



**The Cost of Congressional Campaign Finance
Investigations to the U.S. Taxpayer**

**Minority Staff Report
Committee on Government Reform and Oversight
U.S. House of Representatives**

October 7, 1998

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</u>	i
I. <u>COSTS TO FEDERAL AGENCIES</u>	1
A. <u>Executive Office of the President</u>	3
B. <u>Department of Commerce</u>	3
C. <u>Department of Justice</u>	4
D. <u>Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation</u>	4
E. <u>Department of the Interior</u>	4
F. <u>Department of the Treasury</u>	5
G. <u>Department of Energy</u>	5
H. <u>Export-Import Bank</u>	6
I. <u>Department of Defense</u>	6
J. <u>Federal Election Commission</u>	7
K. <u>Department of State</u>	7
L. <u>Other Agencies</u>	7
II. <u>COSTS OF CONGRESSIONAL INVESTIGATIONS</u>	8
A. <u>House Government Reform and Oversight Committee</u>	8
B. <u>Senate Governmental Affairs Committee</u>	9
C. <u>The House Select Committee on Missile Technology Exports</u>	9
D. <u>The House Education and the Workforce Committee</u>	9
E. <u>Other Congressional Investigations</u>	10
III. <u>OTHER USES OF \$23 MILLION</u>	10
A. <u>Child Nutrition Programs</u>	11
B. <u>Hiring Police Officers</u>	11

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Government Reform and Oversight Committee minority staff estimates that the cost to taxpayers of the congressional campaign finance investigations conducted during the 105th Congress totals more than \$23 million. This includes at least \$8.7 million spent by executive branch agencies responding to congressional requests for information and at least \$14.6 million spent by congressional committees conducting the investigations.

At the request of Ranking Member Henry A. Waxman and Rep. Gary A. Condit, the General Accounting Office (GAO) conducted a survey of executive branch agencies to determine the costs that the congressional campaign finance investigations imposed on the federal agencies. The resulting GAO letter report, which is being released simultaneously with this staff report, shows that (1) federal agencies received 1,156 information requests from congressional campaign finance investigations between October 1, 1996, and March 31, 1998, and (2) these agencies reported spending \$8,767,753.36 responding to these requests through March 31, 1998.

The number of requests and costs varied from agency to agency. According to the GAO survey, the Executive Office of the President reported the most requests (347) and the highest costs to the taxpayers (\$4.5 million). Other agencies reporting high costs to the taxpayer included the Department of Commerce (\$2.4 million), the Department of Justice (\$337,000), the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (\$279,000), the Department of the Interior (\$266,000), and the Department of the Treasury (\$241,000).

In addition to these federal agency costs, the minority staff estimates that Congress has spent at least \$14.6 million conducting multiple campaign finance investigations. The single most expensive congressional investigation is the investigation by the House Government Reform and Oversight Committee, which has cost taxpayers over \$7.4 million to date. Besides the \$7.4 million spent by the House Government Reform and Oversight Committee, the Senate Governmental Affairs Committee spent \$3.5 million on its campaign finance investigation; the House authorized \$1.2 million for the Education and the Workforce Committee's inquiry into campaign finance abuses related to the Teamsters; and the House authorized \$2.5 million for a select committee (the Cox Committee) to investigate allegations that the Clinton administration gave missile technology to China in exchange for campaign contributions.

These four congressional committees -- the House Government Reform Committee, the Senate Governmental Affairs Committee, the House Education and the Workforce Committee, and the Cox Committee -- are not the only congressional committees that have investigated alleged campaign finance abuses in the 105th Congress. The executive branch agencies also received requests from at least 18 other congressional committees. Some of these other committees, such as the House Commerce Committee, held extensive hearings on alleged campaign finance abuses. This report, however, does not estimate the cost to the taxpayers of the investigations by these other committees. If these additional costs were included, the total congressional costs would undoubtedly far exceed \$14.6 million.

As this report illustrates, the money used to pay for the congressional campaign finance investigations could have been put to other uses. For example, this money could have been spent

to provide 12 million school lunches to poor children or used to hire over 800 police officers to fight crime.

This report on the costs and burdens of congressional campaign finance investigations has three parts. Part I analyzes the \$8.7 million spent by federal executive branch agencies responding to congressional requests. Part II summarizes the \$14.6 million already spent or authorized for the duplicate congressional investigations. And Part III looks at what \$23.3 million in federal funds could provide in needed government programs.

I. COSTS TO FEDERAL AGENCIES

The congressional investigations into campaign finance abuses have placed a heavy burden on the federal government. In an effort to determine the costs and burdens of the campaign finance investigation, Rep. Henry Waxman and Rep. Gary Condit asked the General Accounting Office (GAO) to conduct a survey of the executive agencies.¹ The request asked GAO to “identify the number of Congressional inquiries made and the related costs incurred by those agencies.”²

The GAO survey asked 148 executive agencies to provide information on campaign finance inquiries received from October 1, 1996 -- the time the first allegations of campaign finance abuses arose -- through March 31, 1998.³ The agencies were asked the following questions about congressional campaign finance requests: how many written inquiries were received from Congress; how many agency officials testified before Congress; how many additional oral communications the agency had with Congress; actual or estimated personnel costs associated with responding to the congressional inquiries; actual or estimated pages of documents submitted in response to the congressional inquiries and the reproduction and delivery costs; the cost of any outside contractors used to respond to the congressional inquiries; and to what extent the agency encountered duplication among the congressional requests. The survey also gave the agencies the opportunity to describe any problems or other comments regarding the inquiries.

GAO found that 21 executive agencies reported receiving 1,156 campaign finance inquiries from Congress during those eighteen months.⁴ This means that federal agencies received, on average, three congressional inquiries each working day during the period surveyed by GAO. The costs of responding to these requests reported by the agencies totaled \$8,767,753.36.⁵ Table 1 shows the number of congressional requests to federal agencies and the costs incurred responding to these requests, as compiled by GAO.⁶ The actual costs, however,

Table 1: Inquiries and Costs Reported By Federal Agencies

¹Letter from Reps. Henry Waxman and Gary Condit to Acting Comptroller General of the United States James F. Hinchman (February 3, 1998).

²*Id.*

³*GAO Survey of Executive Branch Cost to Respond to Congressional Campaign Finance Inquiries (June 23, 1998).*

⁴Letter from Associate Director, Audit Oversight and Liaison, Theodore C. Barreaux to Rep. Waxman and Rep. Condit (September 29, 1998).

⁵*Id.*

⁶The table includes 28 entries, including: responses from 21 agencies, of which 6 also submitted responses from the offices of the Inspectors General, and a response from the Inspector General office of the Corporation for National Service.

AGENCY	NUMBER OF INQUIRIES REPORTED	COSTS REPORTED
Executive Office of the President	347	\$ 4,562,765.43
Department of Commerce	118	\$ 2,432,012.00
Department of Justice (including FBI)	253	\$ 337,290.00
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	17	\$ 278,846.60
Department of the Interior	26	\$ 266,822.53
Department of the Treasury	44	\$ 241,511.15
General Services Administration	2	\$ 233,549.77
Export-Import Bank	14	\$ 143,662.00
Department of Defense	122	\$ 105,958.00
Federal Election Commission	13	\$ 44,125.60
Small Business Administration	2	\$ 30,672.00
Department of Commerce Inspector General	12	\$ 29,730.00
Department of Energy Inspector General	6	\$ 10,861.90
Office of Personnel Management	2	\$ 10,837.10
Department of Housing and Urban Development	3	\$ 10,796.00
Corporation for National Service Inspector General	2	\$ 10,780.57
FDIC Inspector General	1	\$ 5,894.00
National Archives and Records Administration	4	\$ 4,035.00
National Indian Gaming Commission	1	\$ 3,955.00
Department of State	65	\$ 1,816.50
Department of Labor	2	\$ 1,159.44
Department of the Treasury Inspector General	2	\$ 298.20
SBA Inspector General	2	\$ 210.00
Environmental Protection Agency	1	\$ 155.32
Consumer Product Safety Commission	1	\$ 9.25
Department of Energy	47	N/A
Central Intelligence Agency	46	N/A
HUD Inspector General	1	N/A
TOTAL	1,156	\$ 8,767,753.36

are likely to be even higher

than the figure reported by GAO, because the GAO figure does not include costs incurred for requests received after March 31, 1998, and does not include various personnel costs, document reproduction costs, or delivery costs not reported by certain agencies.⁷ The minority staff analyzed the responses to the GAO survey filed by the federal agencies.

The agency responses show that (1) the federal agencies spent over 150,000 hours responding to congressional campaign finance inquiries; (2) the federal agencies provided over 2.1 million pages of documents to Congress in response to these inquiries; and (3) 18 of the 21

⁷*Id.*, enclosure 1 (footnotes). For example, the Department of Energy, which received 47 congressional requests and produced 43,340 pages of documents, did not provide GAO with personnel costs, document reproduction costs, or document delivery costs related to those requests. Similarly, the State Department, which reported spending 3,386 hours responding to 65 requests, did not provide GAO with its personnel costs.

agencies reported that the congressional inquiries were duplicative.

The responses received by the GAO from the individual agencies are available for public review in the offices of the minority staff.

A. Executive Office of the President

The Executive Office of the President (EOP), which consists of eleven separate offices,⁸ reported receiving 347 requests and expending over \$4.5 million responding to these requests. The House Government Reform and Oversight Committee itself issued 13 subpoenas and 102 document requests to the EOP, and required 42 EOP officials to testify on 48 separate occasions. The Senate Governmental Affairs Committee issued four subpoenas and 86 document requests to the EOP, and required 57 EOP officials to testify on 67 separate occasions.

In total, 1,464 EOP staff spent over 55,000 hours responding to these requests at a personnel cost of over \$2 million. The EOP produced 405,987 pages of documents, 370 videotapes, 480 audiotapes, and six computer tapes to Congress. The EOP reported that “congressional committees often duplicated each other’s inquiries” and that the duplication was “very great.” The Office of the Vice President, for example, noted that “[t]he document requests from the House Committee on Government Reform and Oversight were almost entirely duplicative of the document requests received from the Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs.”

B. Department of Commerce

The Commerce Department reported receiving 118 congressional requests and expending over \$2.4 million responding to those requests.⁹ Overall, Commerce Department personnel spent 54,618 hours answering these requests, including almost 47,000 hours spent by senior executives or other senior staff (pay grade of GS-10 or higher). The resulting personnel costs totaled nearly \$1.9 million. The Commerce Department produced 950,000 pages of documents.

According to the Commerce Department, “There was a great level of similarity among the Congressional campaign finance inquiries. This resulted in a substantial duplication and overlap of the records sent to the various committees. . . . [R]esponding to the many Congressional inquiries that the Department received required a major effort and required the redirection of resources normally devoted to conducting normal program activities.”

⁸These offices include the White House Office, Council of Economic Advisers, U.S. Trade Representative, Office of National Drug Control Policy, Office of Administration, Office of the Vice President, Office of Science and Technology Policy, Office of Management and Budget, National Security Council, President’s Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board, and Council on Environmental Quality.

⁹The Commerce Department Inspector General received 12 additional requests and spent \$29,730 responding to those requests.

C. Department of Justice

The Department of Justice received 253 congressional requests and expended \$337,300 responding to these requests. The inquiries included one subpoena and 75 additional requests for information from members of the House Government Reform and Oversight Committee and 12 requests from senators on the Senate Governmental Affairs Committee. In addition, seven Justice Department officials testified a total of 23 times before Congress.

In total, 148 Justice Department personnel spent 11,368 hours responding to the requests at a personnel cost of \$334,000. The Justice Department produced 59,120 pages of documents.

D. Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation

The Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation received 17 congressional requests in connection with congressional campaign finance inquiries and spent \$278,800 responding to these requests.¹⁰ The inquiries included one subpoena and two document requests from the House Government Reform and Oversight Committee and one subpoena from the Senate Governmental Affairs Committee.

FDIC was required to survey 46 employees for responsive documents at an estimated personnel cost of \$230,000. FDIC also spent over \$32,000 to hire four temporary contractors for 259 work days to assist in the production of 81,212 pages of documents.

FDIC reported that “the requests from the various committees were nearly identical.” FDIC also expressed serious concerns about providing confidential information to the committees:

Public disclosure of such highly confidential information carries the risk of interfering with investigations, invading customer privacy, disrupting supervisory operations and threatening the financial integrity of a Federally-insured depository institution. The FDIC is extremely concerned about the difficulty of maintaining confidentiality in investigations of this kind. Indeed, sensitive information from a pending bank examination was reprinted in the press. This resulted in the bank seeking to have the examination team removed, and threatened to disrupt a pending enforcement action.

E. Department of the Interior

The Department of the Interior responded to 26 campaign finance requests at a cost to the agency of \$266,800. This included one subpoena and three document requests from the House Government Reform and Oversight Committee, one subpoena and three document requests from the House Resources Committee, and one document request from the Senate Governmental Affairs Committee.

¹⁰The FDIC Inspector General also received one request and reported expending \$5,894 responding to that request.

In total, 94 Interior Department employees spent over 4,200 hours responding to the requests at a cost of \$229,000. Interior submitted 234,953 pages of documents to Congress and spent an additional \$4,000 on outside contractors to index the documents as required by Government Reform and Oversight Committee.

The requests to the Interior Department were highly duplicative, and congress committees refused to coordinate their requests to reduce the burden despite the agency's plea to do so. According to the Interior Department response:

Six of the nine requests . . . involved documents related to the Hudson Dog Track. These requests came from both Senate and House Committees. In instances where we suggested one of those Committees refer to the documents provided earlier to another committee, the Committee insisted on our reproducing masses of documents again and sending them to the Committee. The November 25, 1997, request and the December 9, 1997, subpoena from the House Resources Committee requested documents already provided to the House Committee on Government Reform and Oversight. Upon inquiry as to whether the Committee could use the documents already provided, we were told to supply the documents again because the committee had a right to them.

F. Department of the Treasury

The Department of the Treasury reported receiving 44 information requests¹¹ and spending \$241,500 responding to those requests. The inquiries included 25 document requests from the House Government Reform and Oversight Committee and three subpoenas and eight document requests from the Senate Governmental Affairs Committee.

In total, Treasury Department personnel spent over 3,500 hours responding to the requests at a cost to the agency of over \$240,000. Over 90% of the staff time was expended by the agency's senior staff. The agency submitted 23,621 pages of documents to Congress. According to the agency, there was considerable duplication between the House and Senate requests.

G. Department of Energy

The Department of Energy received 47 congressional requests.¹² The House Government Reform and Oversight Committee issued five requests and required one official to testify; the Senate Governmental Affairs Committee issued three requests.¹³ The Energy Department produced 43,340 pages of documents in response to these requests.

¹¹The Department of the Treasury Inspector General reported receiving two additional requests not included in the Treasury report.

¹²The Energy Department Inspector General received 6 requests and reported spending \$10,861.90 responding to those requests.

¹³The Energy Department did not estimate the cost of responding to the requests.

The Energy Department had the following comments on the burdens of the requests:

In order to locate responsive documents, a copy of the request was hand-delivered to each Department Secretarial offices (approximately 26). . . . In some offices, computerized data bases allowed relatively quick “word searches” to determine whether the office held responsive files. In other offices, potential file sources were reviewed manually to conduct a page-by-page search for responsive materials. . . . In accordance with the House Government Reform and Oversight Committee’s request, each page was given a unique Bates stamp identifier and a log of all the documents was developed.

In addition to the cost of manpower directly related to document production, the extensive employee interviews conducted by one Committee consumed hundreds of hours of time [M]any employees were interviewed on multiple occasions.

Over the time period of the campaign finance inquiry, the Department was asked to provide the same information, to the same Committee, on more than one occasion. Although House and Senate requests were phrased in slightly different terms, there also was great similarity between the information provided to both bodies.

H. Export-Import Bank

The Export-Import Bank received 14 congressional requests and spent \$143,662 responding to these requests. Overall, 17 employees spent 2,943 hours responding to these requests at a personnel cost of over \$126,000. The Export-Import Bank produced 32,000 pages to the House Government Reform and Oversight Committee in response to five requests and 80,000 pages to the Senate Governmental Affairs Committee in response to one subpoena.

I. Department of Defense

The Department of Defense received 122 congressional requests and spent \$105,958 responding to these requests. The House Government Reform and Oversight Committee issued seven requests and required one official to testify on campaign finance issues. The Senate Governmental Affairs Committee issued nine requests; one official testified before that Committee on three separate occasions.

In total, 47 Defense Department staff spent 3,198 hours responding to the requests at a personnel cost of \$104,000. Defense produced 21,038 pages of documents and said there was “great” duplication among the requests.

J. Federal Election Commission

The Federal Election Commission received 13 congressional requests and spent \$44,125.60 responding to these requests. The House Government Reform and Oversight Committee issued eight requests and required six FEC officials to testify on seven separate occasions. The Senate Governmental Affairs Committee issued three requests and heard

testimony from one official.

In total, 39 FEC personnel spent 692 hours responding to these requests. On the question of duplication, the FEC noted that “similar topics [were] covered at all hearings.”

K. Department of State

The State Department received 65 campaign finance requests. The Department reported spending 3,386 hours responding to these requests -- including 2,657 hours of executive and senior staff time -- and produced 36,330 pages to Congress.

According to the State Department:

These inquiries proved to be labor intensive, requiring much coordination and processing on very short deadlines. In responding to these inquiries, [the Department] experienced much duplication of effort and multiple demands on limited resources. As a result, there was a considerable drain on the resources available to comply with the entire range of information access statutes and special document production requests.

L. Other Agencies

The Department of Housing and Urban Development reported receiving three requests¹⁴ and expending \$10,796 responding to the requests. HUD personnel spent 276 hours of staff time producing 8,059 pages and reported a “great” amount of duplication between House and Senate requests.

The General Service Administration spent \$233,549.77 responding to only two requests. The responses required 60 GSA personnel to spend 2,509 hours at a cost of over \$109,000 producing 55,446 pages of documents. GSA was also forced to hire six contractors at a cost of almost \$63,000 to respond to the requests.

The Small Business Administration was required to spend \$30,672 responding to two requests.¹⁵ SBA used 19 personnel and 590 hours to respond to the requests.

II. COSTS OF CONGRESSIONAL INVESTIGATIONS

During the 105th Congress, at least 22 separate congressional committees investigated allegations of campaign finance abuses in the 1996 elections. This report estimates that the cost to the taxpayers of these investigations is at least \$14.6 million.

A. House Government Reform and Oversight Committee

¹⁴The HUD Inspector General reported receiving one additional request.

¹⁵The SBA Inspector General reported receiving two additional requests.

The minority estimates that the House Government Reform and Oversight Committee's campaign finance investigation has cost the taxpayers in excess of \$7.4 million through August 31, 1998. This investigation is the single most expensive congressional investigation in history. In comparison, the Senate Whitewater investigation cost only \$1.9 million, the House and Senate Iran-Contra investigation cost \$5 million, and the Senate Watergate investigation cost \$7 million (all adjusted for inflation).¹⁶

The minority's estimate is based on a review of expenses associated with the investigation as reported in the House Chief Administrative Officer's reports and the Committee's monthly activity reports for the 105th Congress.¹⁷ The minority staff estimates that the Committee spent over \$5.7 million in taxpayer dollars on staff salaries and overtime; over \$120,000 on domestic travel; and over \$80,000 for foreign travel paid for by the State Department. The Committee transcribed over 24,000 pages of testimony and statements taken in depositions, hearings, and meetings at an estimated cost to the taxpayer of \$70,000 to \$140,000 and spent over \$300,000 paid for by the Government Printing Office to reproduce this material for public distribution. Some of the other categories of Committee expenses estimated by the minority staff include expenses for consultants (over \$200,000); executive agency personnel detailed to the investigation (over \$100,000); and equipment and supplies (over \$500,000).

The majority disputed previous minority staff estimates of the cost of the investigation. On May 11, 1998, after several requests from minority members to account for the Committee's expenses, Chairman Burton wrote Rep. Waxman that the Committee spent less than \$2.5 million on the investigation in 1997.¹⁸ Chairman Burton's figures, however, are substantially understated, because they reflect only expenditures that are specifically charged to the Committee's supplemental investigative budget. In fact, many of the Committee's investigative expenses are actually charged to the Committee's regular budget.

According to a Roll Call analysis published in July 1998, "Chairman Dan Burton's (R-Ind.) staff provided numbers that do not accurately reflect the actual cost of his investigation into fundraising abuses. . . . Burton does not include the salaries and expenses for investigators . . . who spent virtually all of their time on the investigation but were paid with money from the committee's general budget."¹⁹ Chairman Burton's figures also excluded the costs of transcribing Committee depositions, hearings, and meetings; GPO printing costs; and the cost of foreign travel. The Roll Call analysis found that "the actual number is much closer to the Democrats'

¹⁶*Whitewater: Comparison of Cost and Other Selected Data with Previous Investigations*, CRS Report for Congress (February 9, 1998) (98-101 GOV).

¹⁷House CAO reports were reviewed through June 1998; Committee activities reports were reviewed through August 1998.

¹⁸Letter from Chairman Burton to Rep. Waxman (May 11, 1998).

¹⁹*Democrats' Report Doesn't Add Up; Republican Numbers Aren't Any More Precise*, Roll Call (July 13, 1998).

figure.”²⁰

B. Senate Governmental Affairs Committee

In the Senate, the campaign finance investigation was conducted by the Governmental Affairs Committee. According to the Wall Street Journal, the committee spent \$3.5 million on its investigation.²¹ This is the same amount the Committee was authorized to spend.²²

C. The House Select Committee on Missile Technology Exports

In June 1998, the House created the Select Committee on U.S. National Security and Military/Commercial Concerns with the People’s Republic of China chaired by Rep. Christopher Cox. This Committee was established to investigate allegations that Loral Space and Communications received a waiver to transfer missile technology to China after its CEO, Bernard Schwartz, made significant campaign contributions to the Democratic party. The Committee is authorized to spend \$2.5 million on its investigation.²³

D. The House Education and the Workforce Committee

The Education and the Workforce Committee is authorized to spend \$1.2 million to investigate allegations of money laundering in the Teamsters elections. This figure includes \$1.04 million allocated to the Committee by the House Oversight Committee from the Speaker’s reserve fund²⁴ and a \$150,000 consultant contract²⁵ for outside counsels Joseph DiGenova and Victoria Toensing to be paid out of the Committee’s regular budget.

E. Other Congressional Investigations

The total costs of the four congressional investigations described above is \$14.6 million. In addition to these investigations, however, there were many other congressional investigations

²⁰*Id.*

²¹*Burton’s Campaign-Finance Probe Is Drawing Criticism for Mounting Costs and Slow Progress*, Wall Street Journal (March 27, 1998)..

²²S. Res. 39 (March 11, 1997).

²³H. Res. 463 (June 18, 1998).

²⁴The House Oversight Committee appropriated \$747,274.75 at the March 4, 1998, committee meeting and an additional \$296,543 at the October 2, 1998, committee meeting for the Education and Workforce Committee’s investigation.

²⁵The Education and the Workforce Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations voted to retain Mr. DiGenova and Ms. Toensing at \$25,000 a month for six months for a total of \$150,000. *See The Joe and Vicki Index*, Roll Call (February 16, 1998); *Leaders Seek Subpoena Power for Investigation of Teamsters*, Roll Call (March 23, 1998).

into campaign finance issues conducted during the 105th Congress. The responses from the federal agencies to the GAO identified 18 additional congressional committees that made campaign finance inquiries during the 105th Congress.²⁶

Some of these other committees conducted their own extensive campaign finance investigations. The House Commerce Committee, for example, held 4 days of hearings on allegations that the Molten Metal Technology company received government contracts in exchange for contributions to the Clinton-Gore campaign.

The minority staff's estimate of congressional costs does not include the costs associated with these other investigations. If these other congressional investigations were included, the total costs to the taxpayer would undoubtedly far exceed \$14.6 million.

III. OTHER USES OF \$23 MILLION

As described in Parts I and II, the congressional campaign finance investigations have cost the taxpayers at least \$23.3 million, including at least \$8.7 million spent by the executive branch agencies responding to congressional requests and at least \$14.6 million spent on the investigations themselves.

In this era of limited government spending, the money expended on the campaign finance investigation must be considered in the context of what other government programs could have benefited from those funds. Two noteworthy examples are described below.

A. Child Nutrition Programs

Federal child nutrition programs provide cash and other assistance to federal and state agencies to fund school lunch and breakfast programs. The goals of the programs are to improve children's nutrition and provide lower-income children with access to nutritious food.²⁷

According to the Congressional Research Service, the federal government will spend \$1.9425 for each "free lunch" cash subsidy provided to children from families with incomes below

²⁶These committees include: House Committee on Appropriations; House Committee on Banking and Financial Services; House Committee on the Budget; House Committee on Commerce; House Committee on House Oversight; House Committee on International Relations; House Committee on the Judiciary; House Committee on National Security; House Committee on Resources; House Committee on Rules; House Committee on Small Business; House Committee on Standards of Official Conduct ("Ethics Committee"); House Committee on Ways and Means; House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence; Senate Committee Appropriations; Senate Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs; Senate Committee on the Judiciary; and Senate Select Committee on Intelligence.

²⁷*Child Nutrition Programs: Background and Funding*, CRS Report to Congress 98-25 (August 28, 1998).

130% of the federal poverty guidelines during the 1998-99 school year.²⁸ The government will also spend \$1.0725 for each free breakfast provided. Based on these figures, the \$23.3 million spent by the federal government on the campaign finance investigation could have paid for 12 million school lunches or 21.7 million school breakfasts for children from low-income families.

B. Hiring Police Officers

Many communities faced with tight budgets and high crime rates rely on the federal government to fund the hiring of additional police officers. According to recent statistics, the mean annual salary for a new police officer in cities with populations of 10,000 or more was \$28,238.²⁹ Based on this figure, the \$23.3 million expended on the campaign finance investigation could have been used to hire 825 more police officers to assist communities fight drugs and crime.

²⁸*Id.*

²⁹Sourcebook of Criminal Justice Statistics citing Evelina R. Moulder, *Police and Fire Personnel, Salaries, and Expenditures for 1997*, The Municipal Year Book 1998.