more than $700,000, and I want to commend the committee because the committee has discovered he received at least $200,000 more than was previously indicated, after he resigned as Associate Attorney General on March 4, 1994.

Most of the money came from friends of President Clinton and Democratic Party supporters and was coordinated by people such as then U.S. Trade Representative Mickey Kantor, Vernon Jordan, James Riady, the Indonesian who is also implicated in illegal foreign money. By the way, Indonesia is one of the countries involved in the International Monetary Fund bailing out the government which directly involves the Riadys' economic interests and the Lippo Group, which is the conglomerate owned by the Riadys which has large interests across Asia, including in Communist China.

Client records show that Mr. Hubbell did little or no work for most of the money he received from 18 companies and individuals. Now, his government job was $123,000 a year. His income totaled $704,000 after he left his government job. Something very wrong is going on.

The Committee on Government Reform and Oversight has an obligation to find the truth for the American people, to have people sworn under oath testifying, to work with the Justice Department to make sure that we do not disrupt their investigation. But when the Clinton Administration Justice Department says this person can be immunized, there is no excuse, none, for any Member of this House to vote against that immunization. I call on the committee next week to have a second hearing.

I hope every newspaper in this country will look carefully at the issue. Why would any Member vote against that kind of opportunity? I think that it is very important that we continue this.

Mr. WAXMAN. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GINGRICH. Madam Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Fifteen seconds.

Mr. WAXMAN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Speaker be given 5 additional minutes.

Mr. GINGRICH. I do not think that is possible under the rules.

Mr. STEARNS. Madam Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's time has expired.

RANKING MEMBER OF COMMITTEE RESPONDS TO SPEAKER'S REMARKS ON CAMPAIGN FINANCE INVESTIGATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. DOGGETT. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN).

Mr. WAXMAN. I thank the gentleman very much for yielding. I raced over to the House floor. I did not know the Speaker was going to raise the issue of the Government Reform and Oversight campaign finance investigation. But I did want to come to the House floor to inform him and my colleagues what has happened with this investigation.

First of all, in February of last year I went to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) and said, ''Let's do a bipartisan investigation on campaign finance abuses.'' I wrote to the Speaker and asked that we have a House and Senate joint investigation so that we in the House would not duplicate the work being done by the Thompson Committee over in the Senate.

I never received a reply from the Speaker, but the response that I did get from the gentleman from Indiana was that he was going to do his own investigation, thank you very much. Now, after a year and a half, we have spent over $6 million of the taxpayers' money, we have duplicated a great deal of what went on in the Senate committee, and we have nothing to show for it. We have turned up nothing that was not already in the Senate investigation or quite frankly that has already appeared in the press.

The chairman of our committee, the gentleman from Indiana, has had delegated to him unprecedented authority. He had delegated to him powers that no chairman has ever had before. He has the power to unilaterally issue subpoenas.

The gentleman from Indiana has this authority to issue subpoenas unilaterally. He does not have to come to the committee for a vote. He does not have to seek even authorization from his Republican majority. He can just go ahead and issue subpoenas.

Prior to 1997, how many subpoenas were ever issued unilaterally by a chairman of a House committee? Zero. Now, after a year and a half, we have had the gentleman from Indiana issuing 600 subpoenas, all on his own. No one had a review of them. Those subpoenas are part of a thousand subpoenas and information requests issued to Democrats, or Democratic sources, related to Democratic campaign funding issues.

How many has he issued with regard to Republican abuses in the 1996 election? Fourteen. We have not had a single subpoena authorized by the chairman at our request, even though there are important issues to investigate.

The Haley Barbour national review, national committee, whatever it was, that was a source of foreign funding has never been reviewed by our committee. Fund-raising abuses on public property by Republicans, we cannot get the chairman to pay any attention to that. The strange $50 billion tax break for the tobacco companies, the Speaker knows may know something about that because he and Mr. LOTT were the ones who put that through in the middle of the night. We thought that ought to be investigated. None of these things have been investigated.

□ 1245

The Democrats have been closed out by an effort by the Republicans to do a partisan, reckless investigation. Notwithstanding that, we went along on the only vote where our votes count, and that is on the issue of immunity for witnesses at the request of the chairman once before, and we were all embarrassed by that. The Democrats gave our votes for immunity for a witness who turned out not to have given us honest and credible testimony and a witness who used the immunity granted to him to avoid possible immigration and tax crimes for which he now will never be prosecuted.

Now we are being asked to give immunity to four more people, fairly low-level people. I do not think they have all that much to add to the investigation, but why should we give immunity to these witnesses?

We have not received a proffer from them which would tell us what they know and what they have to say, what to add to the information already available. We have no written proffer from these four people. We have no guarantee that the chairman will conduct the investigation any other way than what he has done up to now.

We wrote to the chairman after that last immunity vote and we said to him, ''We gave you the votes for immunity, and we regret it. We've been embarrassed, as should you be, having given a man immunity for possible offenses that none of us ever knew about. The investigation wasn't done adequately by the majority party staff; and, in the future, if we're going to give immunity to witnesses, we want certain assurances. We want, first of all, the assurances we are going to know what these witnesses are going to say, that work will be done in advance so we don't find giving immunity when it's improper. And, secondly, we want this committee to be conducted the way every other congressional investigation has been conducted.''

Madam Speaker, in the Watergate investigation, in the Iran-Contra and any other investigations, there have always been traditional procedures which are not being followed in this investigation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. PRYCE of Ohio). The time of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT) has expired.

Mr. WAXMAN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for one additional minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will clarify for the RECORD that recognition during Morning Hour debate proceeds upon designations by the respective party leaders, and the Chair does not entertain unanimous consent requests to extend debate time.