And then finally, the Campaign Reporting and Disclosure Act will be considered, an opportunity for all of us to see to it that all of America knows promptly and thoroughly and completely who receives what campaign contributions from which sources and how those campaign funds are used as the day-by-day operations of the campaign go on.

I believe these represent opportunities for every American to have a greater confidence in the honesty and integrity of our American elections, and I am sure that all Members will look forward to the opportunity to vote on them.

Mr. FAZIO of California. I am happy to yield further to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS), and I would hope that he would inquire as to whether or not we are going to have a vote on Shays-Meehan, because I could not tell.

Mr. SHAYS. I intend to, but I thank the gentleman, and I thank the gentleman for yielding. I am trying to understand that we began this session last year, we waited all year long for a debate on campaign finance reform, at the end of that year of our legislative session, we asked the leadership if and when we would be having a debate on campaign finance reform. Our leadership, my leadership, said we would have a fair and open debate in February or March, and I am interested to know if this meets the leadership's definition of a fair and open debate on campaign finance reform.

Mr. FAZIO of California. I am happy to yield further to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ARMEY. I thank the gentleman from California for yielding me the time, and I appreciate so much the ongoing interest of the gentleman from Connecticut.

As the gentleman knows, we have worked diligently on this whole issue in committee and in leadership, and with a great deal of commitment and conviction to the purposes at hand, that of securing honest elections, with great integrity on behalf of the American people.

We believe that we are bringing to the floor next week, under suspension, all opportunities of merit that could not be available to the American people to provide them that assurance, and we are very excited and proud for the opportunity for all of our Members to have the opportunity to express their commitment to that by a yes vote.

Mr. FAZIO of California. I am happy to yield further to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SHAYS. Will you tell me who has decided that we brought all bills of merit? Who has made that decision?

Mr. ARMEY. If the gentleman will yield, again I appreciate the gentleman from Connecticut. This has been a decision that has been made through the entire leadership team in consultation with the committee of jurisdiction, and I appreciate my colleague's interest.

Mr. FAZIO of California. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SHAYS. Were any Democrats consulted on whether there would be bills that they think deserve debate and discussion? Was anyone on the other side of the aisle considered before the leadership made the determination to come out with these bills?

Mr. FAZIO of California. I am happy to yield.

Mr. ARMEY. I appreciate the gentleman from California yielding to my good friend and colleague from Connecticut. I should, of course, feel reassured, and as it should be, we have bipartisan activity in the committee of jurisdiction, and we are very proud of the work that the committee reported out.

Mr. FAZIO of California. I am happy to yield further to the gentleman.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Leader, I asked a sincere question, and I would appreciate a sincere answer. And the question was: Was anyone in leadership on the other side of the aisle consulted before it was decided to bring out four Republican bills?

Mr. ARMEY. If the gentleman will yield, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and again I appreciate the gentleman from Connecticut for his interest, and the answer is no.

Mr. FAZIO of California. I am happy to yield further.

□ 1430

Mr. SHAYS. Then, Mr. Leader, how can that be a fair and open debate if we have not allowed people with differing views to present their bills and to make their arguments before this Chamber? How does that meet the requirement of my leadership, who I like to believe is telling the truth.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY) for response.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, under these circumstances, I appreciate the extraordinary generosity of time of the gentleman from California.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, it is reminding me of a tennis match. The ball is in your court.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, to my friend, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS), let me just say, we are perfectly prepared to continue any further consideration of this subject as the year passes by. But certainly we feel we have identified, through the efforts of the committee on a bipartisan working basis, the key crucial issues that are under concern before the American people. We are very excited about the opportunity we have afforded the body to vote on these next Monday, March 31.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for giving me the opportunity to ask just one or two more questions. I would like to know if our leadership has made a determination to bring up the McCain-Feingold bill that was voted on in the Senate; and if so, when they intend to bring that up for a vote.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I appreciate again the interest of the gentleman from Connecticut. And these are the decisions that have been made with respect to what will be brought to the floor next week.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, has the leadership made any determination on whether or not they are going to bring McCain-Feingold to the floor of the House?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOBSON). The Chair will remind the gentleman from California that the customary extended 1 minute has expired, and the Chair believes that Members have explored this at some length.

Does the majority leader have any unanimous consents that he wishes to continue with?

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, has the Chair made a ruling that I may not continue?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Does the majority leader have unanimous consents that he wishes to continue with?

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, point of clarification: If the Speaker is asking if the majority leader would be willing to ask unanimous consent to continue, the answer is no.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, may I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order?

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

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

The gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, has objection been heard?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection was heard by the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE).

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, obviously I have not had an opportunity to review the precedents, but I have been here for many years, and rarely, if ever, have I seen a Speaker determined that the unanimous consent for 1 minute, while the schedule was being discussed, and the substance of that schedule being discussed——

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, this is not a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, my question is, under what precedents or practices does the Speaker make such a ruling, and on what does the Speaker rely in terms of what a reasonable time for such inquiry is?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair was trying to have a reasonable time of recognition. The Chair granted an unusually long period of time for discussion. The calendar was no longer really under discussion. The Chair has ruled. The House has important business to move on to.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry before we go to that.

We have on the schedule a number of 5-minute special orders and 1-hour special orders, and I just wonder, do the 1-minutes that are now being requested take precedence over that?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As is customary the Chair intends to recognize 1-minutes first.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

ALLOWING SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY GREATER DISCRETION WITH REGARD TO INSCRIPTIONS

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Financial Services be discharged from further consideration of the bill, (H.R. 3301) to amend chapter 51 of title 31, United States Code, to allow the Secretary of the Treasury greater discretion with regard to the placement of the required inscriptions on quarter dollars issued under the 50 States Commemorative Coin Program, and ask its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. WEYGAND. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do so for the purpose of an explanation from the sponsor of the bill and a description of the bill.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEYGAND. I yield to the gentleman from Delaware.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Rhode Island for yielding. This will be very brief.

At the request of the administration, this bill was introduced to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury and the Mint to move statutory wording on the State quarters from one place to another as required by design considerations.

You will recall, we are going to have 50 State quarter bills in the next 10 years. No statutory wording such as ''In God we trust'' will be removed from the coins or any other statutory wording that is on the coins now. The bill simply grants more freedom for individual States that propose designs of their own choice.

It is a noncontroversial, technical bill that has been discussed with the minority. You have no objection. It complements the 50 States Commemorative Coin Program Act of 1997 that was passed and signed into law last year.

Mr. WEYGAND. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 3301

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 5112(l)(1) of title 31, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(C) FLEXIBILITY WITH REGARD TO PLACEMENT OF INSCRIPTIONS.—Notwithstanding subsection (d)(1), the Secretary may select a design for quarter dollars issued during the 10-year period referred to in subparagraph (A) in which—

''(i) the inscription described in the 2d sentence of subsection (d)(1) appears on the reverse side of any such quarter dollars; and

''(ii) any inscription described in the 3d sentence of subsection (d)(1) or the designation of the value of the coin appears on the obverse side of any such quarter dollars.''.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Speaker, I am inquiring regarding the Suspension Calendar. It is my understanding, Mr. Speaker, the Suspension Calendar requires a two-thirds vote; is that correct?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct for passage of measures under suspension of the rules.

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Speaker, is my understanding that the Suspension Calendar is done usually on a travel day when most of the Members are in the process of getting to Congress, and that is why the vote is not scheduled until 6 o'clock? Is that correct?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is not a parliamentary inquiry. That is a matter of scheduling.

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Speaker, is it my understanding that under suspension——

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman stating another parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. FARR of California. Yes, Mr. Speaker, the parliamentary inquiry is that the debate is limited to 20 minutes?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is the Chair's understanding, 20 minutes on each side.

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Speaker, and it is my understanding that this is——

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman stating another parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Speaker, is this how the House normally debates substantive legislation?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the standing rules of the House, at the Speaker's discretion motions to suspend the rules are in order on Mondays and Tuesdays.

Mr. FARR of California. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MEMBERS SHOULD SIGN CAMPAIGN FINANCE DISCHARGE PETITION

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

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, with regard to the last discussion regarding the schedule for Monday and the question of whether or not we should have a true discussion of campaign finance reform, let me remind all of my colleagues that we have a discharge petition at the Clerk's desk. It has 187 signatures on it.

If we can get to 218 Members of the House who wish to see campaign finance reform, all ideas, the Shays-Meehan and all other ideas of serious debate on campaign finance reform, all we have to do is line up here at the Clerk's desk and get 218 signatures, and the regular order of the House will prevail, and we will be able to have the kind of discussion for campaign finance reform that I believe the overwhelming majority of Members on both sides of the aisle really would like to see.

But it is up to us now. Since the leadership has ruled, rather arbitrarily, on how we shall proceed, it is up to Members of the House to use regular House order and sign the discharge petition.

CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

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

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, in a Congress that has been full of outrageousness, what we have seen here this afternoon represents by far the greatest outrage of all.

To imagine that the Republican leadership, as announced by the majority leader, could get together in a secret meeting and plot to deny the American people an opportunity to have a bipartisan discussion and debate about how to clean up our corrupt campaign finance system is incredible.

The majority leader has placed this matter on the docket for action on a