

Lewis (CA)	Olver	Shays
Lewis (GA)	Ortiz	Sisisky
Lipinski	Owens	Skaggs
Livingston	Oxley	Skeen
Lofgren	Pallone	Skelton
Lowey	Pappas	Slaughter
Maloney (NY)	Parker	Smith (NJ)
Manton	Pastor	Snyder
Markey	Payne	Spratt
Martinez	Pelosi	Stabenow
Matsui	Petri	Stark
McCarthy (MO)	Pickering	Stenholm
McCarthy (NY)	Pickett	Stokes
McDade	Pomeroy	Strickland
McDermott	Porter	Stupak
McGovern	Price (NC)	Tanner
McHale	Rahall	Tauscher
McHugh	Rangel	Taylor (MS)
McInnis	Rivers	Thompson
McKinney	Roemer	Thune
Meek	Rogers	Thurman
Menendez	Rothman	Tierney
Millender-	Roukema	Torres
McDonald	Roybal-Allard	Towns
Miller (CA)	Rush	Velazquez
Mink	Sabo	Vento
Moakley	Sanchez	Visclosky
Molinari	Sanders	Waters
Mollohan	Sandlin	Watt (NC)
Moran (VA)	Sawyer	Waxman
Morella	Schaefer, Dan	Weygand
Murtha	Schaffer, Bob	Wicker
Nadler	Schumer	Wise
Neal	Scott	Woolsey
Northup	Sensenbrenner	Wynn
Oberstar	Serrano	Yates

NOT VOTING—6

Carson	Obey	Scarborough
Clay	Richardson	Young (AK)

Mr. CAMP changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So (two-thirds not having voted in favor thereof), the joint resolution was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on House Joint Resolution 2.

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

There was no objection.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 52) and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 52

Resolved, That the following named Members be, and they are hereby, elected to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives: Committee on Small Business: Mr. Hill, and Mr. Sununu.

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

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM SHOULD BE A TOP PRIORITY

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, in this past election season spending levels for Federal elections shattered all previous records, at nearly \$2 billion. The President and our leadership met yesterday and agreed on five priority items for this Congress, but guess what was missing? Campaign finance reform.

Let me make a suggestion. As David Broder noted in today's Washington Post, the reason campaigns are so expensive is because television advertising costs so much. That is why I have reintroduced H.R. 84, the Fairness in Political Advertising Act. It would reduce the cost of elections by requiring television stations to make free time available to both candidates as a condition of the stations renewing their licenses, and I urge my colleagues to join me on this bill.

I challenge the leadership to make campaign finance reform a priority and to enact the Fairness in Political Advertising Act. Democracy should not cost \$2 billion.

Mr. Speaker, I am submitting the article referred to earlier for inclusion in the RECORD:

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 12, 1997]

A TV TIME BANK FOR CANDIDATES

(By David S. Broder)

When you're trying to figure out one of those interlocking wooden puzzles, sometimes it helps to turn it upside down. That is what happened to me one morning recently when I had breakfast with Reed Hundt, the chairman of the Federal Communications Commission.

The topic was campaign finance legislation—or so I thought. But when I remarked that the history of campaign finance laws and regulations was fraught with unintended consequences, Hundt immediately corrected me. "We're not talking about campaign finance legislation," he said. "We're talking about giving candidates and voters more access, and these measures have almost always succeeded. The Voting Rights Act has been a success. The provisions that allowed presidential debates have worked."

Hundt's point was this: For decades, the campaign finance debate has focused on the source and volume of funds—the supply side of the problem. Government has attempted to regulate who could give (and who could not), the size of their contributions and, to the extent the courts allowed, the amount candidates could spend.

Hundt suggested that we turn the problem around by asking where the money goes and whether that cost can be reduced, i.e., examine the demand side of the equation.

The answer is obvious. Most of the money goes into buying television ad time. Campaigns are expensive because television costs so much.

In 1996, Hundt encouraged former Washington Post reporter Paul Taylor's foundation-financed campaign to persuade television and cable operators to make small blocks of free time available to the presidential candidates. Taylor had some success, but never got the broadcasters to agree on a single time when all viewers would find the candidates talking directly to them.

Now Hundt is promoting a radical expansion of Taylor's "free time" proposal. He thinks broadcasters should be required to donate almost \$2 billion worth of commercial time to a "political time bank" that would be available free to candidates for federal and state office.

That sounds like a huge burden to impose, but Hundt points out that the estimated \$1.8 billion of paid political ads in the 1995-96 election cycle was only 2.5 percent of the television ad revenue in that period.

He also noted that, under a law passed last year, the government is about to hand broadcasters a gift of incalculable value in the form of a new spectrum of digital TV channels which can be used for movie theater-quarterly programs or for a wide variety of other high-fidelity communications.

Last week, Hundt's longtime friend, Vice President Al Gore, made that point a matter of administration policy—without endorsing Hundt's specific proposal. "Digital technology," Gore said, "will greatly enhance the opportunities available to broadcasters to utilize multiple channels. The public interest obligations should be commensurate with these opportunities."

Hundt has found one ally high up in the broadcasting industry. Barry Diller, who has been a key player for years and now heads his own company that controls a number of TV stations and the Home Shopping Network, told an industry convention in New Orleans last month that in return for the gift of the new digital TV spectrum, "I propose that we take sole responsibility for the cost of airing all political advertising messages for all government candidates and to use this lever as the impetus to abolish all forms of the current system of political contributions."

Diller conceded that it "would cost us over a billion dollars in lost revenue" in the peak year of each election cycle. "But," he added, "it would also radically change the nature of our rotten political fund-raising system."

Advocates of some campaign finance bills are considering a way to incorporate the "free time bank" into their proposals. Taylor will hold a conference on the subject in Washington next month. But he and Hundt both concede this is not a panacea.

Important policy and administrative issues would remain: Could independent groups buy time for "education" or "independent expenditure" campaigns? Who would divvy up the "time bank" among the thousands of Democratic and Republican candidates in each election? If the national parties controlled the time, how would dissident or maverick Democrats and Republicans fare? And how would minor parties be protected in the allocation of time?

These are all important questions. But this proposal offers a way to reduce the costs of campaigns drastically by eliminating or greatly slashing the expense of television advertising. It deserves to be part of the coming debate.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SNOWBARGER). 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.

TRIBUTE TO JANE CLAYTON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PAPPAS] is recognized for 5 minutes.