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-McDonald	Roukema	Torres
	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.

Mr. PAPPAS. Mr. Speaker, for the past 16 years, the residents of Monmouth County, NJ, have had the great fortune to have Jane Clayton serving as their county clerk. Day in and day out Jane has brought the highest degree of professionalism to this office. Jane's community service and involvement spans over 3 decades and has touched too many people to count. Aside from her service as county clerk, she had been a county freeholder and served on numerous boards and counsels.

It would take hours to list the numerous activities that Jane has given her time to over the past 30 years, so while I will attempt to touch upon just a few. She has served on the Monmouth County Criminal Justice Coordinating Council, County Detention Center's board, County Planning Board, County Election Commission, board of directors of the County Council of Girl Scouts, and the board of directors of the county United Way, to name just a few.

The businesslike approach to government that we in Congress strive to bring to the Federal Government, Jane Clayton has brought to the office of county clerk. To Jane, the people of the county are customers and her goal has been to bring the highest degree of service to these customers. She treats the taxpayers' money as she would her own. She has rooted out waste in her office and, by all accounts, has made it a model for others to follow. Washington could learn a lot from Jane Clayton.

Today, the public's perception of public servants has become tarnished due to scandals and back-door deals. If everyone in public office had the professionalism and high ethical standards that Jane Clayton does, I am sure that public office holders would be held with only the highest regard. She is admired and respected both as a public servant and person.

The quality of Jane's work has not gone unnoticed over the years. Several organizations have recognized her outstanding service and efforts by choosing her as their woman of the year. The March of Dimes, Zonta International, Association of Retarded Citizens, Big Brothers/Big Sisters, the County Council of Girl Scouts and the Monmouth County Fireman's Association are just a few of the groups that have recognized what so many of us see on a daily basis.

During my time as a county freeholder, I remember that Jane used to send around calendars with the history of the U.S. flag. Jane has an unyielding desire to share her knowledge with others and this was just one small example.

More than a public servant, Jane has been a devoted mother and grandmother. I often wonder how she finds all the time while doing everything so well. Often it is said that you cannot be everything to everyone, but if there was someone who came close, it would be Jane Clayton.

The legacy of Jane Clayton will not go forgotten. How appropriate that the archive record retention center in Manalapan Township which she helped create will serve as the ideal place to record her own years of service as well as the service of so many others in the county of Monmouth.

We are sad to lose Jane in the clerk's office and wish her well. The standard that she has set over the past decade and a half will be the bar for all future clerks to reach for.

I guess the greatest accomplishment that anyone in public service can have said about them is that they have made a difference. Jane, you have made a difference, in our county and in our lives.

I join the people of Monmouth County in thanking the Honorable Jane Clayton, my friend and colleague, for her service.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a good friend and great public servant—Monmouth County Clerk Jane Clayton—who just recently retired from her position after 16 years of dedicated service.

Monmouth County, NJ, has had the great benefit of having Mrs. Jane Clayton as our county clerk from 1980 to just a few weeks ago. Jane took that office and transformed it into the fiscally conservative success that it is today—all the while ensuring that our rich history and record of efficient services remains intact for our children, grandchildren, and their children to enjoy.

Before serving Monmouth County as clerk, Jane was a county freeholder in the late 1970's. She has held a variety of offices before county clerk—including serving on the boards of the County Criminal Justice Coordinating Council, the County Detention Center, the County Planning Board, and the Monmouth Museum Board of Trustees.

Over the years, Jane and I have worked on countless projects together. Particularly momentous to both Jane and me was the unique effort between the county and Federal levels of government to acquire an absolutely beautiful mural of the Battle of Monmouth for the headquarters of the Monmouth County Library. This project was especially important, as the Federal Government rarely works with an individual county to provide them with such things as the artwork that we now have in Monmouth County.

Jane has also been successful in getting modern technology to improve the records system for the county archives. As Monmouth County was host to Revolutionary War Battles—such as the Battle of Monmouth—we have a wealth of history that needs to continue to be available for all who wish to learn more about our great area.

Jane has been given countless awards for her numerous years of service—including honors from the March of Dimes, the Monmouth County Fireman's Association, and the Monmouth Council of Boy Scouts and Girl Scouts. Jane has a record of excellence that many in central New Jersey are thankful for.

Monmouth County is a great area with many different communities and neighborhoods. From our part of the Jersey Shore, to towns like Millstone and Allentown, Jane pleased nearly everyone in her service as county clerk.

I'm already missing Jane Clayton, as she retired on December 31, 1996 after many years of hard work. I respect Jane for not only her topnotch performance as county clerk—but also her knowledge and involvement in Monmouth County.

We have a lot to be thankful for in Monmouth County: Great little towns, good roads, great services, excellent land management, good businesses, and a county clerk second-to-none.

Thanks again, Jane, for everything you've contributed to Monmouth County. I look forward to seeing you back home—because I know that you'll still be a staple of the Fourth District. From all of us in the Fourth District and Monmouth County—Jane—best wishes and know that your hard work is and will always be deeply appreciated.

□ 1845

REBUILDING AMERICA'S INFRASTRUCTURE THROUGH PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced four bills that I hope will add to the dialogue about the Federal Government's role in establishing public-private partnerships to leverage both public and private investment in America's infrastructure.

Congress has recognized that our Nation simply does not have the resources to fix and rebuild all of our schools, our highways, mass transit facilities, environmental infrastructure, ports and airports and other infrastructure facilities. Public-private partnerships hold great potential in helping to fill this estimated $30 billion to $80 billion in annual Federal investment, a shortfall in America's infrastructure. In the process we have the opportunity to create hundreds of thousands of new jobs.

Congress started to address the idea of leveraging both public and private investments in infrastructure during the debate over the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991. In addition to promoting discussion about innovative financing tools, the legislation granted to States the authority to establish something called a State infrastructure bank, or an SIB, in cooperation with the Department of Transportation.

The Department of Transportation has now enabled ten States to establish the State infrastructure banks, which are intended to attract both public and private investment in transportation infrastructure. These entities, the State infrastructure banks, are funded using an allotment from the States' Federal transportation apportionments.

The success of the newly created SIB's is limited by undercapitalization and an inability to leverage projects other than highway and mass transit infrastructure. The bills that I offered today will try to provide several solutions for addressing these weaknesses in a constructive and cost-effective manner.