

this country is trying to make consumers have more information. We are labeling what they eat. We are labeling what we sell them. We are labeling what they borrow their money from. And we ought to label what their candidates have to deal with. It is a bad amendment.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

First of all, I know the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN) a while ago was talking about this ad that ran, and I am assuming it ran on television. I assume it ran on television.

Mr. MEEHAN. If the gentleman will yield, I did not see it on television, but I read the transcript of it and it was a television ad and about \$300,000 worth.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Reclaiming my time, I think all of us are very much concerned about any ads that run without a disclaimer.

I talked to some FEC lawyers yesterday about that very point; and it is my understanding that if an ad like that runs anywhere without a disclaimer, they can go to the Federal Communications Commission because they have a law and regulations that prohibit those type of ads.

I agree with the gentleman that we do not need ads running on television or anywhere else that does not have a disclaimer on them. But the FEC does have some rules that disclaimers are required.

Mr. MEEHAN. If the gentleman would further yield, it is not so much the problem of the disclaimer on the bottom of the advertisement. The problem is that nobody knows where this money came from. The problem is we have an ad that is clearly meant to influence an election; and when we run ads that are clearly meant to influence an election, the public has a right to know where the money came from. That is what the issue is.

Mr. WHITFIELD. The only point I would raise there is that that brings up the whole issue of the right of privacy of individuals who contribute or organizations that contribute; and the Supreme Court, in certain cases, has indicated that they have a right to keep that private. But that is another issue that we could talk about another day.

Mr. MEEHAN. If the gentleman would continue to yield, people have a right to privacy. However, when people spend their money to influence elections in this country, the Supreme Court has clearly indicated that the public does have a right to know who is spending money and how much they are spending and where it is coming from to influence elections.

Under this amendment that is being offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLITTLE) basically, it says, any communication, any commentary on the voting record positions or anything else would be okay. That is a different right to privacy.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Well, all I would say is that, if the gentleman is talking

about the hard money, of course, anybody can go down to the FEC and get a record and they will know who gave him money or anybody else in this Chamber and it is spelled out very explicitly.

I think soft money is a little bit of a different issue. If it is independent expenditures, they are required to file their report with the FEC anyway. In issue advocacy, if it is a political committee, it is required to file a report.

But my colleague is right, other groups do not have to file a report. And I think we can find some cases where the Court has said that is free speech and it is a little bit different than hard money and they do not have to go file all these reports, because they can make the argument that in filing all these reports it provides an obstacle for people engaging in the political process.

I want to just touch on for a moment, the reason that I object to what my colleagues all have done on this voting record guide is that in paragraph 3 they basically lay out the language as set out in Buckley vs. Valeo, the so-called bright line, and if they had stopped after the word "reject," I mean, I would not have had any problem with it myself. But the Court has repeatedly said that they do have to use these express words.

□ 1400

As a matter of fact, the question I would ask, the FEC is a group of government employees and they are going to have to make the decision about what does this mean. Does this ad, or a campaign slogan or words in context have no reasonable meaning other than to urge the election or defeat of one or more clearly identified candidates? I think different people looking at a particular ad can come up with different conclusions.

I would say to the gentleman that in the Maine case, almost the exact language was used in that case where it said could only be interpreted by a reasonable person as containing advocacy of the election or defeat of one or more clearly identified candidates, and the Supreme Court ruled that as unconstitutional. I think the point we are trying to make is I think you are going to be inviting another overturn by the Supreme Court on that.

The gentleman mentioned the Furgatch case which is exactly right. Basically they said the simple holding of Furgatch was in those instances where political communications do include an explicit directive to voters to take some course of action, then they are going to say that that is express advocacy. In that case, they said, "Don't let him do it."

I would also say to the gentleman that that case was decided in the Ninth Circuit. The Ninth Circuit has been turned over 27 of 28 times it went to the Supreme Court. I think we have a legitimate concern about the stifling of speech that could go on by the way you

are expanding this definition. That is simply the point that I would like to make.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, subject to the agreement I think of all sides, this debate will continue, and we will have further information provided from both sides, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. COBLE) having assumed the chair, Mr. COLLINS, Chairman pro tempore of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2183) to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to reform the financing of campaigns for elections for Federal office, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. FAZIO of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) so I may traditionally as I do at this time of the week inquire of the majority as to the schedule for the coming week.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from California for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that we have concluded legislative business for this week.

The House will next meet on Monday, June 22, at 12:30 p.m. for morning hour and at 2 p.m. for legislative business.

On Monday, we will consider a number of bills under suspension of the rules, a list of which will be distributed to Members' offices. Members should note that we do not expect any recorded votes before 5 p.m. on Monday, June 22.

On Monday, we will also consider H.R. 4059, the Military Construction Appropriations Act, and H.R. 4060, the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act.

On Tuesday, June 23, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for morning hour and 10 a.m. for legislative business. We will again consider a number of bills under suspension of the rules, a list of which will be distributed to Members' offices.

On Tuesday, the House will also take up the Agricultural Appropriations Act. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday evening, Republicans and Democrats will face off in the annual charity congressional baseball game. We hope to finish legislative business by 5 p.m. and head to the diamond for batting practice.

On Wednesday, June 24, the House will meet at 10 a.m. to consider the following legislation:

The Treasury and General Government Appropriations Act; and the Department of Defense Appropriations Act.

On Thursday, June 25, the House will meet at 10 a.m. to consider the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act.

Mr. Speaker, we hope to conclude legislative business for the week by 6 p.m. on Thursday, June 25.

Friday, June 26, as we know marks the beginning of the Independence Day District Work Period from which the House will return on Tuesday, July 14.

Mr. FAZIO of California. If I could reclaim my time, I would like to ask the gentleman if he could tell us when we would next begin debate on the campaign finance reform issue. It looks, as it appears to, that we will be on appropriations bills all week. Is there a date in the future, 2, 3 weeks out when we might get back to this subject we have just been debating today?

Mr. GOSS. If the gentleman will yield further, as the distinguished gentleman well knows, the debate is well underway on this and has certainly caught the interest of the Members, and I think the people who are interested in this subject and will continue on. Obviously next week we have a very heavy schedule of appropriations bills which are, I think, the highest priority for this body at this time, and so my guess is, unless we have some kind of a serious change in what I have outlined, that we will not get back to the question of campaign finance until shortly after the break. It is impossible to say exactly when, but there is a general understanding that it will happen at about that time, so far as we can foresee the schedule at this moment.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Reclaiming my time, I am constrained to note that we have taken up three amendments and we have 258 of them in order that are nongermane and a number more that obviously are germane and could be developed here on the floor. I am concerned obviously that, while the debate has begun, we have not made a lot of progress on this very important issue.

Could the gentleman tell me whether we would be in late on Monday evening as well as Wednesday evening, given the fact that the baseball game will intrude on Tuesday and we are obviously hoping to get away on schedule on Thursday. Is there any sense the Members could obtain as to how late we would be here on Monday and Wednesday?

Mr. GOSS. If the gentleman will yield further, I would estimate, although I would not want to guarantee, but the best guess at this point would appear to be 7 p.m. to 8 p.m. as a range for Monday night, and, depending on other matters, it looks like now 10-ish or about Wednesday.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Reclaiming my time, is it possible that we would take up a budget decision to go to conference at any time next week which would involve, as the gentleman from South Carolina has been intending to offer, an instruction of conferees on the budget resolution?

Mr. GOSS. If the gentleman will yield further, I am advised that that is a subject that is very timely and in fact is presently under discussion and

that we will have to await further notice from the leadership on.

Mr. FAZIO of California. But that is, reclaiming my time, a possibility that we might have before the 14th of July, at least a conference on the budget resolution?

Mr. GOSS. If the gentleman will yield further, I think that there are many possibilities for continuing good legislation, and, as he knows, we will seize them all. With regard to the gentleman's observations on the number of amendments on campaign finance, surely we are going to have a full, deliberative debate on this subject which is, of course, what we all want.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's comments.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, JUNE 22, 1998

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Monday next for morning hour debates.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

CARVILLE'S ENEMIES LIST

(Mr. KINGSTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, you know there are a lot of lists in the world. There is the top 40 list of hit music, there is the top 10 list that Letterman is so famous for. There is the list of the World Series winners, the most valuable players, the Oscar winners and so forth. But then of course the White House keeps a series of lists. We all remember the list Secretary of Energy Hazel O'Leary had of friendly and unfriendly reporters. There are the lists that the White House had of 900 private citizens who were deemed enemies of the State because they were Republicans, and of course there is the donors list which they have in the tax-paid-for computer at the White House.

But now there is a new list put out by James Carville, the Clinton right-hand man. This is the list of enemies of the administration. Who is on this list?

Such hard-core right wingers as Lamar Alexander. Keep that in mind next time putting on a plaid shirt. Such guys as the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE); oh, is he not a fire storm kind of guy? I mean one of the fairest and most respected Members of the House from both sides is on the list as an enemy of the State.

And then there is Bill Bennett. Of course we know what he did. He wrote that book of virtues which is offensive to the administration.

So I am going to submit this for the RECORD, Mr. Speaker.

JUNE 18, 1998.

JUDICIAL WATCH UNCOVERS CARVILLE "ENEMIES LIST"

CARVILLE DOCUMENTS AND FILES SHOW INFORMATION COMPILED ON PERCEIVED CLINTON ADVERSARIES

Documents produced by James Carville and his Education Information Project (EIP) in response to a Judicial Watch subpoena in its Filagate case show that Carville uses the organization as a means to compile information on perceived adversaries of President Clinton. In addition to Judicial Watch, the documents indicate that Carville targets and/or keeps files on the following persons and groups:

Independent Counsel Kenneth Starr, Independent Counsel Donald Smaltz, House Speaker Newt Gingrich, Congressman Henry Hyde, Richard Mellon Scaife, Olin Foundation, Landmark Legal Foundation, Congressman Dan Burton, Congressman Bob Barr, David Bossie, Kathleen Willey, Jacob Stein, Judge David Sentelle, Jim Guy Tucker, Paula Jones, Citizens for Honest Government, Bradley Foundation, Senator Jesse Helms.

Senator Fred Thompson, Senator Lauch Faircloth, Pat Robinson, David Brock, Floyd Brown, Governor Mike Huckabee, Congressman Jack Kingston, Brent Bozell, Concord Coalition, Common Cause, Susan Carpenter McMillan, Gil Davis, David Hale, Dick Morris, Richard DeVos/Amway, Lamar Alexander, Bill Bennett, Joe DiGenova.

The documents also indicate that Carville likely works with Clinton lawyers David Kendall and Mickey Kantor in compiling some of his information on Kenneth Starr. Other evidence produced by Carville suggest that EIP considered, at least, using President Clinton's private investigator Terry Lenzner and his firm IGI to investigate Independent Counsel Kenneth Starr.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

AWARD OF DIRECTOR'S MEDAL TO RICHARD G. FECTEAU AND JOHN T. DOWNEY ON JUNE 25, 1998

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the extraordinary service and sacrifice for this Nation of two officers of the Central Intelligence Agency, Mr. Richard G. Fecteau and Mr. John T. Downey.