

Let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, why there is a reluctance to address the issue at hand. And 80 percent of the American public agrees with us when surveyed and polled. Union households, 80 percent of union households agree that the Paycheck Protection Act needs to be passed in order to protect their paychecks.

For the other side here who says this is radical, they agree with 16 percent of the union households in America. For the other side that says protecting paychecks is radical, they are agreeing with 16 percent of voters overall.

When it comes to teacher union households, they agree with 13 percent of teacher union households, 16 percent of nonunion households.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot say it loudly enough: 80 percent of the American public believes that it is right and just to protect paychecks and prevent a portion of someone's wages from going toward a political cause unless the wage earner agrees and approves.

Let me say this, the people of America tonight have a big question. They want to know who is in control of Congress and who is listening to whom here. They want to know whether this Congress is going to listen to the 80 percent of the American people, union households and nonunion households alike, who want their paychecks protected or whether this Congress is going to listen to the very small, extreme minority who believes that it is fair and just to steal cash out of someone's wages without their consent and without their approval.

That is the question that needs to be resolved today; and I say, Mr. Speaker, this question needs to be resolved as forcefully and clearly as it possibly can.

Mr. Speaker, Thomas Jefferson's name has come up a couple times; and the quote has come over three times tonight. Let me make it a fourth time, Mr. Speaker, because I believe it is most compelling. Thomas Jefferson said, to compel a man to furnish contributions of money for the propagation of opinions which he disbelieves is sinful and tyrannical.

The question, also, tonight is whether Thomas Jefferson's legacy is correct or whether it will be ignored and trampled by those who believe that union bosses should have their voices heard over and above the voices of common, everyday, hard-working Americans.

There is precedence for this, Mr. Speaker. The State of Washington passed similar legislation where 72 percent of the voters approved the Paycheck Protection Act. The teachers union, 48,000 members strong, dropped their political contributions down to 8,000 members when voluntary standards were applied to those laws. That is freedom, Mr. Speaker. That is liberty. That is real fairness.

That is why the Paycheck Protection Act has more cosponsors in this House than any other campaign finance reform effort. It is the compelling reason

that we put the voices, the concerns of every honest American hard-working taxpayer ahead of those of large, loud union interests.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2608.

The question was taken.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, on that, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

CAMPAIGN REPORTING AND DISCLOSURE ACT OF 1998

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3582) to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to expedite the reporting of information to the Federal Election Commission, to expand the type of information required to be reported to the Commission, to promote the effective enforcement of campaign laws by the Commission, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3582

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Campaign Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1998".

SEC. 2. EXPEDITING REPORTING OF INFORMATION.

(a) REQUIRING REPORTS FOR CONTRIBUTIONS AND EXPENDITURES MADE WITHIN 90 DAYS OF ELECTION TO BE FILED WITHIN 24 HOURS AND POSTED ON INTERNET.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 304(a)(6) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 434(a)(6)) is amended to read as follows:

"(6)(A) Each political committee shall notify the Secretary or the Commission, and the Secretary of State, as appropriate, in writing, of any contribution received and expenditure made by the committee during the period which begins on the 90th day before an election and ends at the time the polls close for such election. This notification shall be made within 24 hours (or, if earlier, by midnight of the day on which the contribution is deposited) after the receipt of such contribution or the making of such expenditure and shall include the name of the candidate involved (as appropriate) and the office sought by the candidate, the identification of the contributor or the person to whom the expenditure is made, and the date of receipt and amount of the contribution or the date of disbursement and amount of the expenditure.

"(B) The notification required under this paragraph shall be in addition to all other reporting requirements under this Act.

"(C) The Commission shall make the information filed under this paragraph available on the Internet immediately upon receipt."

(2) INTERNET DEFINED.—Section 301(19) of such Act (2 U.S.C. 431(19)) is amended to read as follows:

"(19) The term 'Internet' means the international computer network of both Federal

and non-Federal interoperable packet-switched data networks."

(b) REQUIRING REPORTS OF CERTAIN FILERS TO BE TRANSMITTED ELECTRONICALLY; CERTIFICATION OF PRIVATE SECTOR SOFTWARE.—Section 304(a)(11)(A) of such Act (2 U.S.C. 434(a)(11)(A)) is amended by striking the period at the end and inserting the following: ", except that in the case of a report submitted by a person who reports an aggregate amount of contributions or expenditures (as the case may be) in all reports filed with respect to the election involved (taking into account the period covered by the report) in an amount equal to or greater than \$50,000, the Commission shall require the report to be filed and preserved by such means, format, or method. The Commission shall certify (on an ongoing basis) private sector computer software which may be used for filing reports by such means, format, or method."

(c) CHANGE IN CERTAIN REPORTING FROM A CALENDAR YEAR BASIS TO AN ELECTION CYCLE BASIS.—Section 304(b) of such Act (2 U.S.C. 434(b)) is amended by inserting "(or election cycle, in the case of an authorized committee of a candidate for Federal office)" after "calendar year" each place it appears in paragraphs (2), (3), (4), (6), and (7).

SEC. 3. EXPANSION OF TYPE OF INFORMATION REPORTED.

(a) REQUIRING RECORD KEEPING AND REPORT OF SECONDARY PAYMENTS BY CAMPAIGN COMMITTEES.—

(1) REPORTING.—Section 304(b)(5)(A) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 434(b)(5)(A)) is amended by striking the semicolon at the end and inserting the following: ", and, if such person in turn makes expenditures which aggregate \$500 or more in an election cycle to other persons (not including employees) who provide goods or services to the candidate or the candidate's authorized committees, the name and address of such other persons, together with the date, amount, and purpose of such expenditures;".

(2) RECORD KEEPING.—Section 302 of such Act (2 U.S.C. 432) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(j) A person described in section 304(b)(5)(A) who makes expenditures which aggregate \$500 or more in an election cycle to other persons (not including employees) who provide goods or services to a candidate or a candidate's authorized committees shall provide to a political committee the information necessary to enable the committee to report the information described in such section."

(3) NO EFFECT ON OTHER REPORTS.—Nothing in the amendments made by this subsection may be construed to affect the terms of any other recordkeeping or reporting requirements applicable to candidates or political committees under title III of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971.

(b) INCLUDING REPORT ON CUMULATIVE CONTRIBUTIONS AND EXPENDITURES IN POST ELECTION REPORTS.—Section 304(a)(7) of such Act (2 U.S.C. 434(a)(7)) is amended—

(1) by striking "(7)" and inserting "(7)(A)"; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

"(B) In the case of any report required to be filed by this subsection which is the first report required to be filed after the date of an election, the report shall include a statement of the total contributions received and expenditures made as of the date of the election."

(c) INCLUDING INFORMATION ON AGGREGATE CONTRIBUTIONS IN REPORT ON ITEMIZED CONTRIBUTIONS.—Section 304(b)(3) of such Act (2 U.S.C. 434(b)(3)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by inserting after "such contribution" the following: "and the

total amount of all such contributions made by such person with respect to the election involved"; and

(2) in subparagraph (B), by inserting after "such contribution" the following: "and the total amount of all such contributions made by such committee with respect to the election involved".

SEC. 4. PROMOTING EFFECTIVE ENFORCEMENT BY FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION.

(a) **REQUIRING FEC TO PROVIDE WRITTEN RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Title III of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 431 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 308 the following new section:

"OTHER WRITTEN RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS

"SEC. 308A. (a) **PERMITTING RESPONSES.**—In addition to issuing advisory opinions under section 308, the Commission shall issue written responses pursuant to this section with respect to a written request concerning the application of this Act, chapter 95 or chapter 96 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, a rule or regulation prescribed by the Commission, or an advisory opinion issued by the Commission under section 308, with respect to a specific transaction or activity by the person, if the Commission finds the application of the Act, chapter, rule, regulation, or advisory opinion to the transaction or activity to be clear and unambiguous.

"(b) **PROCEDURE FOR RESPONSE.**—

"(1) **ANALYSIS BY STAFF.**—The staff of the Commission shall analyze each request submitted under this section. If the staff believes that the standard described in subsection (a) is met with respect to the request, the staff shall circulate a statement to that effect together with a draft response to the request to the members of the Commission.

"(2) **ISSUANCE OF RESPONSE.**—Upon the expiration of the 3-day period beginning on the date the statement and draft response is circulated (excluding weekends or holidays), the Commission shall issue the response, unless during such period any member of the Commission objects to issuing the response.

"(c) **EFFECT OF RESPONSE.**—

"(1) **SAFE HARBOR.**—Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, any person who relies upon any provision or finding of a written response issued under this section and who acts in good faith in accordance with the provisions and findings of such response shall not, as a result of any such act, be subject to any sanction provided by this Act or by chapter 95 or chapter 96 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

"(2) **NO RELIANCE BY OTHER PARTIES.**—Any written response issued by the Commission under this section may only be relied upon by the person involved in the specific transaction or activity with respect to which such response is issued, and may not be applied by the Commission with respect to any other person or used by the Commission for enforcement or regulatory purposes.

"(d) **PUBLICATION OF REQUESTS AND RESPONSES.**—The Commission shall make public any request for a written response made, and the responses issued, under this section. In carrying out this subsection, the Commission may not make public the identity of any person submitting a request for a written response unless the person specifically authorizes to Commission to do so.

"(e) **COMPILATION OF INDEX.**—The Commission shall compile, publish, and regularly update a complete and detailed index of the responses issued under this section through which responses may be found on the basis of the subjects included in the responses."

(2) **CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—Section 307(a)(7) of such Act (2 U.S.C. 437d(a)(7)) is

amended by striking "of this Act" and inserting "and other written responses under section 308A".

(b) **STANDARD FOR INITIATION OF ACTIONS BY FEC.**—Section 309(a)(2) of such Act (2 U.S.C. 437g(a)(2)) is amended by striking "it has reason to believe" and all that follows through "of 1954," and inserting the following: "it has a reason to investigate a possible violation of this Act or of chapter 95 or chapter 96 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 that has occurred or is about to occur (based on the same criteria applicable under this paragraph prior to the enactment of the Campaign Reform and Election Integrity Act of 1998)".

(c) **STANDARD FORM FOR COMPLAINTS; STRONGER DISCLAIMER LANGUAGE.**—

(1) **STANDARD FORM.**—Section 309(a)(1) of such Act (2 U.S.C. 437g(a)(1)) is amended by inserting after "shall be notarized," the following: "shall be in a standard form prescribed by the Commission, shall not include (but may refer to) extraneous materials,".

(2) **DISCLAIMER LANGUAGE.**—Section 309(a)(1) of such Act (2 U.S.C. 437g(a)(1)) is amended—

(A) by striking "(a)(1)" and inserting "(a)(1)(A)"; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

"(B) The written notice of a complaint provided by the Commission under subparagraph (A) to a person alleged to have committed a violation referred to in the complaint shall include a cover letter (in a form prescribed by the Commission) and the following statement: "The enclosed complaint has been filed against you with the Federal Election Commission. The Commission has not verified or given official sanction to the complaint. The Commission will make no decision to pursue the complaint for a period of at least 15 days from your receipt of this complaint. You may, if you wish, submit a written statement to the Commission explaining why the Commission should take no action against you based on this complaint. If the Commission should decide to investigate, you will be notified and be given further opportunity to respond.""

SEC. 5. BANNING ACCEPTANCE OF CASH CONTRIBUTIONS GREATER THAN \$100.

Section 315 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 441a) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(i) No candidate or political committee may accept any contributions of currency of the United States or currency of any foreign country from any person which, in the aggregate, exceed \$100."

SEC. 6. EFFECTIVE DATE.

Except as otherwise specifically provided, this Act and the amendments made by this Act shall apply with respect to elections occurring after January 1999.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) and the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS).

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This is the fourth item before us tonight. A little bit of math will tell us that, when we are finished with this particular measure, we will have been debating campaign reform for 2 hours and 40 minutes. The phrase "this is a sham" has been repeated, I believe, a world record number of times on this floor, perhaps for a want of a different term.

This particular measure, if anyone bothers to look at it, has 10 specific provisions. Seven of them are FEC, Federal Election Commission, recommendations. They were contained in the Republican campaign reform bill of the 104th Congress. They are, by anyone's examination, absolutely appropriate, indeed, long overdue and necessary reforms.

Of the other three, one especially, the electronic reporting on the Internet, I will leave to my colleague to explain in more detail, as one of the younger, more astute, computer knowledgeable Members of the House.

The other two provisions, are not FEC recommendations, but I believe any Member would have a very difficult time not agreeing that they are also appropriate and indeed overdue.

One of the provisions provide that, when a standard FEC complaint form is filled out, that such complaint indicates that it has not been verified by the FEC. In too many campaigns, someone files a complaint form. It is accepted by the FEC, and the statement is made: The FEC has accepted my complaint. In fact, on the form itself, it will say the complaint has not been verified.

□ 2115

The final provision was in a bill by our colleague from California (Mr. DREIER). It says that the Federal Election Commission, when a question is submitted in writing, can submit a written response to the individual. It just seems to me that if the Federal Government is going to control the election process, someone ought to be able to get an answer from the government when they ask a question. If the question is in writing, then the answer ought to be in writing.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. WHITE) and I ask unanimous consent that he manage the balance of the time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOLEY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) for his work and leadership on this issue. This certainly is a contentious issue, one that we sometimes have some hard times dealing with, but he has exercised some leadership and we appreciate it very much.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is a small bill, but it is a good bill, and I like to take some time and go through it point by point. But before I do that I want to say and make one point that I think may be of more importance than really the details of what is in this bill.

The fact is, as we have heard today from many Members on the other side of the aisle and probably some Members on our side of the aisle, too, there

is some disappointment in this Chamber about some of the bills that we are going to go voting on today; and I have to tell my colleagues very frankly I am disappointed, too, because I had a bill with 118 cosponsors, a commission bill that is not going to be voted on today, and I see the gentlewoman from New York and others on the other side who have cosponsored this bill, and there is certainly disappointment in my heart, too, that we have not been able to vote on all the bills we would like to vote on. But I would ask us all not to let our disappointment prevent us from doing some good things, and that is essentially what this bill is about.

The measures in this bill are all bipartisan, they are common to almost every single campaign finance bill that we have seen in the Congress this year, whether proposed by a Republican or by a Democrat, and it would be a shame to let ourselves miss this opportunity to do something important just because we are upset with one part of the process or another.

I will take just a couple minutes to go through some of the specifics of what we are doing in this bill.

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

Mr. WHITE. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, has the gentleman signed the discharge petition?

Mr. WHITE. I have not signed the discharge petition.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Will the gentleman sign it?

Mr. WHITE. There are several good reasons for why I will not, and I will explain those during the course of this process.

Mr. Speaker, the gist of this bill, the main thing this bill does and the thing I wager that even the gentleman from Connecticut really would not be able to defend voting against is the idea that we put FEC reports on the Internet. Really very hard to disagree that that would not be good for his constituents, for my constituents, for everybody in the country, rather than doing it on microfiche, which was wonderful technology in the 1970s. Let us put it on the Internet so everything can be seen. That is really the heart of what this bill does.

It also does a couple other good things. It says that the gentleman from Connecticut would have to file his campaign finance reform reports electronically so that they can be put on the Internet in a much shorter period of time. It says that within 24 hours after he receives a nickel of contribution in the last 90 days of the campaign he would have to put that information on the Internet.

So the gist of what this bill does is to use this technology to make sure that the American citizens do have the ability to see in a very short period of time what sort of contributions their Members of Congress and their candidate are accepting. I think it is very hard

for any of us in this House to suggest that that is something we should vote against.

In addition, this bill does some other good things. It goes through a list of five or six more or less technical changes that have been requested by the FEC.

This is a good government bill, it is bipartisan, does not have anything to do really with either party. It just increases disclosure and lets the American people see what is going on.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would respectfully urge all my colleagues to vote for it.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. FAZIO), who has led an effort through this Congress trying to coordinate campaign finance reform efforts, and we are going to miss him as well.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON) for yielding me this time.

As the gentleman from Washington said, this legislation has been included in most of the campaign finance reform bills that have been introduced on both sides of the aisle, and certainly I do not believe there is any reason to oppose it. But it is rather ironic that this is presented as additional responsibilities for the Federal Election Commission when in fact, if my colleagues read the bill, there is no new authorization for what the report that accompanies the bill says would cost another \$2 million simply to perform.

That is not unusual when we look at the history of how Republicans have handled the FEC. Year after year after year the commission charged with responsibility for compliance under current law comes to the Congress and asks for a budget that would increase their ability to enforce the law, only to be rebuffed by the appropriations process dominated in the last 3 cycles by the Republican Party, cutting 8-10 percent from the requests, always cutting in the area of compliance, therefore requiring in 1996 hundreds of complaints to be thrown out, so that we cannot even finish requiring people under existing law to live up to their responsibilities as candidates.

Now last year they did not make a very deep cut. A change was made, but it is pointed out in report after report that Republicans have only allowed the fund to go for computer modernization, never for the kinds of activity that would allow the American people to know who is not living up to the requirements of our campaign law.

So there is no reason to oppose this legislation except to say we would hope that this Republican Congress would fund the FEC adequately so that we could see the laws currently on the books, let alone these that would be enacted in this bill, enforced.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have never been so ashamed as I am tonight of the tactic that is being deployed to deprive both Democrats and Republicans from having a serious debate in taking up campaign finance reform. Relegating this issue to a series of very limited debates is depriving both Republicans and Democrats the opportunity to take up and pass the McCain-Feingold bill which closes one of the gaping loopholes in our system today, soft money, and forces outside third party groups to put their names on their ads. Those who have taken control of this process tonight are standing up for the obscene amount of moneys that are flooding into our campaigns today, that really a stop ought to be brought to.

Let me give my colleagues an example about the freshman campaign finance reform bill we brought up. These outside third party groups objected to our bill, similarly the McCain-Feingold bill. They said, "If you force us to put our names on these ads, we won't run these ads." Well, that is exactly what the bill was all about, and by adopting this masquerade tonight when we are supposed to be debating campaign finance reform but we are really not, we are depriving the American public of the chance to make sure those ads have their names on them and to ban soft money.

The American people are watching, they care deeply about this issue. We need take up and debate campaign finance reform.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER).

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, for over 15 months this Congress has spent thousand of hours and billions of dollars investigating campaign finance abuses, and this is what it has all come down to: a package of four partisan bills brought to this floor on a calendar that offers no opportunity for amendment and little debate.

Those who work for genuine reform on both sides of the aisle are outraged by this thinly disguised charade. I call on every American to send a message to this Congress that they too are outraged, that they deserve and rightly expect a system of democracy where their voice and their vote determine the outcome of elections, not the hundreds of thousands of dollars poured into campaigns by special interests, dollars hidden in so-called soft money.

Every American understands that true campaign reform must be accomplished in a bipartisan effort. No such bill was allowed on this floor tonight. Instead we were given the illusion of reform. I am confident that the American people know the difference and that they will demand government in the public interest, not the special interests.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds to point out to the gentleman from California, who may have left the Chamber, that it is absolutely

our intention to fund the FEC separately to accomplish all the goals that are at issue on this bill. So I think he can rest assured that that will actually happen.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE).

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Washington for yielding me this time and for his leadership on this issue.

I too have introduced legislation to require electronic filing of Federal Election Commission reports, and I would hope that our colleagues on the other side of the aisle who have complained about the lack of opportunities to support real campaign finance reform will join us in supporting this important measure, because who could possibly be opposed to this common sense reform? It ensures accountability and provides access to essential information regarding our political system.

Right now when we file a campaign finance report with the FEC, we have to file it by the deadline imposed by the FEC. But that filing simply means putting it in the mail, the U.S. Postal Service, and sometimes it can take a week to get that report to the FEC. They then might take another several days or more to get it up and available to the public, so the news media, campaigns, the general public have a delay of sometimes 10 days or even 2 weeks between when a contribution is made and when they can learn about who contributed to whom in this situation.

I think it is critically important that we adopt this legislation with electronic filing. We can still file on the deadline, but they will receive it on the deadline as well. And if we require them to immediately put it up on the Internet, everyone in the country with access to a computer in their home and libraries and schools can have access to this information instantaneously, and that is a critical reform, letting people decide for themselves what the purpose of campaign contributions are, who is receiving what for what purpose. The best way to deal with campaign finance is to lay it out on the table and let the public know exactly who has received what.

Who could possibly oppose requiring campaign committees that raise or spend more than \$50,000 to file their reports electronically with the FEC? Who could possibly oppose a requirement that Federal committees immediately report contributions and expenditures made within 90 days of an election?

I urge adoption of this legislation.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SCHUMER), an excellent legislator, an orator and someone who has fought for reform for decades in this Congress.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, I hope the introduction did not count against my time. In any case, I thank the gentleman and my friend for yielding this time to me, and I would like to make 2 points.

One, the desperate need for campaign finance reform. It hit me about 7-8 years ago. My best friend came down and worked in the Congress for 3 months, one of my best friends, and he is a smart and sensitive person. I asked him at the end of the three months, we went out to dinner and I said, "Well, Mark, what do you think of the Congress?"

He said there was good news and bad news. He said the good news was that the quality of the people was much better than he ever imagined. He thought the staffs were better than anything he had seen in business or law or anything else. He said the bad news was that it all did not matter because the way we finance campaigns vitiated the entire system.

Mr. Speaker, tonight does not do justice to that problem. Four quick bills put on suspension, calculated, carefully crafted to simply get the issue off their back; it is not right, it is not fair. Sooner or later, I do not know if it will be sooner or whether it will be later, but they will pay the price for trying to play a game with a very serious issue.

The second point I would like to make is the one also made by my colleague from New York (Mr. OWENS), this idea that there should be choice applies to labor unions but not to corporations. What hypocrisy. Do shareholders get the right to determine whether a big company makes a contribution or cascades soft money into a campaign? Not under this logic. What is good for the goose is good for the gander. If my colleagues believe it for one, they believe it for the other. But if my colleagues want the American people to think they really care about the issue, and are not engaged in just a cheap political trick to go after their opponents but not those who support them, they would never put such a bill on the floor.

□ 2130

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON).

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, we need full and immediate disclosure, and that is what H.R. 3582 does. At the end of next month, most of us will file our FEC report for the first time since 1997. I cannot imagine a Member here or a challenger that does not have a fax machine, a telephone, e-mail, the ability to get on the Internet.

This bill will require reports by all committees that raise or spend \$50,000 to be filed electronically so that we can see an immediate reporting of contributions and expenditures within 24 hours. What is wrong with that? Nothing, and that is why every Member here should support it. This bill is an important first step as we look for full disclosure and the need to enforce the law.

Last year, there was a report in the magazine, *The Hill*, that all of us receive here in Washington in our offices,

and it said that most Members do not comply fully with the laws that are already on the books.

Well, I have a fourth grader at home, and I know that when she does not fully comply with her homework assignment, that her dad, myself, or her mom, makes sure that in fact that work is done before she goes to school the next day.

I would say that both this bill and other measures will seek full compliance with the law so that every constituent can see how we raise and spend money which is very important as we look forward to the days when we receive the full confidence that our constituents should have in the Members that run for office.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY), who has worked on campaign finance reform from the day she got here.

(Mrs. MALONEY of New York asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, the Republican majority has spent in this Congress \$8 million investigating alleged campaign finance abuses, yet the same Republican majority failed to fund the Federal Elections Commission at the level they requested and said they needed to do the job. It was \$6 million short.

I am pleased my colleague says he will get the funding for this bill, but we have to get the funding they said they need in order to investigate the cases before them, the only group charged to investigate in a bipartisan way.

The Speaker earlier said we would have a vote on campaign finance reform in this Congress, but what we have tonight is a campaign finance reform kill. Everyone knows that true reform has to be comprehensive. A little small approach, although worthy, will not get the job done.

We have a comprehensive bill, Shays-Meehan. We should allow a vote on this bill before we go home and ask our constituents to vote for us.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the able gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, what is going on this evening is really a cruel hoax on the American people. I would like to say to the Republican leadership, what are you afraid of? Why can we not have an open debate and real campaign finance law?

Today's Roll Call has it right. It says, "Angry GINGRICH scheduled doomed reform votes." It says, "Angry GINGRICH scheduled doomed reform votes," and it says that "GINGRICH scheduled four reform votes under the suspension calendar, requiring a virtually impossible two-thirds majority to pass."

The fact is the Republican leadership does not want campaign finance reform, so they will not give us real reform. Of all these bills, the anti-union

bill is the worst bill. It is nothing more than a cheap political trick to try to punish labor unions for supporting Democratic candidates. It is a sham, and it ought to be exposed for what it is.

The fact of the matter is that we need to have a discharge petition signed so that this Congress can vote on McCain-Feingold and Shays-Meehan and have a real debate on campaign finance reform.

Let the majority of this Congress prevail. Let us have an up or down vote on campaign finance reform, not the sham being perpetrated this evening.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SALMON).

Mr. SALMON. Mr. Speaker, when I came here 3 years ago, I came, I think, full of fire in the belly ready to make some major changes in this place.

I, too, am very disappointed tonight. There are a lot of reformers on both sides. The gentleman that just spoke is a true hero of mine, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL). I think he is a great guy and somebody that stands for the right thing time and time again. Hopefully, he sees there are some of us on the other side that try to do the same thing.

We get a little tired of the games between the leadership on both sides. Frankly, we stand here tonight, and I am ashamed, I really am ashamed to see how this is coming up tonight, that it is in the same manner as that of the leadership who ran the House for 40 years under the Democrats. It is wrong. It is wrong when they did it, and it is wrong if we do it, and I don't think this is a service to the American people.

Let me say something. We are here to talk about a very sensitive issue, special interest influence on Washington. I come from a State that passed the most comprehensive campaign finance reform in the Nation. You can only give \$300 to a candidate in the State of Arizona, yet scandals still persist, problems still occur, because people do break the law.

Let us stop telling lies to the American people. Everybody knows that the Republicans want to preserve the ability for big corporations to give bucks on the side through soft money to the ones in charge.

By the way, if the Democrats were in charge, they would be giving to you, because, frankly, I do not think they have a soul. They give to whoever is in charge of the place so they can get what they need.

But the Democrats do not want the unions to be restricted in any way. They do not want union employees to know where their money is going. So there is this perpetration on both sides. I think it is wrong.

Frankly, I think that until we have a real debate, and I hope we do, we are never going to get this resolved. Let us finally realize what will really make a difference. It is not about stopping PACs or stopping this or that. What is going to stop it is full disclosure.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the articulate gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. TIERNEY).

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I thank the gentleman for his previous comments a moment ago, and I applaud his common sense in approaching this. I join him, Mr. Speaker, in the idea that having come here to Congress and knowing before I got here, obviously, there is a great deal of cynicism about our process, speaking to any number of students that come to Washington or going throughout the district and speaking to students, trying to address them and tell them they ought not to be caught up in the cynicism, it is very hard to watch what has been going on here tonight.

Although this particular portion of the bill may indeed be well-intended, and what you intend to do with this may, in fact, have some merits that could be supported, the whole process by which you have gone about doing this tonight, the whole idea of not even addressing any of the bills that have been filed for some period of time now, not giving them the period of time for debate and discussion, putting it forward tonight in a late-drafted bill, broken down into four parts, very cynically, looking to get people on record for campaign purposes, but never really dealing with any details of campaign finance reform. We do not talk about getting money out of campaigns, we do not talk about shortening campaigns.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the able gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY).

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am a freshman, and one of the things that we first did when we first got here, freshmen Republicans and Democrats, we tried to work together on campaign finance reform. We wanted to make a difference.

Tonight what is going on is wrong, only because there are a lot of good bills out there that could make a difference.

We have to go home and face the people and they do not understand. To be very honest with you, when I am working with people and they are thinking that because someone comes in to lobby me I am getting money out of this, I do not like it.

I have a campaign coming up. I do not want to have to raise the amount of money I have to raise. I think it is obscene. I would rather see it go to education and health care. I think our businesses and people would rather see the money go there also.

I hope tonight does not end the debate. I am hoping we will truly get finance campaign reform before I retire from this place.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. SLAUGHTER), who has fought for this issue year after year.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, Congress desperately needs to reform our

campaign finance laws. The Federal campaigns are becoming little more than a money chase to pay for increasingly expensive elections, and voter turnout is at an all time low. The most recent election cycle spent on the Federal election an estimated \$1.6 billion, but less than half of the eligible Americans exercised their right to vote.

The cost of political campaigns has simply become too high, threatening the integrity of our system of representative government. The American people are discouraged by a system in which money seems more important than issues, and the interests of money seems more important than the concerns of working families.

But the legislation the House will vote on today actually increases the amount of money that can be contributed by wealthy individuals and special interests, and it includes a gag rule that makes it even more difficult for working Americans to get information on issues that matter to their families.

To add insult to injury, this misguided legislation has been brought to the House under suspension of the rules.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN), another gentleman deprived of the opportunity to offer his legislation.

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, not that long ago I listened to my friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS), state all kinds of reasons as to what was wrong with the Shays-Meehan-McCain-Feingold bill, and he went on and on and on about all these problems with this bipartisan approach to campaign finance reform.

It kind of made me wonder why the Republican leadership has gone to great lengths, such great lengths, to prevent a vote on this bill, if it is such a bad bill. It is incredible how far the Republican leadership has come to try to stop this debate.

We were promised a debate; a full, fair debate, with integrity and honesty on the floor of this House, and we have not gotten it.

The gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) knows full well that every public interest group in America who has been fighting for campaign finance reform supports the bipartisan approach, and he knows as well that every major editorial board in America favors the bipartisan approach. He also knows that Members on both sides of the aisle have been working for 3 years to get a debate and get a vote on meaningful bipartisan campaign finance reform, and he also knows that the other body just voted 53 votes for the same bill in the United States Senate.

Well, we are going to get this bill sooner or later, because the American people will respond and newer Members will respond. All I have to do is look at the newest Member of this body, the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPP), who walked into my office with the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr.

SHAYS), and made this legislation the first bill that she signed on to as a new Member, and the people of the 22nd District of California are proud of the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPs), and Walter is as well, and there will be more Members that will be elected in the November elections, and campaign finance reform will be an issue. There will be a price to be paid for this disgusting maneuver.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS).

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, my interest in campaign finance reform goes back to 1972 when I became very angry at a fellow Republican, Mr. Nixon, for the manner in which he raised and disbursed money in his Presidential campaign, and that, in fact, is one of the reasons that I ran for public office the following year.

Today, we have decided that those laws which were passed after Watergate simply no longer do the job, and I speak particularly in favor of the bill that is before us, the one introduced by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. WHITE). It is something we should do. I am sorry we are not debating it more. But in this electronic age we clearly should do precisely what this bill requires, and that is to have instantaneous disclosure, instantaneous reporting of contributions received. The money contributed will be known to the entire world and to the opponents of the person involved.

Now a few general comments about the debate. Several speakers have said we need comprehensive campaign finance reform. Those are the bills that do not pass.

I think what we are doing here tonight is right. I am hopeful that at least one, perhaps two, maybe even three, and, if a miracle occurs, all four will pass. But I am convinced that the only way we are going to get campaign finance reform passed in this House is to take it bit by little bit, put it up for a vote, up or down, and some will pass and some will fail, and we will keep plugging away.

□ 2145

Parkinson's law, for those of us who are old enough to remember Parkinson's law, tells us that the difficulty in getting something passed in a decision-making body is inversely related to the experience that body has with the issue.

We all know and understand campaign finance reform, and we can find something wrong with every bill. The more comprehensive the bill is, the harder it is to get it passed. So I think doing what we are doing tonight, breaking it into little pieces and saying we will pass each individually, is the right way to go. We have to continue doing that.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the articulate gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, even in the perpetration of a sham, a little light comes through. There is nothing wrong with this bill. It is the right thing to do.

I would hope everybody would support this bill, even in their disappointment about this process, even in their disappointment that this bill is a sliver of what we ought to be doing, even though this bill, introduced by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. WHITE), does not cover soft money. There is no disclosure of soft money in the bill offered by the gentleman; and, furthermore, there is no disclosure of independent expenditures: who come into your districts and spend all sorts of money.

Both candidates, both the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. LOIS CAPPs) and her opponent, said that that kind of expenditure undermined the integrity of their election.

So even though the bill of the gentleman from Washington (Mr. WHITE) goes only a little bit, it is a proper bill, so it would be foolish to oppose this bill.

I suggest to my colleagues that this bill was put last in this group of four because, number one, it is such a small facet, a correct one but a small facet, that it would perhaps clean up what has been an otherwise desultory representation of campaign finance reform.

Let me again repeat to all the editorial referencing this process,

Newt Gingrich has selected today as the moment to line up his firing squad and kill campaign finance reform in this Congress. Just how desperate Mr. Gingrich is to thwart reform is clear from the parliamentary tactics he is preparing and is using this night. It is a cynical maneuver that will come back to haunt Mr. Gingrich and any House Member who supports it.

Yes, this facet is an acceptable small but appropriate facet. But the package that has been presented is a sham and a shame.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, when the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) said it would be foolish to oppose this bill, and that it was a bright light shining in an otherwise dark universe, I realized how very articulate he really is. I appreciate that very much.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1¼ minutes to the equally articulate gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST).

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to respond to my good friend, the other gentleman from Maryland (Mr. STENY HOYER) that the part of this legislation that is by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. WHITE) is a good piece of the puzzle.

I would also add, however, that I think the package that we are voting on tonight, the fundamental issue here is that the package that we have an opportunity to vote on tonight pushes the whole campaign finance funding prob-

lem into a better situation. Basically what we are voting on is a package that will put the whole campaign funding situation in a much better light for the American public.

I would like to say one other thing, that each succeeding Member that speaks to the House tonight, Mr. Speaker, should also tell the American people that we as individuals have an opportunity every single day, every day we have the option, we have the choice, to reject all out-of-State money, all PAC money, all out-of-district money. Each of us can just say, I will only accept money from those people who vote and live in my district.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA), a fighter for campaign finance reform.

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, because we have not been given enough time to truly and meaningfully debate this, let me tell a story about a meeting I had with some constituents on Friday night. I met with folks from the Citizens Committee to save Legion Park on Friday night, and I had a chance to briefly speak to them.

I said this morning, meaning today, we are going to be debating campaign finance reform, but I said, do not hold your breath. Chances are we are going to do it in the dead of night, and it is going to be a stacked deck against the passage of any bill. Sure enough, that is what we have.

But perhaps the worst thing and saddest thing about this is that none of my constituents were surprised. They all knew that we were not going to head toward any type of meaningful reform. So for me to stand here and tell why this legislation we have before us is bad for the average citizen who is fed up with money-driven elections, or bad for working men and women who simply want to keep their meager voice in society heard, or it is bad for long-term legal residents who are always asked to pay their taxes, but the little chance they have to express their voice in this democracy is now going to be stifled through this legislation. It is also bad for new citizens, whose new voice through their vote will be stifled, as well.

That is okay with this bill, but we will not pass it because we know it is being done in the dead of night, stacked against us. It will go nowhere. Vote against this legislation.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I probably will not take the 2 minutes, because I want to say that we have heard some harsh rhetoric in the last few minutes, but it is actually harsh rhetoric that hides a relatively pleasant fact: That there probably is one piece of legislation that just about everybody in this Chamber can agree on.

I will grant that it does not do everything that any of us would like it to do,

but it is a small step in the right direction. It may be all that we are able to do this year, but by golly, let us at least do something. Let us not miss this opportunity to take a step, small though it may be, to move in the direction of real campaign finance reform.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOLEY). The gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON) is recognized for 3½ minutes.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, it is time for a little review. We have been here going over four proposals, all authored by the Republicans. I have been in this Congress for 18 years. I have spoken to Members in this Chamber who have been here longer. I have never, ever in my life been on the floor debating campaign finance reform where the other party was not given an opportunity to put forth a proposal.

My parents fled Hitler and Stalin. In those countries there was no debate. We have just done that here on the floor of the House. Unless you are an R, unless you are a Republican, you do not get to offer something.

That is not bad enough. Even on the proposals they have put forth here, they have chosen a procedure that guarantees failure on the Thomas proposal, because they choose a procedure that guarantees a necessity of two-thirds of the House of Representatives.

Let me get this straight: They get to set up the rules for their own proposal, and rather than half, they choose two-thirds. Why? Because they do not want to succeed.

We look at this institution we serve in, and we look back to our Founding Fathers. There have been references here to Jefferson. I would venture to say, none of us can speak for Jefferson, none of us can match his imagination, but I would be shocked to find Jefferson being for a system that did not allow the other party in the Congress to offer even one alternative proposal.

I can read from Madison. Madison, in questioning who the electors are, who should control the great fate of this country, he said, "Not the rich," "Not the rich, more than the poor; not the learned, more than the ignorant; not the haughty heirs of the distinguished names more than the humble sons of obscure and unpropitious fortune. The electors are the great body of the people of the United States."

We have come a distance from democracy's beginnings in England and elsewhere: A Magna Carta that gave rights to wealthy lords, so they could protect their property against the nobility of the King. Along came the revolutionaries on this continent, and they gave the power of the vote to white men who owned property, even though without title. It was a step forward.

Through years and struggles, we extended that vote to blacks and Indian

males, and finally, yes, we included women. But there is still one great divide. If you have money, you get to speak and you get to be heard. If we get the Republican proposal of the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS), money speaks louder than it ever has in this Chamber.

Mr. Speaker, I ask Members to tell me, is what is wrong with the American political system that rich people cannot find their voice? Do we need to triple the amount of money that wealthy individuals can give? I do not believe there is a nonpartisan American in this country that believes it.

Give us a chance to vote on real reform. Reject this fundamental proposal that the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) has put before us. Vote for American clean government. Reject that proposal.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) is recognized for the 4 minutes remaining in the debate.

(Mr. THOMAS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, if some are looking for the definition of "cynical," I would suggest they go back to the 103rd Congress. The current minority party controlled the House of Representatives, controlled the United States Senate, controlled the office of the presidency. The Democratic Party could pass in the House or in the Senate and sign by their President campaign reform. Guess what happened? Guess what happened? Nothing. Nothing went to the President.

So what I find about these fervent reformers is simply this: They are fervent. The problem is, if we look at the previous legislation, McCain-Feingold or Shays-Meehan, what they are fervent about changes. Go back to the original McCain: This country is being undermined by Political Action Committees. We have to ban PACs. We have to ban leadership PACs. Take a look at their bill. It is not in there.

Now, does it mean that what was fundamentally important to Americans has changed, or are they in search of a political answer that they can use under the guise of real reform? If we want to ban soft money, take a look at H.R. 3581. This bill tonight bans soft money at the Federal and the State level tougher than they do. Yet they are going to complain and moan about soft money.

Take a look at what we are doing in terms of non-citizens. The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN) has a bill that agrees with that, but he has been coming to the floor and berating what we are doing. It seems to me that at some point cynicism has to stop, and it stops now.

They have had 2 hours and 40 minutes more time than we have had previously to debate reform. It seems to me that

the key to good legislation, the key to following the process, is to see if any of these measures pass. I believe campaign reform tonight will pass.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, the Republican Majority is again bringing to the floor of this House legislation designed to discourage voter registration and participation and our electoral process.

H.R. 3582 is but another attack on the rights of thousands of citizens to vote, aimed primarily at our nation's Hispanic citizens. Earlier in this Congress, Republicans targeted Hispanic voters in the 46th Congressional District of California during their outrageous investigation of LORETTA SANCHEZ's victory in 1996. What happened there was simply an effort to deny a Hispanic candidate a legitimately won seat in Congress, while attempting to intimidate lawful citizens and discourage them from voting.

But that's not all. The Republicans are also attempting to limit the impact of Hispanics in the political process by setting up a Census procedure that will severely undercount Hispanic and other minority populations. They are promoting a method that by all accounts will prevent an accurate Census count, with Hispanics in particular being harmed by their proposal.

Now this troubling trend is continuing with this unwarranted provision of H.R. 3582, a provision which could allow state and local officials to drop thousands of American citizens from the voter rolls, solely on the basis of race or an "ethnic-sounding" name. I find it incredible and intolerable that the Republicans would so blatantly go after Hispanic Americans and attempt to deny them their rights at the voting booth.

Mr. Speaker, Hispanic Americans are watching, and they understand that they are being targeted by the Republican Majority for discriminatory treatment. It is absolutely critical that we stand up to this attack against Hispanic citizens, and defeat this and other provisions promoted by the Republicans that would erect substantial barriers to voter participation and undermine the right to vote.

The priority under our Constitution is on citizens' rights to participate in democratic elections. This proposal undermines that right, and it must be soundly rejected.

Mr. POSHARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to register my strong opposition to H.R. 3582, the majority's embarrassing attempt to bring campaign finance reform to the House floor. As a member who has worked for meaningful campaign reform for many years, who refuses PAC money and voluntarily limits individual campaign contributions, I find it offensive that the leadership would try to fool the American people into believing that they have kept their promise to allow debate and a vote on real reform. However, I am confident that the people will not be fooled, and I trust that my colleagues will join me in my opposition if they truly believe in our duty to reduce the overwhelming influence of money and return our campaign system to its roots of citizen legislators who challenged each other on the issues and their vision of the future.

It is incredible to me that one of the most complex, contentious and critical issues facing this Congress could be brought up under suspension of the rules, but it is no more than a

thinly veiled attempt by the Republican leadership to stifle debate and disallow amendments, thereby locking out Democrats and Republicans who would embrace the challenge of implementing true reform. H.R. 3582 ignores the most pressing issues in campaign financing and focuses instead on intimidating working men and women and attempting to shut them out of the political process. The Republican bill delivers yet another unwarranted and mean-spirited attack on the labor movement by erecting barriers to the political participation of working families and making it more difficult for them to exercise their fundamental right to join together to protect their interests. Furthermore, this legislation seeks to silence minority populations by establishing a "ballot integrity" pilot program in, certainly not by coincidence, the five states with the largest Hispanic populations.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues and I were promised the opportunity to debate and vote on meaningful campaign finance reform during the 105th Congress. Instead, all we have seen are delays, stalling tactics and tricks designed to place the blame for failing to enact campaign reform on those who have gone to the line to press for its passage. I am confident that my constituents, and the American public, will see this sham for what it is and will instead reward the efforts of those who have continued to work against the odds in the hopes that someday this tainted system can again be a source of pride for all of us.

Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I am a strong supporter of campaign finance reform. I firmly believe that we must work to end the money chase and put power back in the hands of voters, not special interests. The political process should be a competition of ideas, not of checkbooks.

To this end, I am a co-sponsor of H.R. 493, the Shays-Meehan legislation which is the companion bill to the McCain-Feingold legislation introduced in the Senate, and also a co-sponsor of the Bipartisan Campaign Integrity Act of 1997, legislation introduced by both Democratic and Republican members of the current freshman class of Congress. In addition, I am one of 187 signatories to the discharge petition to force comprehensive campaign finance legislation to the floor for a vote.

Along with many of my Democratic colleagues, I have also signed two letters to Speaker GINGRICH and Chairman SOLOMON of the House Rules Committee to urge a fair and open bipartisan debate on campaign finance reform. Our Republican reform colleagues have also submitted similar letters to Speaker GINGRICH and Chairman SOLOMON.

Unfortunately, Republican Leadership has ignored our plea with its decision to bring bills today to the House floor under suspension of the rules, seriously jeopardizing their passage and tabling open discussion of campaign finance reform for the remainder of this Congress. For example, Republican Leadership is recommending passage of H.R. 3485 which would triple the amount of money individuals may contribute to federal candidates and political parties.

Placing these bills on the suspension calendar effectively precludes free and open debate on these bills from occurring on the House floor, which would include the option of considering the Shays-Meehan/McCain-Feingold bills, comprehensive legislation which is supported by legislators on both sides of the

aisle as well as by citizens groups serious about campaign finance reform.

This move on the part of the Republican Leadership reflects their desire to block the House from enacting true campaign finance reform and cheapens bipartisan efforts to address the concerns of American voters across the country who feel politics are unduly influenced by checkbooks. To restore voter confidence in the American electoral process, we need authentic, comprehensive campaign finance reform.

Reform-minded Republicans and Democrats alike have worked very hard to craft legislation that deals with the real issues behind campaign finance reform, such as banning soft money contributions and tightening up disclosure requirements. Partisan Republican Leadership should not be allowed to defeat our efforts with transparent political posturing such as bringing disingenuous legislation to the floor in the name of campaign finance reform.

Mr. EWING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the four bills on the floor to reform our campaign finance system. While I am a cosponsor of H.R. 2183, The Bipartisan Campaign Integrity Act of 1997, the legislation on the floor today would make many needed improvements. The campaign finance system needs to be reformed in order to improve public confidence and accountability in the system. The investigations of campaign finance abuses during the 1996 presidential campaign only serves to further the public's distrust and cynicism of our election system. However, new laws would not have prevented many of these abuses from occurring—the abuses occurred despite the laws already on the books. We need to ensure that the opportunity to violate the law is as limited as possible, and that when the law is broken, the responsible parties are swiftly punished. Today's debate is an important step in strengthening our democracy, and ensuring that continued violations of campaign finance laws are stopped.

While reform measures can benefit our political process, we must be careful not to compromise the free speech constitutional rights of voters, candidates and other participants in the system. I am concerned that some of the reform proposals seek to adopt public financing of congressional campaigns. Some measures advocate free television advertising for candidates, an unwarranted provision that is inevitably intended to lead to eventual taxpayer-funding of national elections. Further, legislation has been introduced which prohibits any PAC contributions to federal candidates, a very likely unconstitutional provision which would remove citizen's constitutionally guaranteed rights to free speech and to support groups that participate in public advocacy.

The campaign finance abuses that we have witnessed over the last few years could be all but eliminated by adopting two reform measures, and Congress has the opportunity to do just that today. The first is to ban the use of soft money by state and national political parties and federal candidates, and to ban the transfer of soft money between state and political parties. Unlike hard money (which can legally be accepted by a candidate or used by a party for political advocacy), soft money is raised outside the federal limits on campaign contributions, and can be used for such events like party building and voter registration drives, which were abused during the last election cycle. The current controversies over

illegal fundraising activities by the administration focus almost entirely on abuses in raising soft money. Soft money is not subject to any donation limits, meaning corporations, labor unions, and wealthy individuals can donate massive amounts of money to political parties, completely unregulated by the Federal Election Commission.

We also need to adopt measures requiring complete and immediate disclosure of campaign donations. Implementing a full disclosure policy will ensure that the public has quick access to candidates' campaign activities, which would also have greatly curbed the fundraising abuses of the last presidential campaign. The Campaign Reform and Election Integrity Act we are considering requires all contributions that a campaign receives within the last 20 days of an election to be reported within 24 hours, requires mandatory electronic filing for campaign committees which raise or spend more than \$50,000, and prohibits a candidate from accepting cash contributions greater than \$100. Further, the bill takes steps to curb the use of "push polls" by requiring a disclaimer on who is paying the expenses of a federal election poll and requires that the contributions and expenditures for non-publicized polls of more than 1,200 people and conducted within 90 days of the election to be reported to the FEC.

Congress has the opportunity to adopt rules that will require a corporation or labor union to obtain the written and voluntary consent of their employees or union members before removing from their pay any portion of their wages for political purposes. These reform measures also prohibit campaign contributions from individuals who are not United States citizens. Also, "issue advocacy" is a practice that has been prone to abuse, and the Campaign Reform and Election Integrity Act requires disclosure of all contributions and expenditures for communications that identify a federal candidate or political party within 90 days of the election.

We have the opportunity today to ban soft money, mandate full disclosure of campaign spending, require workers' consent to use their dues for political purposes, and ban non-citizen contributions to political campaigns. While we will never be able to eliminate the possibility of campaign abuses occurring, today's legislation would put in place campaign finance reforms that will greatly reduce the chance of future abuses, and that will make it extremely difficult to hide abuses of campaign law. Congress is faced with the task of reforming our campaign funding system so that public confidence in our democratic system is strengthened, but that at the same time protects citizens' basic constitutional free speech rights.

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Speaker, today we are considering legislation which addresses in part other issue of union dues being taken from workers without their consent and spent on activities which have nothing to do with legitimate collective bargaining activities.

I rise to point out that H.R. 1625, the Worker Paycheck Fairness Act, which the Committee on Education and the Workforce favorably reported to the House November 8, 1997, after six hearings the past two years in my Employer-Employee Relations Subcommittee, addresses the issue of compulsory union dues from a different perspective.

While H.R. 3485 would amend federal election campaign law to require written consent of

employees before funds could be taken from their paychecks to fund political activities, H.R. 1625 is a free-standing federal statute, also requiring written consent, but which focuses on the union security agreement, contains tough enforcement measures, provides for notice and disclosure to workers, and prohibits unions from retaliating against those exercising their rights under the statute. It is my hope that the House will consider H.R. 1625 later this year, perhaps in June, when the State of California will be voting on a similar initiative in its drive for fairness.

Indeed, decades ago Congress granted unions an extraordinary power—the power to require employees to give financial support to unions as a condition of employment. This mandate is called a union security agreement, and such agreements are currently legal in 29 states. Simply put, a union security agreement forces a worker to pay an agency fee to the union, or the worker has no right to work. The reason I introduced H.R. 1625 is because unions are diverting wages from employees working under such security agreements and spending it on activities having nothing to do with a union's legitimate activities.

In the six hearings I chaired on this issue during the past two Congresses, we heard from worker after worker telling us one thing they wanted from their union: "Give me the respect," they all said, "of asking me for my permission before you spend my money for purposes unrelated to your union obligations." Yes, most of these employees were upset over finding out their hard-earned dollars were being funneled into political causes or candidates they did not support. However, these employees supported their union and still overwhelmingly believe in the value of organized labor. A number of them were stewards in their union. All they want is to be able to give their consent before their union spends their money on activities which fall outside collective bargaining activities and which subvert their deeply held ideas and convictions.

At its simple core, H.R. 1625 is about common sense and basic fairness. It is not about trying to silence unions or interfere with the role they play in the political process. In fact, nothing in H.R. 1625 keeps unions from spending their money exactly as they currently do.

What H.R. 1625 does is grant to workers, union members and non-members alike, the ability to give their consent to unions before they direct workers' funds into activities that are not "core" union functions. H.R. 1625 is about implementing the spirit of the Supreme Court's Beck decision nearly a decade ago, which held that workers cannot be required to pay for activities beyond legitimate union functions. It is about the freedom of all men and women to make individual and informed choices about the political, social or charitable causes they support.

H.R. 1625 also requires employers whose employees are represented by a union to post a notice telling workers of their right under this legislation to give their prior consent. It also amends the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 to ensure that workers will know what their money is being spent on. Under this change, unions will have to report expenses by "functional classification" on the LM-forms they are currently required to file annually with the Department of Labor. This change was proposed by the Bush administra-

tion in 1992 but was done away with by the Clinton administration. H.R. 1625 also puts real enforcement into place, as those whose rights are violated would be entitled to double damages and attorney's fees and costs—similar to relief available under the Family and Medical Leave Act.

Finally, H.R. 1625 includes a common employment law provision making it illegal for a union to retaliate against or coerce anyone exercising their consent rights. This provision is intended to overrule the Fourth Circuit's 1991 Kidwell decision, a case arising under the Railway Labor Act, which has been interpreted by some to hold that a union can kick a member out of the union for exercising his or her Beck rights. H.R. 1625 applies to all employees—union members and non-members alike—and under it unions may not discriminate against any worker for giving, or not giving, their consent.

Some say the current system is working fine and no changes are needed because workers already have the right under the Supreme Court's Beck decision to opt-out of paying non-collective bargaining fees under a union security agreement. To them I say two things. First, the current system absolutely is not working. As my six hearings have shown, individuals attempting to exercise their rights under current law often face incredible burdens, including harassment, coercion, and intimidation. Second, no one would argue that just because the Supreme Court has issued decisions regarding racial or gender discrimination, or on the rights of handicapped children to a quality public education, that Congress was somehow precluded from passing legislation addressing due process concerns guaranteeing such rights. The current system is badly broken, and it is our responsibility to fix it.

It is my strong belief that equity and fairness in the area of compulsory union dues would become a reality under H.R. 1625, and it is my hope that the House of Representatives will consider this legislation this June.

Mr. HINOJOSA, today we are scheduled to debate what is purported to be campaign finance reform. If only that were the case. Sadly, it is not.

When I ran for this office I said I wanted to see substantive change. I, in fact, co-sponsored a bipartisan bill to bring about such change. It is a measure which would ban soft money and take the biggest of the big money out of the political system. It would replace unregulated, million dollar contributions with limited, hard money contributions. It also would require advocacy groups to disclose their identify and expenditures when they run advertisements to affect a political race. Tough new candidate disclosure provisions are also part of the bill.

But what is before us today does not bear any semblance to this solid package. What is before us is a bill that locks average citizens out of the political process, and gives even greater influence to big money contributors. Americans want less money in politics, not more.

Simply put, this bill is not genuine campaign finance reform. And what is even more onerous is that this bill has been placed on the suspension calendar, a procedural tactic effectively blocking the House from having a free and open debate that allows consideration of alternative measures. I have brought with me

an article printed in this past Saturday's New York Times which I would like to have inserted into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD elaborating on this sham, and which I find to be nothing less than a total disregard for public interest.

The opportunity that should be before us today is one to make the system better. That is what the public wants and that is what we need to do. However, the legislation before us will do nothing more than preserve the status quo. It is egregious, to say the least. That is why I cannot vote for this package. The status quo must be changed and I will continue to fight instead for real campaign reform, so that Congress responds to the needs of all Americans, not just those who are able to contribute the most money.

HOUSE G.O.P. SHIFTS ON CAMPAIGN BILLS
VOTE SET FOR NEXT WEEK, BUT NOT ON THE
MAIN BIPARTISAN PROPOSAL

(By Steven A. Holmes)

WASHINGTON, March 27.—Abruptly shifting gears, the House Republican leadership announced today that it would take up four campaign finance bills on Monday—but not the main bipartisan bill, which would not be allowed to the floor.

The four measures would be considered on a special calendar under which they could not be amended and would require a nearly insurmountable two-thirds vote to pass. These rules are usually reserved for non-controversial legislative items like resolutions honoring a group or an individual.

The announcement was made by Representative Dick Armey, the Texas Republican and majority leader, and was the latest twist in efforts to overhaul campaign finance. Democrats and some moderate Republicans responded with indignation.

Among them was Representative Martin T. Meehan, the Massachusetts Democrat who is co-sponsoring the bipartisan bill with Representative Christopher Shays, Republican of Connecticut.

"I cannot believe the total disregard for the public interest that we have seen this afternoon," Mr. Meehan said, "It's an absolute outrage. I have never seen it this bad before."

In November, Speaker Newt Gingrich, hoping to secure enough votes from Republican centrists to adjourn the House, promised a vote on campaign finance legislation by the end of March. In announcing plans to vote on the four bills, Mr. Armey said the Republican leadership was fulfilling the commitment made by Mr. Gingrich, a Georgia Republican.

Christina Martin, his press secretary, explained the decision this way: "Today, in an elected leadership meeting, it became clear that there were a number of members who had informed their constituents that there would be a vote on campaign finance before Easter, regardless of their stance on the issue. Therefore, they wanted the promise fulfilled."

House Republican leadership is fiercely opposed to the Shays-Meehan proposal, which is similar to one sponsored in the Senate by John McCain, an Arizona Republican, and Russell D. Feingold, a Wisconsin Democrat. The House bipartisan proposal would restrict so-called issue ads, which often skirt campaign rules by focusing on candidates, and ban the unlimited and unregulated donations that corporations, unions and individuals give to political parties for general activities, not for specific candidate elections.

The Shays-Meehan bill would not have gained the two-thirds vote to pass if it had been included on the special calendar. But the Republican decision to exclude the bill in the package to be voted on next week eliminated not only the possibility of a test vote

showing that it could obtain a majority but also campaign television commercials singling out Republicans who voted against the Shays-Meehan proposal.

The Republican leadership's maneuver provoked the unusual scene on the House floor today as Democrats stepped back to allow some Republicans to direct sharp questions at their own leaders.

For several minutes, Mr. Shays mordantly questioned Mr. Armev on how he could call the new approach a fair and open debate. To question Mr. Armev, Mr. Shays had to ask the opposition Democrats to yield some of their speaking time. Each time he made the request, the Democrats complied, producing the legislative version of holding Mr. Shays's coat while he did the fighting.

"I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut," Representative Vic Fazio, Democrat of California, said eagerly as Mr. Shays pressed the majority leader. "I'm more than happy to yield."

The House leadership's maneuver came just a day after the Republicans abandoned their plans to vote this week on campaign legislation. The vote was put off because enough Republicans were leaning toward the Shays-Meehan bill that it threatened to pass on a procedural motion. The Republican rebellion showed that the bill could very likely have achieved a majority.

But the decision to kill any vote on campaign finance until after the House recess, which begins next mid-week, did not sit well with some members of the Republican leadership, said senior aides. Some Republicans did not want to be left vulnerable to criticism from Democrats and some moderate Republicans.

Thursday's decision provoked a group of conservative Democrats to press a petition that would allow a number of campaign finance bills, including the Shays-Meehan proposal, to be considered. The petition is about 30 signatures short of the necessary 188 needed to bring it to the floor.

One of the Democrats, Scotty Baesler of Kentucky, said he wanted "to challenge those who say they are for campaign reform to fish or cut bait."

Although Mr. Shays and Mr. Meehan cannot block the leadership's plans for Monday, they signaled that it would bolster the efforts by Mr. Baesler and others to collect enough signatures for the petition.

Mr. Shays offered this assessment: "I think every Democrat and every reform-minded Republican would want to sign a discharge petition that allows for a free and open debate on campaign."

Of the four bills to be considered on Monday, one would ban the national political parties from receiving the unlimited donations to the national political parties, known as soft money, but would still allow state parties to use such contributions for Federal candidates. The bill includes a number of other elements that are certain to provoke opposition from Democrats.

The second bill would prohibit noncitizens from contributing to political campaigns. The third bill, which is opposed by Democrats but embraced by many Republicans, would require labor unions to seek permission from members to spend their dues on political activity. The fourth bill, which might receive a two-thirds majority, would expand reporting and disclosure requirements for campaign contributions.

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker the campaign finance reform legislation we are considering today, and the process by which we reached this point is a complete sham and a fraud. The Republican leadership of the House of Representatives is engaged in a purely partisan attempt to kill campaign finance reform. As

was illustrated by the debate last Friday, the scheduling of this bill took place without any consultation with the Democrats or even with moderate Republicans who are committed to reform. With the scheduling of reform under "Suspension of the Rules", which requires the support of 2/3 of Congress to pass, it is guaranteed that campaign reform will fail.

It is clear that a bipartisan majority of this House supports campaign finance reform. The delay of the vote from last week, and now the parliamentary tricks the leadership is using today, show the lengths the Republican leadership will go to kill campaign finance reform.

For the past year I have worked with my fellow freshman members on the Bipartisan Campaign Finance Reform task force. Our group came up with a strong, bipartisan bill that had no poison pills. No one from our group was consulted in scheduling this vote. Representatives CHRIS SHAYS and MARTY MEEHAN have been working in a bipartisan manner for more than three years to craft a campaign finance reform bill. They were not consulted in scheduling this vote. The members who are committed to changing the status quo have been shut out by the leadership in favor of those who want to increase the amount of money in the campaign system.

For the second time this year, the will of the majority to pass meaningful campaign finance reform has been denied. In the U.S. Senate, a majority of Senators supported the McCain-Feingold reform bill, but because of a Senate rule, 60 votes were needed to pass the bill. Now in the House, through the creative use of legislative tactics, the leadership is on its way to defeating reform legislation.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to end this deception and allow an honest vote on campaign finance reform. The House Republican leadership's attempts to deny the will of the majority and kill campaign finance reform is a black mark on this House. The only way to restore the faith of the public in their elected officials is by reforming our broken system. This is a sad day for our democratic process.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my outrage at the manner in which the Republican leadership has decided to bring campaign reform to the House floor and my opposition to the bills we are considering tonight.

Mr. Speaker, despite the well-remembered handshake with the President in New Hampshire, despite promises last fall that the House would have a full, fair debate this spring on reforming the way political campaigns are financed, the process your side has contrived goes in the opposite direction. Procedures that were designed to speed passage of non-controversial legislation are being bent to prevent passage of any meaningful reform.

Under the suspension procedures the Republicans have decided to use, each of the four bills being presented today will receive only twenty minutes of debate on each side. None can be amended unless by the bill's manager. To pass, each must gain two-thirds of the votes, not the usual majority, making passage virtually impossible.

Moreover, even though there is visible bipartisan interest in campaign finance reform, and even though several bipartisan bills have been introduced, the content of the four bills comes entirely from the Republican side. Democrats were simply not part of the process.

H.R. 3582, the so-called "Campaign Reform and Election Integrity Act", is far and away the worst bill of the bunch because it contains so many outrages. It is appropriate that the Republicans call this "Campaign Reform" instead of "Campaign Finance Reform", because it would vastly increase—double or even triple—the amounts of money that wealthy special interests could pour into political campaigns and political parties.

At the same time, its Worker Gag Rule provisions would silence working men and women by making union political activity subject to an expensive and cumbersome approval process. And political activity is defined so broadly that it would even keep unions from educating their members about legislation that could directly affect their health, safety, pensions, or bargaining rights.

It would continue the Republicans' recent string of immigrant-bashing measures in two ways:

It would prohibit non-citizen legal residents from contributing to federal campaigns—which, since they cannot vote, is the only way they can exercise their First Amendment rights and participate in the political system. I'm not aware of any legal barrier to felons contributing to candidates, although a candidate might think twice about accepting such a contribution. But legal permanent residents, who work, pay taxes, serve in the military, and spend their lives under our laws, would be silenced by this bill.

Moreover, the bill would establish a voter citizenship verification pilot program in the five states with the largest immigrant populations—a provision explicitly designed to harass and intimidate Hispanic and other ethnic voters by threatening would-be voters who look or sound "foreign" with investigation. It certainly can't be intended to actually verify anyone's citizenship, because the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) and the Social Security Administration (SSA) have said their records and databases are not complete or up-to-date enough to be used for that purpose. It can only be meant to intimidate and suppress minority voters.

Mr. Speaker, these are only a couple of the flaws in this bill, but the bottom line is that the process is outrageous. Members of this House, and the people we represent, have the right to full and open debate and votes on the range of proposals for reforming the campaign finance system. This is not that debate and the major reform proposals are left entirely out.

I intend to vote against all of these bills tonight and I will work to win the 218 signatures needed to free the discharge petition that would bring the various campaign finance reform proposals to the floor. I urge my colleagues to vote against these bills and to sign the discharge petition so we can finally engage in fair and open debate, with votes, on meaningful campaign finance reform.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, in one of the most outrageous, cynical, and arrogant displays I have seen in my long service in the Congress the Republican leadership put the bill H.R. 3485, the Campaign Reform Election Integrity Act, on the floor today under suspension of the rules.

This procedure allows no amendments, and only forty minutes of debate.

This is one of the most important issues in the Nation today.

Americans are being alienated by the deluge of money entering our political system and being alienated from their government and our political system by practices they believe are corrupting our entire political system.

I cannot and will not vote for bad legislation protected by a gag rule and outrageous procedure, without opportunity for either debate or amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOLEY). All time has expired.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3582.

The question was taken.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

□ 2000

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOLEY). Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I, the Chair will now put the question on each motion to suspend the rules on which further proceedings were postponed earlier today in the order in which that motion was entertained.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 3581, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 34, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 2608, by the yeas and nays; and

H.R. 3582, by the yeas and nays.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first such vote in this series.

CAMPAIGN REFORM AND ELECTION INTEGRITY ACT OF 1998

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 3581.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3581, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were— yeas 74, nays 337, answered "present" 1, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 81]

YEAS—74

Archer	Ehrlich	Hayworth
Bachus	English	Herger
Ballenger	Ewing	Hill
Bartlett	Fawell	Hilleary
Bass	Fowler	Horn
Bryant	Fox	Hulshof
Buyer	Frelinghuysen	Hutchinson
Camp	Gilcrest	Kasich
Campbell	Gillmor	Kingston
Castle	Goss	Kolbe
Chambliss	Granger	Livingston
Coburn	Greenwood	Lucas
Cook	Gutknecht	McCollum
Duncan	Hansen	McKeon

Metcalf	Sanford
Mica	Scarborough
Miller (FL)	Schaefer, Dan
Petri	Sensenbrenner
Porter	Shadegg
Pryce (OH)	Shimkus
Radanovich	Shuster
Rogan	Smith (MI)
Rohrabacher	Souder
Roukema	Spence
Salmon	Sununu

NAYS—337

Abercrombie	Edwards
Ackerman	Ehlers
Aderholt	Emerson
Allen	Engel
Andrews	Ensign
Armey	Eshoo
Baesler	Etheridge
Baker	Evans
Baldacci	Everett
Barcia	Farr
Barr	Fattah
Barrett (NE)	Fazio
Barrett (WI)	Filner
Barton	Foley
Bateman	Forbes
Becerra	Ford
Bentsen	Fossella
Berman	Frank (MA)
Berry	Franks (NJ)
Bilbray	Frost
Bilirakis	Furse
Bishop	Galleghy
Blagojevich	Ganske
Blumenauer	Gejdenson
Blunt	Gekas
Boehkert	Gephardt
Boehner	Gibbons
Bonilla	Gilman
Bonior	Goode
Borski	Goodlatte
Boswell	Goodling
Boucher	Gordon
Boyd	Graham
Brady	Green
Brown (CA)	Gutierrez
Brown (FL)	Hall (OH)
Brown (OH)	Hall (TX)
Bunning	Hamilton
Burr	Harman
Burton	Hastert
Callahan	Hastings (FL)
Calvert	Hastings (WA)
Canady	Hefley
Capps	Hefner
Carson	Hilliard
Chabot	Hinche
Chenoweth	Hinojosa
Christensen	Hobson
Clay	Hoekstra
Clayton	Holden
Clement	Hooley
Clyburn	Hostettler
Collins	Houghton
Combest	Hoyer
Condit	Hyde
Conyers	Inglis
Costello	Istook
Coyne	Jackson (IL)
Cramer	Jackson-Lee
Crane	(TX)
Crapo	Jenkins
Cubin	John
Cummings	Johnson (CT)
Cunningham	Johnson (WI)
Danner	Johnson, E. B.
Davis (FL)	Johnson, Sam
Davis (IL)	Jones
Davis (VA)	Kanjorski
Deal	Kaptur
DeFazio	Kelly
DeGette	Kennedy (MA)
DeLahunt	Kennedy (RI)
DeLauro	Kennelly
DeLay	Kildee
Deutsch	Kilpatrick
Diaz-Balart	Kind (WI)
Dickey	King (NY)
Dicks	Kleckza
Dingell	Klink
Dixon	Klug
Doggett	Knollenberg
Doyle	Knovich
Dreier	LaFalce
Dunn	LaHood
	Lampson
	Lantos

Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Thorton
Reyes
Watkins
Waldon (FL)
Waldon (PA)
Weller
White

Rahall
Ramstad
Redmond
Regula
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogers
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryun
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaffer, Bob
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sessions
Shaw

Shays
Sherman
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Adam
Smith, Linda
Snowbarger
Snyder
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Talent
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)

Thompson
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Torres
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Walsh
Wamp
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Wexler
Weygand
Whitfield
Wicker
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Kim

NOT VOTING—18

Bereuter	Cox	Rangel
Bliley	Gonzalez	Riggs
Cannon	Hunter	Royce
Cardin	Jefferson	Solomon
Coble	McCarthy (MO)	Waters
Cooksey	Payne	Yates

□ 2219

Mrs. CUBIN, and Messrs. GIBBONS, PICKERING, EVERETT, RYUN, WICKER, BARRETT of Nebraska, and RILEY changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. FOX of Pennsylvania, SMITH of Michigan, and WELDON of Pennsylvania changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOLEY). Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5, rule I, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device may be taken on each additional motion to suspend the rules on which the Chair has postponed further proceedings.

ILLEGAL FOREIGN CONTRIBUTIONS ACT OF 1998

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 34, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 34, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 369, nays 43, answered "present" 1, not voting 17, as follows: