shame on our Government that they would use these other countries, use how they may have to deal in other

parts of the world to let them think they have to give money to the President's campaign committee and the President's party in order to do business with the United States. They should be up front and say, we do business fairly here. We do not have things for sale in this country. We have a different standard than the rest of the world. And instead, we abuse people who may not have known, who had always looked to America as a country different in the world, a country that was not corruptible. And they went and used these people, even in their own Buddhist temple. They used these people to get their money and to then use it for campaign purposes to stay in power. It is very difficult, I feel bad if I mispronounce these names but there is a whole bunch more from there.

□ 2115

I could go on, but I see I have been joined by a few of my friends here. I will yield to the distinguished gentleman from Arizona [Mr. SHADEGG].

Mr. SHADEGG. I would be happy to join in this discussion if the gentleman would yield.

One of the posters the gentleman put up is one that strikes me a great deal in this debate, and if he will put it back up, it says, first rule, follow the current law.

I notice we are now debating on the set-aside the whole issue of campaign finance reform, and there is this hue and cry that we really ought to be revising our campaign laws because, clearly, this episode demonstrates that we need to rewrite the law. And yet, as the gentleman shows there, rule No. 1, follow the current law, it kind of makes me wonder what is the point of rewriting the law so that we have a new law if they did not follow the old law. Why do we think they will follow the new law? It is kind of amazing.

I know the gentleman talked about legal authorities. I am an attorney, and I was proud to make my living in that field before coming here, but in that regard, and just to touch on follow the law, let us talk about AL GORE's favorite phrase: The controlling legal authority. And guess what? There is some in this area. As a matter of fact, there are a number of statutes that touch on these practices quite directly.

For example, 18 United States Code section 201 outlaws bribery in this country. Now, whether or not we quite have the facts to establish bribery, whether they will come out before the Thompson hearings end, whether they will come out in the course of the Burton hearings may not be clear, but there is a law here that says bribery is wrong.

But let us talk about some others where we do have some pretty clear evidence.

How about 18 United States Code section 600, which prohibits the use of government offices for political purposes. How about that same section of law that says it is a crime to promise ac-

cess to a government building or to government services in return for campaign contributions.

There were, I think, 103 White House coffees held with the President, telling them they could come to the White House and have coffee with the President for \$500,000. It seems to me we turned this place into Starbucks on Pennsylvania Avenue.

Let us talk about another one. 18 United States Code section 607 specifically says it is a Federal crime to solicit campaign contributions in a Federal building. On that one we have AL GORE on at least 86 different solicitation calls from the White House.

We also have a fascinating note, that maybe the gentleman has put it up or maybe he has not put it up, where a White House staffer makes a note that BC made 15 to 20 calls and raised \$500,000. Now, BC, I suppose we could be talking about the cartoon character BC who I used to read about. We could be talking about Bill Cosby.

Mr. SOUDER. Or Boston College. We should not be so judgmental.

Mr. SHADEGG. Boston College. There could be that other remote possibility, that when it says on a staff note written in the White House, written by David Strauss, "BC made 15 to 20 calls and raised \$500,000," there is at least a slim chance, I would suppose, and maybe I could ask my colleague if he wants to comment on this, that BC did not refer to Bill Cosby or Boston College but Bill Clinton.

Mr. SOUDER. Especially when we look at the—it is hard to read the small print, but it is talking about the \$5 million needed by year's end, refers to other specific individuals, and then it said BC made 15 to 20 calls, raised \$500 K. Hard to believe that would not be Bill Clinton.

Mr. SHADEGG. We are trying to bring some light to this discussion and maybe some humor here, maybe we should do a national call-in, where we put up a 1-800 number and ask the American people how many people think BC in that note refers to Bill Cosby or Boston College or the cartoon character BC or somebody other than Bill Clinton; and how many think maybe BC in that White House note refers to 15 to 20 calls raising \$500,000 by BC, referring to Bill Clinton.

Mr. SOUDER. Kind of a credibility test.

Mr. SHADEGG. We could do that and let the American people call in and tell us what they really think.

To continue the theme of mentioning a few controlling authorities that the Vice President did not happen to notice.

Mr. SOUDER. Did the gentleman mention the HRC?

Mr. SHADEGG. The gentleman can talk about the HRC.

Mr. SOUDER. Well, there is one here that says HRC was making calls, too, which I assume is the human resources counsel. I would not want to jump to the conclusion it was Hillary Rodham Clinton.

Mr. SHADEGG. Hillary Rodham Clinton? Oh, no, I am certain that is a coincidence. I doubt if it would be Hillary Rodham Clinton.

Mr. SOUDER. It is against the law. They would not do that.

Mr. SHADEGG. No, that is right. That is in the same note where it said BC made 15 to 20 calls and HRC is making calls. I doubt if that is Hillary Rodham Clinton. I am certain it is just someone else who happens to have similar initials.

Mr. SOUDER. We will probably discover it after the statute of limitations runs.

Mr. SHADEGG. No doubt shortly after the statute of limitations.

Just, again, reclaiming the time the gentleman has yielded to me graciously, AL GORE, in his perusal of the statutes, could not find a controlling legal authority. My staff found yet another one they thought was interesting.

18 United States Code, section 641, which talks about converting Federal property to a private use. That, of course, brought to my staff's mind the idea that there was a notation, I believe, since we are talking about notations on House documents, that said quote, ready to start overnights right away, and was signed President Clinton.

President Clinton. Now, those initials BC, Bill Clinton? That would be the same one?

Mr. SOUDER. Maybe it was supposed to have a P in front of this one.

Mr. SHADEGG. PBC?

Mr. SOUDER. Well, maybe it was Bill Cosby.

Mr. SHADEGG. There was one last one. The gentleman was just talking about the use of the Buddhist temple and the innocence of the people there. We found one more controlling authority that our friend Mr. GORE might want to take a look at.

It was 18 United States Code, section 371, and 26 United States Code, section 7201, which similarly make it a crime to misuse a tax exempt organization such as, for example, a Buddhist temple which has tax exempt status.

Mr. SOUDER. If the gentleman will yield for a second, I need to make a brief point before yielding to the gentleman from Colorado.

Earlier the gentleman mentioned the White House coffees and the \$50,000 for the coffees and mentioned Starbucks. Starbucks is \$1.27 for me. I did not want people to think coffee at Starbucks was the same as coffee at the White House.

Mr. SHADEGG. Good point. So coffee at Starbucks is \$1.27, coffee at the White House is \$50,000.

Mr. SOUDER. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona once again.

Mr. SHADEGG. If I could, briefly, while we are on this point, and then I will be happy to yield back. We are trying to bring some light and make this a little humorous, so I hope everyone

watching understands this is a little tongue in cheek.

We did discover a rather tongue-in-cheek memo from the White House, actually probably not crafted in the White House because I doubt they would let this memo out, but it says "Clinton White House Lessons Learned in the Campaign of 1996."

I thought the gentleman mentioned some humorous things his friend had sent him, and so I thought I would mention a couple of these things that I thought were rather pointed in the vein of Clinton White House lessons learned in the campaign of 1996.

First, lesson No. 1, "Blame it all on the DNC chairmen."

Lesson No. 2, "Don't give back illegal money until it's discovered in a Senate hearing."

Lesson No. 3, "Make sure all donors know their 5th Amendment rights" against self-incrimination.

Lesson No. 4, "The press won't cover the truth until after the campaign."

Lesson No. 5, "Spin illegal international contributions as 'foreign investment,' helping the trade deficit, pro-labor."

Mr. SOUDER. That is a good point, I never thought it as helping to balance the trade. Get some of our money back.

Mr. SHADEGG. We are trying to help out the economy. Helps the trade deficit and the labor movement.

Lesson No. 6, "Sprint has the best rate for international calls."

Mr. SOUDER. That is good to know, if I ever make one.

Mr. SHADEGG. If we are going to call overseas to get a contribution, use Sprint, it is cheap.

Mr. SOUDER. They have done our field work for us.

Mr. SHADEGG. Lesson No. 7, "Never put it in writing."

This one AL GORE should have learned. Obviously, he does not have friends.

Lesson No. 8, "Friends don't let friends call from work."

And one that touched on the point the gentleman went into at length about what happened in this Buddhist temple, and the fact that people there were extremely generous, as a matter of fact. This is an important Clinton White House lesson learned in the course of the campaign of 1996: "Monks may not be as poor as you think."

Another one, "Don't settle for less."

Yet another, "Never sell the Presidency for less than \$50,000," unless of course you can get \$50.

Another one, "Felons deserve a second chance: Donor mentoring."

"The CIA can't keep a secret."

Mr. SOUDER. That is something we just recently learned in these hearings.

Mr. SHADEGG. The last one, and I will conclude: "Leak it as soon as you know it, so that before the hearing you can call it old news."

That one we watched play out last week, where it was very important in the Committee on House Oversight that we make all depositions instantaneously public so that they could be old news by the time the hearings were held, and we brought them out and brought them to light and pointed out, oh, by the way this sentence in the deposition demonstrates a crime.

Mr. SOUDER. Then the President says it is old news. "They already proved I did this immorally and illegally." What is news about this?

Mr. SHADEGG. If it was leaked last week or a month ago, it is old news, even if it is just now revealed to show a crime.

I thank the gentleman and give back my time.

Mr. SOUDER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan, who has been a leader in a lot of these issues in trying to root out corruption in government.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I appreciate some of this tongue-in-cheek tonight, but I think we also recognize that this is very serious business, and recently we have encountered another whole aspect of what may be corruption in the administration. We know that there is corruption.

What I am talking about is an action that the House took here last week, on Friday, and we also took a similar action the week before, and it deals with the Teamsters Union, where in 1996 the Teamsters had another election for a Teamsters president.

The election cost somewhere in the neighborhood of \$20 million. And it is kind of like, well, I really hope that when the Teamsters run an election and they spend \$20 million, that the Teamster members are entitled to a fair and honest election, and there are Federal laws in place to make sure that that happens.

But there is one slight difference with the Teamsters election in 1996, in that the Teamsters did not pay for the election in 1996. They did not pay for their own election. They did not pay for the printing of the ballots, they did not pay for the counting of the ballots, they did not pay for the facilities that were rented, they did not pay for the campaigns; none of these things. The sad thing was, in 1996, and over a period of about 2½, 3 years, the American taxpayers spent about \$20 million, the American taxpayers spent \$20 million to pay for a Teamsters election.

The Teamsters election was completed in December 1996, the ballots were completed, counted early in 1997, and on August 22 the election officer who oversaw the election process overthrew the election. She looked at the election, looked at the charges that were made, and said this was a fraudulent election and we are going to throw it out; meaning we have to do it over again.

Mr. SOUDER. Reclaiming my time, I want to make sure that I and those listening understand this. Was it Congress' intent to pay for that election?

Mr. HOEKSTRA. No, we do not think so. It was a consent decree in 1989, where the Justice Department reached

an agreement on a series of steps and activities to root out corruption out of the Teamsters and required a democratic election for the president of the Teamsters in 1991 and another election in 1996, and it was optional for the Justice Department or the executive branch to decide who was going to pay for the election in 1996.

□ 2130

In 1991, the Teamsters did exactly the right thing, they said this is an internal operation. We would like Government Oversight to make sure that Federal laws are adhered to and those types of things. The Teamsters paid for their own election in 1997. It was a good, fair, clean election. The people that we have interviewed and told us about that said it was a good election, 1996.

Somewhere around 1993, 1994, we do not know exactly who or where, but somebody said do not worry about that \$20 million, Teamsters. The Federal Government is going to pick up that tab. We will pay for it, and who knows what you are going to do with that other \$20 million, but the Federal Government will pay for the election. We run the election, and 9 months later we throw it out.

Mr. SOUDER. Reclaiming my time, as my colleague has pointed out repeatedly in other issues, there really is not a Federal Government. That is your people in the district of Michigan and mine in Indiana that paid for that election. You are telling us that the Justice Department decided that we were going to pay for the Teamsters election.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. That is correct.

Mr. SOUDER. And then after, in effect, deciding for us that without a vote that we were going to pay for the election, they were overseeing the election that they now say is corrupt?

Mr. HOEKSTRA. That is absolutely correct. What has happened, and I thank the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SOUDER] for clarifying this. I was right, the Federal Government paid for it. You were more correct because, you know, when we in Washington spend \$20 million, it is not our money, it is taxpayer dollars. It was about \$50 a vote for every vote cast is what the American taxpayers paid for the Teamsters election.

Now, the interesting thing is how did the election officer determine to make this serious, you know, change in policy that said, I have reviewed the election, and there is such corruption in this election I am going to throw it out. And what she found in this process was that there was money laundering. There was money laundering to vendors who would bill the Teamsters for certain activity, never complete the activities, but get paid for it and funnel money back into the campaign of Mr. Carey.

There were political action committees, organizations, whose primary intent and focus is to drive the agenda

here in this House and drive the agenda here in Washington, who all of a sudden started getting extraordinarily large amounts of dollars from the Teamsters.

This is now the union money, funds coming to the union headquarters in Washington and being sent somewhere with the understanding that if we send you some money, oh, look, they gave me some money.

Mr. SOUDER. Reclaiming my time, is that because the union dues could not be used directly for Mr. Carey's election?

Mr. HOEKSTRA. That is because the union dues could not be used directly for the election of Mr. Carey. So they were laundered through campaign organizations with a quid pro quo, you do this for me and I will do this for you.

The end result is what do we have? We have \$20 million of taxpayer money that is right down the drain. We know that when the Teamsters ran their own election, they ran a clean election. When the Federal Government and this administration got involved in the process, we spent \$20 million of taxpayers' money and all we got was an illegal election.

So we know that the Teamsters election was full of illegalities. That is why it was overthrown. We know that there were lots of dollars that were funneled out into congressional campaigns, meaning that I believe that there were many congressional campaigns that we can accurately describe as being tainted elections because the dollars got into those elections in an illegal way. So we have got tainted Teamsters elections. We have got tainted congressional elections. And we have \$20 million of taxpayers' money right down the shooter.

I just want to add one thing, what we did last week, in a very surprising vote, is Congress finally stood up twice in the last 10 days and said, we are not going to pay for the rerunning of the Teamsters election. We are going to follow the current law. We can run a Teamsters election fairly. We know that we did that in 1991. We do not need any change of the law to have Teamsters get a fair election. All we need to do is follow the existing law.

In the last 10 days, this Congress and the other body on one occasion have said, we are not going to pay for any more internal operations of the Teamsters. But increasingly, in both cases, we had almost 190 Members of this House say, oh, yeah, we will let the taxpayers pay for the rerun of this election. We have the Justice Department and Labor Department right now figuring out ways to get some money, the money we did not spend in 1996.

We are collecting some fines and penalties. Why are we collecting fines and penalties? These are not wild allegations. There are three people that have already pled guilty and have been fined and the Justice Department saying, wow, here is some more money coming in, these people who will pay for the rerunning of the election.

This House stood up and said, no more. We will supervise the election. It is our job to make sure that the Federal laws are enforced. That is our responsibility. That is the people's responsibility. But it is not the people's responsibility to pay for the printing and counting of ballots and to run the internal operations of the union.

This is an interesting situation. We are going to be taking, I think both of our committees are going to be taking an additional look at this because of the involvement of taxpayers' dollars, the overthrowing of the election, and how it may have gone into other parties of the campaign process in 1996.

Mr. SOUDER. Reclaiming my time, I want to yield, if the gentleman will, for a couple more questions just to reiterate, because it is confusing to a lot of people how this occurred.

As I understand what the gentleman said, is that somewhere along the line, around 1994 or thereabouts, the Justice Department decided that the taxpayers should pay for the election, which had the Teamsters pay for it out of their own dues, would not have left as many dollars for the then President to go out and cut sweetheart deals with contractors and with the Democratic Party in return for them giving money to his campaign.

In other words, if the dues had been used for a fair election, perhaps A, the president of the union might not have won, unless he wasted all his dollars in the campaign, and B, there are Members of Congress whose elections may have been different.

Is that what you are, in effect, saying?

Mr. HOEKSTRA. We are saying that, as a result of the American taxpayer picking up the tab for the 1996 election, the American taxpayer spent \$20 million that the Teamsters organization did not have to spend itself. I do not know what they did with that money, where that money went. But I think it is a question that is worth asking.

Just as a side note to this, not only did the American taxpayer pay for the Teamsters election in the U.S., now think about this, the American taxpayer paid for the printing of ballots, paid for the counting of ballots in Canada. We paid to run the private internal organization of the Teamsters not only in the U.S., but also in Canada. Unbelievable.

Mr. SOUDER. Reclaiming my time, I guess it kind of counters the point that the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. SHADEGG] was making earlier about the balance of trade. We were getting money in illegal contributions, but we were taking taxpayer dollars to pay for elections overseas.

My colleague would know this more than I, but my understanding was that the losing candidate actually carried the Midwestern States, where we are from, and lost the Canadian vote which we funded.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. If the gentleman would continue to yield, I believe that

if the Teamsters election had only been an U.S. election, the result would have been different. But because the American taxpayer picked up the tab for the Canadian election, the result was different, and that is what pushed Mr. Carey over the top.

And just a quick correction, before we get inundated with faxes, a correction, Canada is not overseas.

Mr. SOUDER. It depends on how you define the Great Lakes. As a police Midwesterner, those are big lakes to us.

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, at the risk of changing topics, and I think that is a vitally important issue about which we are all concerned and it fits with the theme of this hour, I notice we are running out of time, and I wanted to take a moment, both of my colleagues are on the Committee on Education, to raise a separate issue that was raised at the end of the last hour, and ask each of them to comment on it, because I think it is an issue that the American people need to know about.

My questions tonight arise out of a Wall Street Journal column that appeared today that I hope each of my colleagues have seen. It is a column by Lynne Cheney, and it carries the caption "A Failing Grade for Clinton's National Standards." If I could, I just would like to talk about this article for a moment because it is so compelling to me.

I have a 15-year-old and an 11-year-old at home. As a matter of fact, just before coming over here to the floor, I was on the phone with my 15-year-old and asking her some questions, and she was working on her homework and doing a small project for me. Nothing is more important to me than their education. And I am deeply interested that they get a good education and get ahead in this life.

And that takes us to a debate that is at the fore of this Nation right now and on which conferees between the House and Senate will be meeting very soon, and that is the question of national testing. The point I want to make here is that I have reasonable friends at home, very bright people at home, who come to me and say, "Congressman, I do not understand. Why are you against national testing? Should we not, as a Nation, want to know how our students are doing and want to compare our kids in Arizona," my home State, "with the children in other States across the country," such as yours, Indiana. And I walk them through this explanation. But this article really brings the issue home.

I point out to them that the sad reality is that teachers will teach to the test. And maybe that is not so sad. They want their students to do well. So if they know the content of the test, they are going to say, "I better make sure my students learn the content of the test."

So people say to me, okay, Congressman, if you are worried that a national

test will cause people to teach to the test, does that not simply say that when the President picked objective areas, such as math, and not more subjective areas, such as social studies, that that really should solve the problem about national testing, we will test English and we will test math and there are black and white, right and wrong answers and we will see how kids are performing and we will not get into the subjective areas like history?

And I point out to them that, while that sounds good, reasonable, rationale people ought to be deadily opposed to National testing. And this article makes it clear why: Because there are not black-and-white areas in today's Washington, D.C. Education Department under Bill Clinton.

And here is the point: The article by Lynne Cheney in today's Wall Street Journal, and I hope my colleagues all have read it and I hope America will read it, talks about a gentleman by the name of Steven Leinwand. He sits on the committee overseeing President Clinton's proposed national mathematics exams. He has written an essay, and this gentleman is mainstream, new education, Washington, D.C. expert. In the essay he explains why it is "downright dangerous" to teach students things like $6 \times 7 = 42$. He says it is downright dangerous to teach students the multiplication facts.

Now why does he say that is dangerous? Because such instruction, teaching kids their multiplication facts, "sorts people out," Mr. Leinwand writes, "annointing the few who master these procedures and casting out the many." His basic principle is, we cannot teach math to kids because some kids will learn the answer, $6 \times 7 = 42$, and some kids will not learn it; and the kids who do not learn it will feel bad. Now, if that is the kind of mindset that is going to dictate Bill Clinton's national testing and the teachers in America will be compelled to teach to that, I think it is disastrous.

Let me conclude by pointing out, he writes another test for an organization called the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics; and they propose, through this committee, a national math exam that will avoid directly assessing certain knowledge and skills, such as whole-number computation. He does not want kids to be able to do addition, subtraction, multiplication, or division because of this sense that some of them will fail and some of them will feel bad.

And the organization says, in case this exam which they have written might indirectly assess whether 8th graders can add, subtract, multiply and divide, the committee recommends that, even for those basic skills, students should have a calculator throughout the entire time period. This is just amazing to me. But that is why I think national testing, while it sounds good and sounds reasonable, is in fact an attempt to impose a national

standard and national agenda that the people in Arizona do not really like.

□ 2145

Mr. HOEKSTRA. The problem gets to be, and we have had hearings around the country in my subcommittee. I chair an oversight subcommittee, and we have been taking a look at education.

Mr. SHADEGG. Did a hearing in my district in Arizona.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. We have been in Arizona, and we also went to Delaware, and the reason I bring up Delaware is, Delaware is the size of one of our congressional districts, all right? So, you know, Delaware said, we want a State test, and what Delaware did is, they spent 3 years starting at the grassroots level to develop a State test. Remember, one congressional district; Michigan has 16. It took them 3 years to develop a test, because they wanted to get parental buy, and they wanted to get teacher buy, and they want to get school administrator, business community. They wanted the State to accept the test. Bill Clinton wanted to take 10 months and, top down, drive a test and impose it on all of America, on every school, on every child, and have them test, the exact wrong. It is the "Washington knows best" mentality rather than doing a grass, which is going on in the States right now; States are developing tests, and it is a grassroots, bottom-up type of move, not good enough for our President. Bill Clinton wants to be the expert, says, I am going to develop a test, I am going to impose it on everybody.

Mr. SHADEGG. Reclaiming my time, top down is just dead wrong.

I want to rebut one other argument in support of national testing, and that is, the proponents of this idea said, well, States can opt out, and Lynne Cheney, in writing this article which I commend to all of my colleagues here in the Congress and to all of America, points out that even if States choose to opt out, a Federal test will strongly influence the textbooks because they are only a handful of textbook companies, and they are going to write those textbooks to such a national task.

And it seems to me the whole notion of, well, one or two States, Arizona, can opt out; heck, Arizona opted out of daylight savings time, one of, I think, only two States in the Nation which did. But in this field, where Arizona just said, we do not want that national test, the textbooks we would have to go purchase would be driven by that top down Bill Clinton dictated, but I do not care if it was Ronald Reagan dictated top down, one-size-fits-all standard, and I think it is a mistake.

Mr. SOUDER. Reclaiming my time, because I would like to kind of tie a couple things together here, and one of the things we are seeing is that what has gone on in this country, it is hard for us, many of us do not get up here every day and talk, but it does not pass the laugh test. I mean a national test

where the person on the math board does not want to do 7 times 6 equal 42, because it might intimidate some people that they feel left out or behind.

The idea that the taxpayers are going to pay for a Teamsters election so the Teamsters can use their money, the leadership, to try to finance their own race against what appears to have been the majority of the Teamsters members of the United States, and we pay for Canadian ballots, and then that money goes and elects other Members of Congress who claim they want campaign finance reform.

How about those members paying for the Teamsters election who got and benefited from the money of the Teamsters' members and the taxpayers of the United States, and it flowed into their campaign. How about following the current law?

Another debate that we are currently having that I simply cannot fathom is on the Census, because it is fine to use sampling to try to set up and understand where we are headed, but it is not fine to do the actual count mandated by the Constitution by guessing. That would be like going to the Clinton administration political appointees and saying, we are going to throw one out of every five of you in jail because we know at the end of this time, and when we get through, done with everything, one out of five is going to jail. They may have the wrong person, just like in the sampling that they have had around the country, they may have the people in the wrong State. That is real sad, but at least they got the rough number calculated.

It does not pass a laugh test. National tests do not pass the laugh test. The funding of the Teamsters election, which the gentleman from Michigan has twice now had this House go on record where, against the Census sampling, it does not pass the laugh test, and, quite frankly, the President of the United States threatened to recall lawmakers to the Hill so that we would have a special session on campaign finance and the people here in the House who keep saying this, it is a joke, it is an insult to the intelligence of the American people in a book, now discounted because it did not sell that great, called "Putting People First" by Governor Bill Clinton and Senator AL GORE.

In campaign finance reform, to show you how humorous this is, it says American politics is being held hostage by big money interests. Members of Congress now collect more than \$2.5 million in campaign funds every week, like he did, while political action committees, industry lobbies, and cliques of \$100,000 donors buy access to the White House. This is what Bill Clinton ran against, and he turned it into an art form.

This simply does not pass the laugh test, and it is so frustrating to me, and I know that, and I thank the two gentlemen who are here tonight on this special order who have been leaders in

investigating this and in campaigning against this, and I enjoy working with both of you on the different committees.

I do not know if any of you have a concluding comment here, too, but I wanted to get that last comment in. No matter what area we look at right now, whether it is Census sampling, national tests, Teamsters election, campaign finance reform, it is hard for me to believe the American people are taking this seriously.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. If the gentleman would yield, I think it is pretty exciting we have made some progress on the education issue again, but it is interesting to watch the debate. In the Senate a couple of weeks ago, they passed a motion that said, they passed an amendment that said we are moving decisionmaking back.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2378

Mr. KOLBE submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 2378) making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the United States Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain Independent Agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT H. REPT. 105-284

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2378) "making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the United States Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain Independent Agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert:

That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

DEPARTMENTAL OFFICES

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Departmental Offices including operation and maintenance of the Treasury Building and Annex; hire of passenger motor vehicles; maintenance, repairs, and improvements of, and purchase of commercial insurance policies for, real properties leased or owned overseas, when necessary for the performance of official business; not to exceed \$2,900,000 for official travel expenses; not to exceed \$150,000 for official reception and representation expenses; not to exceed \$258,000 for unforeseen emergencies of a confidential nature, to be allocated and expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury and to be accounted for solely on his certificate; \$114,771,000: Provided, That section 113(2) of the Fiscal Year 1997 Department of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, Public Law 104-208 (110 Stat. 3009-22) is amended by striking "12 months" and inserting in lieu thereof "2 years": Provided further, That the Office of Foreign Assets

Control shall be funded at no less than \$4,500,000: Provided further, That chapter 9 of the fiscal year 1997 Supplemental Appropriations Act for Recovery from Natural Disasters, and for Overseas Peacekeeping Efforts, including those in Bosnia, Public Law 105-18 (111 Stat. 195-96) is amended by inserting after the "County of Denver" in each instance "the County of Arapahoe": Provided further, That \$200,000 are provided to conduct a comprehensive study of gambling's effects on bankruptcies in the United States: Provided further, That for necessary expenses of the Office of Enforcement, including, but not limited to, making transfers of funds to Treasury bureaus and offices for programs, projects or initiatives directed as the investigation or prosecution of violent crime, \$1,600,000, to remain available until expended, to be derived from balances available in the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund.

OFFICE OF PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Office of Professional Responsibility, including purchase and hire of passenger motor vehicles, \$1,250,000: Provided, That the Under Secretary of Treasury for Enforcement shall task the Office of Professional Responsibility to conduct a comprehensive review of integrity issues and other matters related to the potential vulnerability of the U.S. Customs Service to corruption, to include examination of charges of professional misconduct and corruption as well as analysis of the efficacy of departmental and bureau internal affairs systems.

AUTOMATION ENHANCEMENT

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the development and acquisition of automatic data processing equipment, software, and services for the Department of the Treasury, \$25,889,000, of which \$11,000,000 shall be available to the United States Customs Service for the Automated Commercial Environment project, of which \$6,100,000 shall be available to Departmental Offices for the International Trade Data System, and of which \$8,789,000 shall be available to Departmental Offices to modernize its information technology infrastructure and for business solution software: Provided, That these funds shall remain available until September 30, 1999: Provided further, That these funds shall be transferred to accounts and in amounts as necessary to satisfy the requirements of the Department's offices, bureaus, and other organizations: Provided further, That this transfer authority shall be in addition to any other transfer authority provided in this Act: Provided further, That none of the funds appropriated shall be used to support or supplement Internal Revenue Service appropriations for Information Systems: Provided further, That of the \$27,000,000 provided under this heading in Public Law 104-208, \$12,000,000 shall remain available until September 30, 1999: Provided further, That none of the funds appropriated for the International Trade Data System may be obligated until the Department has submitted a report on its system development plan to the Committees on Appropriations: Provided further, That the funds appropriated for the Automated Commercial Environment project may not be obligated until the Commissioner of Customs has submitted a systems architecture plan and a milestone schedule for the development and implementation of all projects included in the systems architecture plan, and the plan and schedule have been reviewed by the General Accounting Office and approved by the Committees on Appropriations.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, not to exceed \$2,000,000 for official travel expenses; including hire of passenger motor vehicles; and not to exceed \$100,000 for unforeseen