implemented, even every-day household products like garden-hose fasteners and window fixtures could be forced to comply with the additional burdens of the Act. Furthermore, the automotive industry projects the cost of compliance for the motor vehicle industry could be greater than $300 million a year without necessarily enhancing vehicle safety.

As Chairman of the Committee on Science, I have pledged to hold additional hearings on the issue beginning next month. Technology Subcommittee Chairwoman MORELLA will again take the lead on these important hearings, and I would like to thank her for all her support and hard work to date on this important issue. We may find that changes in the fastener manufacturing process have diminished the need for the Fastener Quality Act. H.R. 3824 will give us the time needed to ensure that costly and redundant regulations do not go into force.

H.R.3824 passed the House by voice vote on June 16, 1998. It has wide bipartisan support and has been endorsed by several business associations, including the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. As the Chamber concludes in their endorsement letter, ''H.R. 3824 * * * is an important step to help ensure that America's manufacturing economy and consumers are not harmed by outdated or unnecessary regulations''.

I strongly urge all my colleagues to support this common-sense legislation.

Mr. BARCIA. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I want to indicate that the minority has been consulted on this unanimous consent request and that we have no objection to its consideration.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support swift passage of H.R. 3824 so that it may be sent immediately to the President and enacted into law before the October 25th implementation date for the Fastener Quality Act regulations.

As chairwoman of the Technology Subcommittee which has held a hearing to examine the Fastener Quality Act and Aviation Manufacturing, I can report that there is consensus among the aviation industry, FAA and NIST that a federal quality assurance process already exists to certify the quality and safety of proprietary fasteners manufactured or altered specifically for use by aviation manufacturers. Adding another set of federal regulations and involving another federal agency in that process would hinder the efficiency of aviation manufacturing and add to the costs of production, while potentially degrading the level of safety currently provided by the FAA.

In addition to addressing issues raised about the Fastener Quality Act's impact on the aviation industry, I am pleased H.R. 3824 also includes an amendment that I offered during the Science Committee's mark-up of the legislation to delay the implementation of the Fastener Quality Act's regulations on all other industries until no earlier than June of 1999. The extra time will allow Congress to review the industries affected by the Fastener Quality Act and determine what changes to the Act may be needed.

Without the delay in implementation of the regulations, several industries—including the automotive manufacturing industry—may suffer production delays that will impede product delivery and increase costs. As we all know, increases in production costs result in job-layoffs and higher prices charged to consumers.

As Chairman SENSENBRENNER mentioned, the Technology Subcommittee plans to hold another hearing on this subject after the August recess. As chairwoman of the Subcommittee, I will continue to work with NIST, the automotive manufacturers and other industries impacted by the Fastener Quality Act to avoid promulgating costly regulations which are unnecessarily burdensome.

I would like to thank Chairman SENSENBRENNER and Technology Ranking Member BARCIA for their important work on this critical measure. I urge all my colleagues to support this important legislation.

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3824, a bill amending the Fastener Quality Act. The Committee on Commerce was named as an additional committee of jurisdiction on this bill and has had a longstanding interest in the issue of fastener quality and the Fastener Quality Act. This interest goes back to the 100th Congress, at which time the Committee undertook an investigation of counterfeit and substandard fasteners. This investigation resulted in the issuance of a unanimously approved Subcommittee report entitled ''The Threat from Substandard Fasteners: Is America Losing Its Grip?'' which ultimately led to the approval by our respective committees of the Fastener Quality Act of 1990.

H.R. 3824, as approved by the House, would amend the Fastener Quality act in two ways. First, the bill exempts fasteners approved for use in aircraft by the Federal Aviation Administration from the requirements of the Act. Secondly, it delays implementation of the final regulations until the Secretary of Commerce and the Congress have had an opportunity to consider developments in manufacturing and quality assurance techniques since the law was enacted.

During the consideration of the bill by the other body, the study to be conducted by the Secretary of Commerce was amended to include an analysis of other regulatory programs which cover fasteners and the extent to which there may be duplication between the Fastener Quality Act and those programs. The elimination of duplicative programs is an important and worthwhile goal, and the Committee on Commerce has no objections so that amendment.

It is my understanding that the Secretary of Commerce has delayed the implementation of the rules promulgated pursuant to the Fastener Quality Act in anticipation of this legislation. Because of the importance of this bill, and the cooperation of Chairman SENSENBRENNER in addressing our concerns throughout the process, the Committee on Commerce has chosen not to exercise its rights to separate consideration of the measure. However, we have been involved throughout the House's consideration of the legislation, and would urge its adoption.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that H.R. 3842 should be sent to the President for his signature, and urge my colleagues support this bill as well.

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

There was no objection.

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

There was no objection.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 3824.

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

There was no objection.

BIPARTISAN CAMPAIGN INTEGRITY ACT OF 1997

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GOODLATTE). Pursuant to House Resolution 442 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2183.

□ 1009

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2183) to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to reform the financing of campaigns for elections for Federal office, and for other purposes, with Mr. EWING (Chairman pro tempore) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. When the Committee of the Whole House rose on Monday, August 3, 1998, amendment No. 13 by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) had been disposed of.

Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, August 5, 1998, no further amendment is in order except the following amendments:

Amendment No. 15 by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. TIERNEY), debatable before offered for 40 minutes; amendment No. 7 by the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR) debatable before offered for 40 minutes; amendment No. 5 by the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLITTLE) debatable before offered for 40 minutes; amendment No. 4 by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) debatable before offered for 40 minutes; and amendment No. 8 by the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON) debatable before offered for 60 minutes.

Each amendment may be offered only in the order stated and shall not be subject to amendment. The additional period of general debate prescribed under House Resolution 442 shall not exceed the time stated for each amendment pursuant to the order of the House and each amendment shall not otherwise be debatable.

Pursuant to the order of the House of the legislative day of Wednesday, August 5, 1998, it is now in order to debate

the subject matter of the amendment printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as No. 15.

Pursuant to House Resolution 442 and that order, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. TIERNEY) and a Member opposed will each control 20 minutes.

The chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. TIERNEY).

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I voted for the Shays-Meehan bill. I view that passage as one step in the right direction, an important step but a step toward where we need to end up. I voted for the Shays-Meehan bill because it will eliminate soft money and the influence of soft money but it still, even after passage, preserves an element of the status quo and the current way that we do business.

The Tierney substitute amendment proposes an alternative to the private money changes. It is called the clean money option. It is an approach that has already been passed into law in the State of Vermont by its legislature there and by the main ballot referendum.

Under a clean money system, a candidate who agrees to forego private contributions including his or her own and accept spending limits receives a limited allocation to run their campaign from publicly financed clean elections funds. It is not a blank check. Participating candidates must meet all local ballot qualification requirements and gather a significant number of $5 contributions from the voters they seek to represent.

Clean money campaign reform is both simple to understand and sweeping in scope. It is a voluntary system that meets the test of constitutionality under the Supreme Court's ruling in Buckley versus Valeo. It effectively provides a fair playing field for all candidates who are able to demonstrate a substantial base of popular support. It strengthens American democracy by returning political power to the ballot box.

Few of the other approaches currently under debate come close to the comprehensive solution because they all preserve a central role for private money. What sets the clean money campaign reform apart is that it attacks the root cause of the crisis that is perceived in our system, namely a system founded on private money that comes from a small fraction of the electorate and is dominated by wealthy special interests.

As elected public officials, we should be seen only to owe our allegiance to the people who sent us here, not the largest campaign contributors. It comes down to this, Mr. Chairman: Who should be perceived to own the office that we serve, the public- or the private-money interests?

The public gets it. They know what needs to be done. Various clean-money campaign reform bill ballot initiatives and grassroots movements are now in motion in more than 3 dozen communities. If we cannot act here in Washington to change the system, the voters will increasingly do it for us, Mr. Chairman. So we should all get ready because it is happening in our respective states.

This proposal is sweeping in its breadth and it deserves full deliberation and full debate. It could benefit from the input of the Members of this Congress on both sides of the aisle. It is unfortunate, Mr. Chairman, that we did not get a chance to go through full committee hearings to have the full input of this body so that we could make sure that we have the complete support. And we all saw how much work was done and the belaboring that had to be completed just to get the Shays-Meehan aspect through this Congress.

Mr. Chairman, Shays-Meehan is a part of this bill, but we need to do more. The commission in Shays-Meehan, hopefully, will allow us to address this, to observe the work that is done in the communities, and move forward.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY) opposed to the amendment?

Mr. NEY. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY) is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. NEY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS).

□ 1015

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I voted for the Shays-Meehan bill. I did so because it goes a long way towards moving us in the direction of cleaning up our campaigns. But it really did not go far enough, and the level of confidence is so low that we need to go for the jugular. Tierney goes much further. In order to clean up, we need to seriously take some of the money out of politics, provide some public financing for all Federal campaigns, set a limit on Federal candidates' use of personal funds, provide voters with enough unfiltered information so that they can make rational decisions that are informed, shorten the election cycle, create a truly independent regulatory agency to monitor campaigns and elections, require paid lobbyists to publicly report who and when they lobby, create a universal voter registration system, and require full disclosure of all independent expenditures. As I indicated, I voted for Shays-Meehan but I think we need to go for the jugular and really clean up our elections. I support the Tierney substitute. It goes much further.

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I strongly agree that campaign finance reform must be passed by this House and this Congress and I remain committed to working with my colleagues to ensure swift passage of the Shays-Meehan bill. The present campaign finance system is a blot on our democracy. In fact, if it is not tamed, if we do not fix this broken system, future historians may write that American democracy had a good 200-year run but then like Roman democracy it evolved into an oligarchy. We must fix this.

The public already believes, partly correctly, that this House does the bidding mainly of the special interests and the big money people and that the little people, the ordinary people, cannot really affect what we do. There is more than an element of truth to that. The Shays-Meehan bill is a great and essential step, but it is limited. It deals with the soft money plague, it deals with the sham issue ads that advocate for a candidate or against a candidate, but if we pass the Shays-Meehan bill, as I believe it is essential that we do, it will reform us all the way back to 1992 when I first came here and we were talking about the great need for campaign finance reform.

Mr. Chairman, this substitute cleans up the system. It says for those who opt into it, we are not giving an advantage to candidates of great personal wealth or who sell themselves out to the special interests or to incumbents. We are going to level the playing field. Everyone will get a free frank and cheap TV ads and public financing; almost complete, limited amount but almost complete public financing for the campaign. That is the only way to change our system from what it is becoming, a system of one dollar, one vote, back to what it was supposed to be, a system of one person, one vote. We have to give challengers a real chance at incumbents. We have to make sure that we do not lock in incumbents, millionaires or celebrities. We have to restore democracy to this great country and preserve our democracy. I submit that ultimately we will have to do this. This is the best way to do it. I urge support for the clean money substitute which will also be on the ballot in New York this year. I assume that we will become the next city and State to advance this cause.

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER).

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Chairman, I certainly commend the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. TIERNEY) as a freshman member of this House for the wonderful work he has done in advancing the cause of cleaning up the campaign finance system. I want to call particular attention to his provisions that provide free television time for candidates. This is a cause that I have long championed. The gentleman from Massachusetts' provisions and my own bill start from a fundamental and well-established premise that the Nation's airwaves belong to the American people. The measure would require broadcast stations as a condition of licensing to provide free television time in modest amounts for political candidates.

The reasoning behind the free television time is simple. In the past election season, spending levels for Federal elections shattered all previous records, and broadcast advertising is the single most expensive factor in Federal elections. House candidates spend more than a quarter of their total campaign funds on broadcast advertising. The figure last year was closer to two-thirds.

In 1972, political candidates spent $25 million on television commercials. In 1996, they spent $400 million, an astonishing increase. These dramatic increases in the price of advertising time are the major cause of the spiraling cost of running for office in our country and the ensuing money chase. Given the vast sums of money required to run for office, wealthy individuals have a significant advantage over the ordinary citizen candidate. That is hardly representative government. The cost of running for political office in America has simply become too high.

The time for this legislation has come, Mr. Chairman. Last year broadcasters received a windfall in the form of a whole new spectrum of digital TV channels. In light of this gift and the huge new revenue sources it will open up, these stations can certainly afford to give a little back in the name of the public interest and in the public good. All we are really asking them to do is very little.

I urge my colleagues' support for this measure.

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY).

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Chairman, to my mind the real strength of this democracy lies in the fact that every citizen, regardless of their circumstances, has the opportunity to participate fully in the electoral process, including the opportunity to run for office. And that includes, of course, the Congress of the United States. Unfortunately that principle works more in theory than it does in practice under the present set of circumstances. That is why campaign finance reform is so critically important and that is why this particular approach to reforming the way we finance our campaigns, that which is offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts, is so much to the point. Because it provides that opportunity for every citizen in a real sense. Under the provisions of this legislation, should it become law, people could run for the Congress regardless of how well or poorly connected they might be. Under the provisions of this bill, people do not have to have personal fortunes or be able to raise huge amounts of money in order to finance political campaigns. This legislation provides the financial wherewithal for even those of the most modest means who are capable and interested in participating in the public process to do so and to run for public office and to make a real, substantial contribution. It realizes fully and completely, more so perhaps than at any other time in our history the full potential of the democratic process, by making every citizen eligible. It frees candidates and elected officials alike of the drudgery and the demeaning process of having to raise enormous amounts of money in order to finance campaigns. This is real campaign finance reform. It is what we need to open up this process. Among other things, it requires that the public means of discourse in our country, principally radio and television, are made available to all candidates equitably and openly. I support this bill. I hope others will, too. It is real campaign finance reform. It will do the job in a meaningful and complete and comprehensive way.

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER).

(Mr. MILLER of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Tierney amendment for clean campaigns. I want to commend the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) who is here on the floor this morning and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN) for all of their efforts to pass the Shays-Meehan bill. It is a historic step in campaign finance reform, it is a historic step for this House to pass it and hopefully in September the Senate will find the courage to do the same and the President will sign that bill. But even after the signing of that bill and that historic reform, we are still left with the system that requires the addiction of politicians to special interest money. We are still left with the system where Members of the House of Representatives and Members of the Senate are required every day to go to the Republican headquarters or to the Democratic headquarters and get on the phone and call people they do not know who represent special interests and ask them for $1,000 or $5,000 to fund their campaigns, then come back here when the bell sounds for a vote and vote for or against those very same parties. Nobody in America believes that that is a pure system. Nobody in America believes that that is a system without conflicts of interest. And nobody in America believes that that is a system that is not corroding and not corrupting the democratic principles of the House of Representatives and of the United States Senate of this country. That is why we have got to take the next step. We have got to take the next step toward clean money and clean campaigns. That is what the Tierney legislation does. That is what the people of Vermont and the people of Maine have said they want. They want to break this link between special interest contributions and the phone calls that their members in the State legislatures had to make and all of the visits and all of the parties to raise this special interest money. They said, ''We had rather put up our own money and make sure you're working for us as opposed to the special interests.'' That is what the Tierney legislation does. I want to commend the gentleman from Massachusetts for his effort on this legislation.

People will tell you that you can never have public financing of campaigns, that the public will never go for it. What makes them think the public is going for the system we have today? Every campaign cycle, we raise more and more money from the special interests and every campaign cycle we spend more and more money on the elections, and every campaign cycle fewer and fewer Americans show up to vote, because they do not believe it is on the level. They do not believe that challengers have a chance. They do not believe that the incumbents are listening to them. They do not believe when people are elected to office that they represent them. They believe that they represent the $1,000 contributor, the $5,000 contributor, the $100,000 contributor. They are not too far wrong. That is why we need the clean campaign, clean money bill. That is why we need to break this addiction to special interest money and that is why we need the Tierney bill. I want to commend the gentleman for having the courage to offer this legislation.

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN).

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to thank my colleague from Massachusetts, another outstanding member of the freshman class dedicated to reform, for offering this alternative. In a perfect world, the Congress would pass a measure like the Tierney substitute. The Tierney proposal would provide full public subsidies as well as free broadcast time to Federal candidates. If you really look at our election system to the extent that we are able to reduce the amount of private money and remove private money from elections and instead have public funding, that is the cleanest way to have an election.

The other thing that is critical with this proposal is the fact that it looks at broadcast time. If we look around the country, it is obvious to see that the reason congressional campaigns and Senate campaigns and presidential campaigns are increasing, the costs are increasing dramatically, it is because of television time. One of the things that my partner from Connecticut in working on our legislation, the Shays-Meehan bill, one of the things that we worked on with trying to get in our comprehensive bill was a way to get incentives for people to agree to spending caps and provide incentives by cutting the cost of television. So I think my colleague from Massachusetts gets directly at the heart of what is corrupting campaigns in America.

I think in a more perfect Congress, all campaign finance proposals would include a public financing element, because only when we take this private

money out of the system will the ties between money and legislating be conclusively severed.

My colleague's substitute is also important because I think it highlights the importance of the commission made in order by the Shays-Meehan bill. There are a lot of great ideas in this House of Representatives for changes we ought to make in our campaign finance system. Added by an amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), two other heroes of reform in this Congress, the commission provision of the Shays-Meehan bill will give the Congress an opportunity to consider other important reform proposals like the Tierney proposal for public financing, for free air time and for all of the proposals that we think may help to lessen the influence of special interests in congressional elections across this country.

I know that my friend from Massachusetts has worked diligently within the freshman class on campaign finance reform. I want to say, there are so many freshman Members of this House, so many who have been so dedicated to campaign finance reform, I want to make it clear, we would not be where we are today, on the verge of passing historic campaign finance reform, if it were not for the efforts of the gentleman from Massachusetts and the other freshman Members from throughout this country who have stood with us, stood with us on reform, worked with us on proposals, supported the Shays-Meehan legislation and made it a priority.

□ 1030

Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague for his commitment on this issue.

Mr. NEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Chairman I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I want to just associate myself with all the remarks of the colleagues who spoke previously on this issue. I want to say that this is what the clean-money, clean-election bill essentially does. It eliminates the perceived and the real conflicts of interest caused by the direct financing of campaigns with private interests. It limits campaign spending. It allows qualified individuals to run for office regardless of their own personal economic status or their access to large contributors. It frees candidates and elected officials from the burden of continuous fund-raising. And it shortens the effective length of the campaigns and deceases the cost of campaigns by forcing the broadcasters to step forward with their responsibility in return for the large amounts of spectrum they receive for very little contribution on their side. It rids of the system of the disfavored soft money. It is voluntary, giving incentives for people to get involved with the system and making sure that people find out the better alternative. It leaves no one unilaterally disarmed. It simply puts a fair playing out there, and the public gets back its elective process. The best organized candidates with the best messages win, and so do the voters.

That said, Mr. Chairman, I understand, as the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN) said, this is not a perfect world. In a perfect world this bill would come before this body, would be deliberated fully, would get the imprint of all the Members, would be perfected and would be passed, and it would become the law of this land. But right now we all saw the effort it took to get Shays-Meehan forward, and we will not in any way be seen as stepping in the path of that. We are going to make sure that Shays-Meehan goes through this House, that it gets brought over to the other body, that hopefully public opinion, individuals, as well as editorial boards, will hold them to the process of this year passing at least the Shays-Meehan ban on soft money and further disclosure for fair elections. That part will go, and then hopefully the commission under the Shays-Meehan bill will make sure that we get a chance to go where the public already is on this.

Let me close, Mr. Chairman, if I would, with the words of the late senator from Arizona, Barry Goldwater. He said:

> The fact that liberty depended on honest elections was of the utmost importance of the patriots who founded our Nation and wrote the Constitution. They knew that corruption destroyed the prime requisite of constitutional liberty, an independent legislator free from any influence other than that of the people. Applying these principles to modern times we can make the following conclusions. To be successful representative government assumes that the elections will be controlled by the citizenry at large, not by those who give the most money. Electors must believe their vote counts. Elected officials must owe their allegiance to the people, not to their own wealth or to the wealth of interest groups who speak only for the selfish fringes of the whole community.

Mr. Chairman, we should all stand behind those words, we should all move Shays-Meehan forward, we should then have the commission look at other alternatives like this Canady substitute amendment. This body, which has such genius within it, should look those terms over, add its comments to it and improve this bill and perfect it so that we have a vehicle that reflects what the people in this country want, which is clean elections with clean money and not beholden to special interests.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the colleague from Ohio, and I thank all of my colleagues for speaking on this, and with the Chair's indulgence I look forward to passing Shays-Meehan through this House, through the Senate and having it become law, and in future years, Mr. Chairman, I look forward to us getting to where the public already is, clean money, clean elections.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. EWING). Does the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. TIERNEY) intend not to offer his amendment?

Mr. TIERNEY. Yes, Mr. Chairman, for the reasons stated we will not be seen as interfering with the process of Shays-Meehan.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Amendment No. 15 not being offered, as announced by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. TIERNEY), pursuant to the order of the House of the legislative day of Wednesday, August 5, 1998, it is now in order to debate the subject matter of the amendment printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as No. 7.

Pursuant to House Resolution 442 and that order, the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR) and a Member opposed each will control 20 minutes.

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

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise on my bill, which is the substitute bill. It is called the Farr bill, or better known around here as H.R. 600. This bill was introduced on February 5, 1997, a year and a half ago. It has 106 cosponsors, all of them Democrats. It is a shame that we could not get bipartisan support on this bill.

Mr. Chairman, it is a comprehensive campaign reform. Unlike the Shays-Meehan bill, it is a bill that still to this day in the stage it is on the floor is comprehensive. It is based on four principles of campaign reform, the principles of fairness; that is, the bill should not favor one party over another; the principle to reduce the influence of special interests. We have the bill that reforms PAC contributions, large donor contributions, bundling and soft money. Third, the principle of level playing field; that is, make campaigns competitive by enacting spending limits. And fourth, to assess to make the system accessible to nontraditional candidates, make it possible for minorities and for women to run for this House of Representatives. This House ought to reflect the composition of the people it governs in the United States, and, therefore, we need more people of color and more women in office.

Mr. Chairman, how are we going do that under the tradition that we have established in America that just says, ''You can spend as much money as you can raise,'' and we go on, and on, and on.

What this bill does is it sets spending limits, it sets new PAC limits, it sets new individual contributions limits, it eliminates bundling. We made an exception to those organization who do not come up here and lobby, that do not make efforts to campaign on the Hill to have connection between the money and their issue on the Hill. So, organizations like Emily's List or Wish List are still available under our bill. It eliminates soft money, but it does one thing different than the Shays-Meehan bill does: it still allows for States to do voter registration, voter build up, essentially allowing at the State level people to be encouraged to get into the public process of electing

their Members of Congress. It broadens the definition of express advocacy so that those third party, undisclosed, sort of hit pieces as we have come to know them, will no longer be allowed to be done without telling the people whose doing it, and it establishes a lower cost rate for those candidates that voluntarily pledge to limit their spending so that they will get cheaper rates at television and radio.

That is essentially what the bill does.

Now the history of those who have watched this debate, who have listened to debate and have written about campaign reform, they know that this has all been historically proposed by the Democrats. I hate to stand here in a partisan way in this Chamber, but we have to because the history of the effort is that the Republican party has opposed all efforts to do campaign reform. This bill is a good example. The bill came out of the bill that President Bush vetoed in 1992. If my colleagues look over the history, they will see that there is constant defeat of efforts of campaign reform spelled out in the congressional history.

Mr. Chairman, in this decade alone a bill similar to the one that is on the floor right now passed this House in 1990. Another one passed when it came back from the Senate in 1991, and Bush vetoed it in 1992. In 1993 the Democrats passed out a comprehensive campaign reform bill, filibustered in the Senate in 1994. Then guess what happened? The Republicans took over this House, and we have seen not one, nada, nothing in campaign finance reform.

Thank God for the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN), two colleagues here who have put together an effort similar to mine, started at that same place, started at the same time. They negotiated like mad, and had they not had the courage and particularly the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) to stand up against his leadership and tell him that time was now to bring the bill to the floor we would not have had the debate nor the successful vote even though their bill is much watered down, much different than when it started out, much compromise, and, as the newspapers have said, the effort is not over yet.

So this challenge, this bill, this moment, is whether we in Congress can stand up and really do comprehensive campaign reform.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. FAZIO).

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR), for yielding me this time, and I rise to commend the hard work and dedication of my good friend.

I have spent more than half of my 20 years in Congress trying to convince my colleagues of the need for comprehensive campaign finance reform. Throughout the years Republican opposition has prevented the enactment of meaningful campaign finance reform.

For example, in 1987 our Senate colleagues showed an early willingness to pass campaign reform. However, it failed as a result of GOP opposition. In 1990 the House and Senate voted for campaign spending limits, but the Senate Republican leadership stalled on appointing conferees and, as a result, the differences were unsettled and the bill died. In 1991 the House and Senate passed a campaign finance reform bill, but President Bush vetoed that conference report in 1992. In 1993 both the House and the Senate again passed campaign reform bills, but in 1994 the Republicans blocked the appointment of conferees in the Senate. As a result another reform bill died. In 1996 Republicans offered a sham campaign finance reform bill that was defeated when more than a hundred members of their own party joined all Democrats in opposition.

Mr. Chairman, over the last decade Democrats have been leading the fight to fundamentally reform our campaign finance system. In 1996 my colleague the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR) offered a spending limit bill which would have fundamentally reformed the campaign system in this country. The Farr bill would level the playing field for candidates who agree to voluntarily limit their campaign spending. It would limit the influence of wealthy donors on our campaigns and encourages small local contributors. Like the Shays-Meehan bill, the Farr bill addresses the huge unreported spending of soft money and independent expenditures in a comprehensive manner.

The Republican leadership of this House has done everything possible to prevent real campaign reform from coming to this floor. At best, if we stay together now, we will enact these two important reforms through the Shays-Meehan bill, but we will not have taken the need for comprehensive reform off the table. It remains a responsibility for future congresses.

Mr. Chairman, this is my last term in Congress. During my tenure I have worked hard to achieve comprehensive campaign reform that would restore the trust and encourage greater public participation by the American people. I hope the Members of the 106th Congress will make this a priority and summon up the courage to pass a complete comprehensive reform bill like the Farr bill that has been blocked repeatedly by Republican leadership in this House and in the Senate.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON) is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. I yield myself such time as I might consume, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, first of all I want to compliment the sincerity of the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR) in his work on campaign finance reform, and even though we might have some disagreements on the approach, certainly he has been a very active participant in this process, and I certainly extend my compliments to him for the work that he has done.

And, as we worked on the Freshman Task Force, which I cochaired with the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN) my Democrat colleague, we heard a lot of different ideas, and if I recall correctly, the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR) came and gave testimony before the hearing of our task force which was very helpful. But we made a decision as we went through this that we wanted to seek campaign finance reform enacted into law, and so we evaluated many different ideas, one of them that was addressed by Mr. FARR that had some interesting ideas, but there was not any practical way it was going to go through this body or through the Senate, and it perhaps raises some constitutional questions.

□ 1045

So, for that reason, those ideas were not adopted by the freshman task force, and we came up with a broad-based bipartisan bill that will be offered later on the floor today that I believe has a real chance of passing the Senate, but also being signed into law and being upheld by the United States Supreme Court. I guess that is my greatest objection to the legislation being proposed by the gentleman from California. I believe that it has some constitutional problems.

One of the things that is mentioned in his proposal is there is a 35 percent tax on contributions of candidates who do not participate in the voluntary spending limits. I believe that that has some serious constitutional implications because, for the first time in our history, we would be imposing a revenue-generating source for the government on free speech. All of a sudden, the tax money is going to be coming in from candidates, and it would certainly increase the bureaucracy and power of the Federal Elections Commission. So that is an area that I think has some severe constitutional problems.

Also, by the public benefits that flow in that direction with the reduced postal rates, the benefits that go of public money, public subsidized money to candidates, I think raises some questions and obviously some bureaucratic problems. It gives a preference clearly to mailing over television, which is interesting, because it requires reduced rates by television, and also increases the postal opportunities.

But one thing I did want to compliment the gentleman on, and I wanted to yield to the gentleman for an answer to a question, if he might, I just wanted to be able to pose a question to the gentleman, and also to compliment the gentleman.

I noticed that in the gentleman's proposal and in his speech he made reference to the fact that he bans soft

money to the Federal political parties. I think that that is the right approach. But then you made the point that you did not, if I understand correctly, ban soft money by the state parties. That way they could utilize that money for get-out-the-vote efforts. Am I understanding the bill correctly?

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUTCHINSON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, that is one thing the gentleman is correct on. But the gentleman is absolutely wrong on the fact there is any public money on this and it is unconstitutional, because it is totally voluntary on the part of the candidate.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I appreciate the answer, but if I could focus on the similarity of the gentleman's bill with the freshmen's bill, you made a decision in your bill that you should ban soft money to the Federal political parties, but not ban it to the state parties. I think that is exactly the right approach, and if you could take that out of there and build a proposal around there, I think that is very helpful.

That is quite in contrast to the Shays-Meehan approach that, in my judgment, would federalize the state election process by saying that the states could not utilize money that is lawful in that state for get-out-the-vote efforts for their legislative candidates or for their gubernatorial candidates. So I compliment the gentleman for recognizing that distinction and recognizing the role of the states. I think the gentleman has done a very, very effective job on that particular point.

I mentioned the fact, and, again, this is a very well-intentioned proposal and I apologize if I misstated it in any fashion, and it is going to have a good vote today I would anticipate, but I think we have to look at what we are trying to accomplish, which is signing reform into law. We have to look at what the Senate is going to do and whether they are going to enact anything during this session.

I noticed in one of the Washington publications there was an interview with some of the Senators over there as to what they are going to accept. They pointed out that on the Shays-Meehan proposal, which is really I think is more moderate perhaps than the proposal by the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR), but they said ''been there, done that; dead on arrival.''

I think the reform people have got to be concerned about what is new over there, and they could possibly have an opportunity of generating more support and more votes. So I think we need to take that approach, and that is why I think the freshman bill, in contrast to some of the other proposals, really elevates the potential for enacting campaign finance reform legislation this year.

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

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the kind remarks by the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON), a person who led this effort before I ever got elected here. I am sort of the ''Son of Sam'' on this issue to Sam Gejdenson from Connecticut, who has been a great leader and historian on campaign finance reform.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR) for his continued efforts.

Frankly, I come to the floor somewhat frustrated today. Instead of being involved in a process whose intent is to come out with the kind of positive legislation that the American people seek, to lessen the importance of money and the time spent raising money, we are in a game. This is worse than the Iron Man or the Iditarod.

The Republican leadership of the Congress has us in an endless race, with ambushes at every step of the way. We cannot have an honest discussion about the proposal of the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR) because we have a process that has been so rigged and so extended, there is really only one shot to move forward. So we come here today not so much in debate, but in trying to bring one of the most tortured processes that I have seen in the Congress to its conclusion.

The American people are not going to be thrilled with what happens here. We will hopefully get out a bill that makes some major reforms. It will then clearly be killed by the Republican leadership in the Senate. It has taken us long enough to get here, and it is going to be awfully hard to break that hold. That has been the record of not just the leadership of this Republican Congress, but of the Republican Congress over the last 30 years, first the overriding efforts of Richard Nixon's veto to establish a commission simply to record and keep track of contributions. The major campaign finance reform in the mid-seventies, gutted by the Supreme Court in Buckley versus Valeo, moved us a step forward.

The American people are speaking with their feet. The old right wing in America, when talking about communism and its failure, rightly noted that communist citizens were not allowed to vote in their countries, so they voted with their feet. They fled the process.

As we have seen an increase of funding, we have found that voter participation has gone down and down. The more we talk about large contributions, big money and television advertising, the average citizen feels less important to this process.

This is not simply a matter for partisan advantage. We are driving a dagger in the heart of this democratic system. A system like ours, where there is opportunity and freedom, and less than half the public chooses to exercise the most minimal participation in its democratic institutions, is a democracy in danger. It affects policy, it affects perception, and, in a democracy, perception soon becomes reality.

Most Members of Congress spend all too much time raising money. The American public is confused by a Congress unable to deal with some of the most critical issues before it. Reform is necessary now, and from here I hope we go to a real debate to extend a more comprehensive reform like that of the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR). I commend him for his effort.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition, particularly to key parts of the Farr substitute as cited earlier by the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON).

I rise in opposition to the government mandates in the Farr substitute for the reduced air time on broadcast television, and I speak today as someone who has had more than 30 years of experience in the broadcast media before I began in elected office. So I come to this debate today with what I think is a unique perspective on the news gathering side of broadcast media, but also an appreciation for all of the TV ads that we see on TV every day.

What the Farr substitute will do by mandating even further reduced TV ads will not reduce the amount of TV ads, but proliferate them. People are angry enough about the tone and the amount of negative advertising. This will only increase it.

I have to be clear though that I strongly support changing the way that campaigns are paid for, and that is why I voted for the Shays-Meehan bill earlier this week, and that is why I am also an original cosponsor of the bipartisan freshman campaign finance reform bill. We would not have gotten this far if it had not have been for the efforts of everyone who has spoken today. But we have to go after the important items, soft money and the anonymous faceless outside interest groups that now do not have to disclose who gives them their money. They increase voter access to information.

One issue though in this Farr substitute before us has little to do with how campaigns in fact are paid for. Mandating TV stations to reduce already reduced campaign advertising rates, which already have to be paid at the lowest rate available, the only change we will see is the candidate will be able to purchase double the ads. Are the American people clamoring for more TV political advertising, more negative advertising? Voters want, I think, more credible information, and not more ads.

There was a survey in July of 1977 that found that voters rated debates in forums sponsored by TV and radio as well as broadcast news coverage as the

two most helpful sources of political information. That is because, for the most part, people get their source of information from TV and then from radio. They rated ads by candidates as the least helpful.

There are forums provided. Let me remind you, the broadcast medium has provided for $148 million in free air time given in election years through debates, forums, election specials, where free and open debate is held and people can make judgments.

We need to encourage a positive environment in the broadcast media, not create a new burden on TV and radio. Eliminating soft money is going to close the loopholes that have created the flood of negative TV ads in recent years by national parties. That will give the American people the forum they want and require better identification from anonymous outside interest groups, giving voters more information on how to make their decision. That will give the American people the reform they are seeking. But having the government force only the broadcast media to slash their ad rates is wrong, and I oppose the Farr substitute.

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield four minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN), a cosponsor of the bill and one of the persons that has been working hard and diligently to bring us campaign finance reform.

In the process of yielding, I would like to respond that the reduced limits in this bill and originally in the Shays-Meehan bill do not cost the taxpayers anything. They are under existing business rates, rates that are given to nonprofits. They still have to pay for it, but it is a reduced rate that is in the public interest. It says the candidates ought to be treated just like we treat nonprofit entities for mailing and for buying public service announcements. They have to pay for those, but they pay at the lowest rate. That is what this bill does.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN).

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN) is recognized for four minutes.

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, let me first of all say to my colleague from California (Mr. FARR), it seems like it was not that long ago when you and I came to this House, and one of the first things that we did was sat down and worked on campaign finance reform. And if one looks at over a period of the last few years, we have spent literally hours upon hours, days upon days, that have become weeks upon weeks, months upon months, trying to work out a bill that we would be able to get a majority for. I just want to compliment the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR) for his commitment on this issue, his unwavering commitment. I know that as we are on the verge, I hope today, of passing campaign finance reform with the Shays-Meehan bill, I want to make it clear we would not be here at this point in time if it were not for the commitment that the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR) has had to campaign finance reform.

The legislation that I cosponsored, I voted for, I believe my colleague from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) has voted for this legislation on occasion, is an important comprehensive piece of legislation. Many of the provisions that are in the bill are provisions that were in the Meehan-Shays, Shays-Meehan comprehensive bill, when we talk about trying to find incentives, voluntary spending limits, to keep the cost of Congressional elections down. The way that this bill would do it would be to provide incentives through low cost television advertisement and provide low cost mailings.

□ 1100

The money for the low-cost mailings would come from franking, not allowing franking during election years. The money we would save there would help pay for congressional campaign mailings to go out.

This is a good bill and it is a strong bill. It is a bill that I have always supported. It is a bill that has been an integral part of all of the conversations and dialogue that we have had over the last few years about campaign finance reform.

The great thing about the Shays-Meehan legislation is that the commission bill that has been added to the Shays-Meehan bill is a great vehicle for us to push forward with many of the comprehensive ideas for reform that we have.

Specifically, when are we going to do something about the high cost of running congressional campaigns in this country? This is a great opportunity for us to do that. We cannot deal with the expensive cost of running for political office if we do not deal with the cost of television.

We have passed telecommunications legislation, we have passed a number of bills that will mean big money for television networks, and they use the public airways. There is no reason why we cannot come to an agreement of a system to provide low-cost television for those candidates who are willing to agree to spending limits.

I think that is what the American people are looking for, I think that is what most of the public interest groups that have been fighting for campaign finance reform believe in, and ultimately, I believe that this is the type of system that we are headed to.

I believe that the support of the gentleman from California (Mr. SAM FARR) and others have us at a point in time where we are on the verge of making a historic vote today, a vote that could result in the passage of campaign finance reform. However, I also think it is important that we have this discussion and dialogue today, because when it comes time to make the further improvements that we need to make in our election system, we have to look to this legislation and its provisions on capping, voluntarily capping the amount of money that is spent for limiting political action committees. I think this goes a long way towards where we need to move as a country.

Again, I want to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. SAM FARR) for all of his commitment to campaign finance reform. Some people will never know how much time has been put into this effort.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. TOM CAMPBELL).

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

I commend my colleague and friend, the gentleman from California, for his bill. On the substance, there is one point of disagreement. I am troubled by the spending limit, because when the candidates are relatively obscure, as most of us in the House are, a spending limit probably created an advantage to the incumbent. We have spending limits at the presidential level, but those candidates are not obscure.

However, beyond this substantive point my fundamental reason for rising is to note that I have given up my own alternative. That alternative was, ''if you cannot vote for me, you cannot give to me.'' It is a very fundamental and deep reform about which I felt strongly. I gave it up because only Shays-Meehan has a chance this session of Congress.

My good friend, the gentleman from California, deserves great credit for being thoughtful and persistent in this field, but I would urge him also to give up his substitute, because only Shays-Meehan has 57 votes in the Senate. If the proposal is not Shays-Meehan, the Senate will not even take it up; at least, I fear that.

In the interests of getting campaign finance reform, I urge that this not be the alternative, that Shays-Meehan be the alternative.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I just want to make a comment in response to my good friend, the gentleman from California, on what has the best chance over in the Senate. I suppose at some levels that is a little bit speculative, but words mean something in this business. We have to rely upon what happens over there, what they say.

When we look at the Senate, they have spent a considerable amount of time debating campaign finance reform, the McCain-Feingold bill, which is the Senate version of Shays-Meehan. After considerable debate and lobbying and pressure, they got I believe it was 57 votes, which is short of what is needed to break filibuster in order to pass it. It takes 60 votes over there.

So they have a very difficult schedule, because they are behind on their

appropriation bills. They have to move forward with other legislation. If they consider coming back to campaign finance reform, they have to come back to something that has a chance of getting more than 57.

We can debate this all day long, but what they say is that it would be a waste of time to bring up Shays-Meehan over in the Senate. That is true because they cannot get anymore votes. But if we give them another vehicle with the potential of getting more votes, then it increases the pressure on them. I think that is a real possibility. I respect the differences of opinion on that.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. JOHN DOOLITTLE).

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

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I rarely agree with my hometown newspaper. It is one of the most partisan Democrat newspapers in the United States, known as the Sacramento Bee. But they did write an editorial which had many points of agreement. I have put it out in a Dear Colleague. The editorial was yesterday. It is entitled ''Wrong-headed Reform: Passage of Bad Campaign Regulations Is No Victory.''

I just thought I would share this with the Members. This is not coming from the Republican side or the conservative side, but this is coming from a very liberal Democrat-oriented newspaper. I think they make some very, very valid points. The points they make, I believe, are as valid against the substitute of the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR) as they are against the Shays-Meehan bill and other bills of that type.

They are speaking of the Shays-Meehan bill. They say, ''It centers on two big wrong-headed reforms: Prohibiting national political parties from collecting or using soft money contributions, and outlawing independent political advertising that identifies candidates within 60 days of a Federal election. That means the law would prohibit issue campaigning at precisely the time when voters are finally interested in listening, hardly consistent with free speech.

''Since that kind of restriction is likely to be tossed by the courts as a violation of constitutional free speech guarantees, the net effect of the changes will be to weaken political parties while making less accountable independent expenditure groups, kings of the campaign landscape.'' It was a great editorial. I will not take the time to read it all here now.

The point is this, that even they, even from the other side, they recognize how disastrous these approaches are. This is the same approach that the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR) is going to take.

I say to the gentleman from California, he and I have talked about whether we are going to request a vote. I am going to request a vote on mine. I hope the gentleman requests a vote on his. I hope the gentleman will put it up there and let people register or be publicly recorded on how they stand on the approach being taken in the gentleman's bill. I think it would be beneficial for the process.

I would like to just to now make a couple of points about some of the problems with the present system, and some of the problems with the proffered solutions. I believe that today's campaign finance system requires current and prospective officeholders to spend too much time raising money and not enough time governing and debating issues.

Lamar Alexander may have had a very interesting statement. He was one of the gentlemen who ran for the Republican nomination for President in the last cycle. This is what he said. I will not read the whole quote, but he said, ''When I ran for President in 1996, contribution and spending limits forced me to spend 70 percent of my time raising money in amounts no greater than $1,000.'' If Members ask any congressional candidate, any nonincumbent, especially, what percentage of time they spend raising money, it will be just about the same. This is a disaster. It has to be corrected.

Now, in addition to this problem of too much time raising money, today's system has failed to make elections more competitive. We have had big government campaign reform. It was enacted by Congress in 1974. Shays-Meehan and the Farr substitute are just reiterations of that same philosophy.

We need to make these elections more competitive by allowing challengers to be unleashed, and to go out and raise money wherever they can and in any amount, only with the proviso that there has to be full and timely disclosure.

Mr. Chairman, we know this system works. We have it in the Commonwealth of Virginia across the river over here, and we have it in the State of California and in a number of other States. The system works, only we need better disclosure than we presently have in the Federal system. We need to adjust those limits.

Even David Broder, from the Washington Post, not known as a Republican, let alone a conservative, had this to say. Excuse me, this is in the Washingtonian, August, 1996. He said, ''Raise the current $1,000 limit on personal campaign contributions to $50,000, or maybe even go to $100,000. Today's limits are ridiculous, given television and campaigning costs. Raise that limit with full disclosure, which would enable some people to make really significant contributions to help a candidate.''

I would submit, Mr. Chairman, this is the direction we should move in, not in the direction of the amendment of the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR), not in the direction of the Shays-Meehan amendment, but in this direction. This is the way that will actually produce some real reform and some real results. I ask for opposition to the Farr substitute.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS).

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, first, I would like to compliment my colleague, the gentleman from California, because he does have a true reform bill. He has been at the forefront of this.

I would also like to compliment my colleague, the gentleman from Connecticut, who brought forward legislation which I supported and which was vetoed by my own Republican President.

That notwithstanding, we are talking about Queen of the Hill and which bill will get the most votes. I urge members to support the Shays-Meehan proposal, which bans soft money on both the Federal and State levels, just like the proposal of the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR), and misstated, unfortunately, by my colleague, the gentleman from Arizona.

The bill of the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR) bans soft money on both the Federal and State levels for Federal elections, as it has to, and unfortunately, as the freshman bill does not. Our bill also recognizes sham issue ads for what they truly are, campaign ads; improves FEC disclosure and enforcement; and establishes a commission to deal with those issues that have not been dealt with in our legislation.

In regard to whether the Senate will act or not act, all I know is that 45 Democrats came to the forefront and supported the McCain-Feingold bill. This is what Mr. DASCHLE said. He said, ''The Republican leadership continues to employ a strategy designed to confuse the public and complicate the prospects for true reform. The one way to cut through all of that is for the House to pass Shays-Meehan, and send it to the Senate.''

Then he said, ''Passage of any other measure in the House, no matter how well-intended, would only have the effect of offering political cover for the opponents of reform to kill the bill in the Senate.'' Mr. DASCHLE is urging support of the McCain-Feingold, and says any other proposal is likely dead.

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), following the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS), who has been a leader in understanding the problems of too much money in campaigns.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to commend the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN) and the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS), and all of my colleagues who in fact never lost faith in achieving

comprehensive campaign finance reform. Most of all, I commend the citizens of this country, who have demanded meaningful changes to clean up our national campaign system.

Americans want fundamental change across the country. They want meaningful limits on out-of-control money in politics, and they want those changes now.

□ 1115

For years, the Republican leadership stalled and they still are. It is hard for me to listen to the words of the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLITTLE) who just spoke a few minutes ago, who says there is nothing wrong with the system, that the system is working, truly mind boggling.

But the Republican leadership has stalled, made phony deals and promises, strong-armed real reformers in their own party off of a discharge petition. They introduced a hodgepodge of bills that the House had rejected. They brought to the floor an amendment that they did not believe in and even its sponsor voted against. They snowballed us with amendments in debate in the wee hours of the night.

But we were never discouraged. The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN) and the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) were never discouraged. The gentleman from California (Mr. FARR) was never discouraged. The gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON) was never discouraged. We fought for real reform. We kept the Republican leadership's feet to the fire. We forced them to listen to the voices of the American public, not powerful special interests and their large campaign contributions.

With the help of people across this country who called for real reform of our campaign system, we prevailed. Republican tactics failed to kill campaign finance reform and on Monday, we passed Meehan-Shays, we passed genuine reform. It banned soft money. It reins in exploitation of issue ads and brings elections back home to the American people.

This vote is a victory for campaign finance reform. It is a victory for the American people.

I want to pay particular thanks to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR) and the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON) for their groundbreaking efforts on this issue. They fought this battle long and hard. To all we say thank you.

But we have to remain vigilant. We must, in the long run, support Shays-Meehan for real campaign finance reform.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS).

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. HUTCHINSON). The gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) is recognized for 1½ minutes.

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Connecticut and the gentlewoman from Connecticut continue to talk about the Shays-Meehan bill. I respect they won the battle on the floor, yet they come down and take the time on another completely different bill and start talking about their bill. It is not even relevant to the Farr amendment.

I think it is important we go back and talk about what we are talking about. After you listen to the two Members from Connecticut, you would think we were talking about the Shays-Meehan amendment when we are talking about the Farr substitute.

The Farr substitute would reduce the advertising rate by 50 percent below the lowest unit charge rate that broadcasters now are already forced to charge political candidates and would give free time to candidates to respond to other ads.

When I looked at this, I went back and reminded myself of an article that was in the Hill magazine newspaper on June 10, 1998. This Hill magazine really shows what is going to happen if the Farr substitute is passed.

Federal political candidates, because they would have absolutely minimal rates to pay, will gobble up all the available ad space and squeeze out all local State candidates as well as probably squeeze out all the third-party candidates who have the fundamental and constitutional right to express their free speech, who want to inform the public on specific issues. These are people that are not Republicans, they are not Democrats. Libertarians, Independents and others will not even be able to get on the TV screen. This has been documented in that article.

Mr. Chairman, I rise against the Farr amendment. This is socializing the political campaigns. I urge its defeat.

Mr. Chairman, unfortunately, sometimes we do not fully recognize the law of unintended consequences here in Congress.

Many Members of Congress, in their zeal to regulate American society, believe they know what is good for all Americans, but they do not take into account how their liberal do-goodism negatively affects the industry in which they are trying to regulate.

The debate that Washington should force television and radio broadcasters to bend to its will and provide federal political candidates with free broadcast time for political advertisements is fraught with problems.

The idea to regulate political speech has been ruled unconstitutional over and over again by the Supreme Court.

The Farr substitute will have the unintended consequences of: severely harming broadcasters financially; damage state and local party candidates; insulate incumbents and the two main parties from challengers and from third parties; and in the end, harm our democracy and our notions of freedom.

As an example of my argument, The Hill newspaper reported on June 10, 1998, "TV stations ration campaign advertising, citing high demand."

The article states that in this year's primary campaign in California, the requests for political advertising were so overly demanding that complying with every request to purchase advertising space for political ads would have placed television stations in an economic bind.

The stations, in response to such high demands, were forced to restrict local and state candidates, besides those running for Governor, from airing political ads.

The Hill reported that stations "KCBS and KPIX refused to take ads from campaigns other than federal campaigns and the governor's race, infuriating candidates for other offices."

Well, what do the Members think will happen if we follow the Farr Substitute, which would reduce the advertising rate by 50% below the lowest unit charge rate that broadcasters now are already forced to charge political candidates and would give free time to candidates to respond to other ads?

This story in The Hill indicates what will happen. Federal political candidates, because they would have absolutely minimal rates to pay, will gobble up all the available ad space and squeeze out all local and state candidates, as well as probably squeeze out all other third party groups, who have the fundamental and constitutional right to express their free speech, who want to inform the public on specific issues or candidates.

For an example, Ron Gonzales, Democratic candidate for Mayor of San Jose, CA, could not even purchase any time for political ads and was put into a competitive disadvantage that forced him into a runoff. But instead of making sure that all candidates and all groups have an equitable opportunity to acquire time to inform the public of their candidacies or the issues important to them, the proponents of free air time want to make the system as unequitable as possible and give just federal candidates priority.

The other dramatic and unintended consequence of such free time proposals would be the devastating economic impact it would have on broadcasters. In the Farr Substitute, all primary candidates would have an automatic rate 50% below the lowest rate broadcasters already charge. There are no limits in this Substitute about how many adds could be aired or how much time would be given to candidates.

Broadcasters already have a significant financial commitment to make in transitioning to digital television. Broadcasters will have to spend tens of millions of dollars in order to transition to digital television in the next few years. With federal elections every two years, free air time proposals threaten conversion to HDTV.

Imposing free-time requirements on broadcast licensees would be the equivalent of telling lawyers, doctors, or home builders, who all have to be licensed in some capacity, what kind of law that they would have to practice, what type of information they could give to patients, or what type of homes to build.

Once Washington starts trying to control how much, when, and what rates political candidates must pay, I fear it will snowball to the point where people in Washington, with good intentions, will try to tell political candidates what they can say.

I think these free time precedents are a danger to our democracy as a whole because they defend just the narrow interests of a few, federal candidates.

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I appreciate the opposition, because it shows how little they really understand the bill. First of all, there is no free time in this bill. There is no free lunch. All candidates pay. They just pay the lowest unit rate only if they volunteer to limit what they are going to spend in campaigns.

This is about campaign expenditure limits. You, as a candidate, say, I will limit myself to $600,000. That is all I am going to spend to get elected to the House of Representatives. Why do we have to do this? Because, Mr. Chairman, it is getting obscene how much money we are spending.

Do Members realize, 10 years ago, the Senate and the House, total expenditures to get elected spent $58 million. This year, in 1998, disbursements, money that has already gone out is $112 million in the Senate and the House. In 10 years we have more than doubled what we are spending in this House. We have got to put a limit on that.

I do not think we are going to get enough votes to be the bill that will top the Shays-Meehan. We are going to have to be back here next year. I hope that in all this debate we are listening to each other so that we can come up with a comprehensive campaign reform bill. We are not doing it this session.

In fact, I really appeal to my Republican colleagues, because throughout history you have not been there. You have not been helping. In 1990, only 15 Republicans voted for a bill that got out of the House with 255 votes. In 1991, only 21 Republicans voted for a bill that got out of the House with 273 votes. In 1992, only 19 Republicans voted for a bill that got out of the House with 259 votes. And George Bush vetoed the bill, the bill that I am talking about right now.

We need campaign reform. We need it now.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. All time has expired.

Amendment No. 7 not being offered, as announced by the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR), pursuant to the order of the House of the legislative day of Wednesday, August 5, 1998, it is now in order to debate the subject matter of the amendment printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as No. 5.

Pursuant to House Resolution 442 and that order, the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLITTLE) and a Member opposed will each control 20 minutes.

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

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

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to continue on with my analysis of what is wrong with the present system. There is something definitely wrong with it, but there is great disagreement as to what that is, I think, between me and the other side.

Point number 3, we talked about how the campaign finance system requires current and prospective office holders to spend too much time raising money and not enough time governing, debating issues.

Secondly, today's system has failed to make elections more competitive. We had huge domination of Congress by incumbents for decades. Finally dramatic change occurred in the 1994 elections. I believe that was directly attributable to the 1974 law enacted 20 years earlier.

Thirdly, this is very important, I think, for us to understand, as the public, as Members of the House. Today's system allows millionaires to pursue congressional seats and inhibits the ability of challengers to raise the funds necessary to be competitive. The millionaire is the only one who can write whatever amount he or she wants to his election campaign. Everyone else is forced to live within the same hard dollar limits that were put in place in 1974 and have never been adjusted for inflation.

All of the moaning about soft money and these terrible issue advocacy ads that are, as they say, are sham campaign ads, I do not agree with that, but that is what they say, those are the result of never lifting those hard dollar limits.

Sometimes it is important to understand, all the time it is important to understand causes and effects. We do not get that as a majority body in either House of Congress. We seem not to understand that the effect of issue advocacy ads or the effect of soft money or the effect of independent expenditures is directly caused by the hard and unadjusted limits on hard campaign dollars contributed directly to candidates.

Inflation has risen by two-thirds. Can Members imagine having to live on the same salary, just to put this in perspective, pay all your food bills, your rents, your utilities, clothing, et cetera, gasoline with the same amount of money you earned in 1974, and have to live with that same amount of money today and meet all your bills? They could not do it because the prices have risen.

In the campaign context when that happens, we start then pushing out into the less explored areas of the law. PACs became very big, which were really pretty much a creation of the 1974 big government reform that we have now. And those were heavily attacked by the left as recently as 2 years ago.

Now we have gotten off PACs; now we are on to that hated soft money. Soft money is nothing more than unregulated money. It falls in two categories. Soft money that goes for political parties to do get out the vote and voter registration, voter identification, that type of thing, and then there is soft money, unregulated money that groups, independent groups will spend to communicate their views on an issue.

That is what so upset incumbents, because those groups start using the name of the incumbent, start criticizing his voting record. They do not break the law; they live within the law. They do not make express advocacy. But that is very upsetting to incumbents, and they are not going to take it anymore, and that is why we have Shays-Meehan and these other bills, because they are not going to allow that sort of insolence to be displayed toward the incumbents. They are going to have more regulation. They are going to make it harder for the challenger.

If I wanted to be guaranteed election for life in my congressional district, I would join on with Shays-Meehan, because that is the effect it will have. It will make it even harder for challengers who do not have the advantages of incumbency, who do not have the name ID in the district, who do not have the district offices, who do not have the ability to reach out and communicate with the voters, who do not have the ability to call a press conference and have anybody show up, when you restrict these things, you are helping the incumbent because he or she has all those advantages. You are hurting the challenger.

I do not mind saying the Emperor has no clothes. I hope all the rest of my colleagues will feel free to join me today in making that important declaration, because that is really what this is all about.

The founders of Shays-Meehan may have won the battle today, but I predict they will lose the war. The bill will not be enacted into law this year, will never clear the Senate. Let us just remember this, you are going to have a less sympathetic House to big government campaign reform after this, the coming 1998 elections this year. You will have a House that is less receptive to that when we convene in the next Congress in January.

Your Senate, which now has at most 57 votes for the big government Shays-Meehan approach, will have, after these 1998 elections, at most, 54 votes, maybe 53 votes. So bask in the glory today and enjoy it. You are entitled to your temporary victory.

I would just say to my colleagues that, please, feel free, even those of you who voted for Shays-Meehan, even those of you who will vote for the freshman bill, please step forward today and vote for a new approach. We know this bill is not going to pass today, my bill, but it is important to lay the foundation so that we can build upon that next year.

Yes, I agree with the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR), this will be back next year.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOOLITTLE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CAMPBELL. A serious concern I have is, if your opponent does not have any money, how can your opponent make public, make widely known the

list of donors that you have? My biggest concern is that, that if your opponent does not have money, all the disclosure in the world will not help. This is a sincere question.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Reclaiming my time, I will answer that question.

The point is, when you are a challenger and you do not have any money and you are not a millionaire, you can go ask somebody else that has money to give you their money. You can read the quotes of Eugene McCarthy, which, in effect, is what happened, helped get Lyndon Johnson not to run for President again in 1968. McCarthy has said that if he had not been able to raise large amounts of money from a relative handful of individuals, he never could have run the race. That is the situation we are in today.

Let me continue describing the problems that we face.

□ 1130

Today's system hurts taxpayers by taking nearly $900 million collected in Federal taxes and subsidizing the presidential campaigns of all sorts of characters, including convicted felons and billionaires. That needs to be changed.

Lastly, today's system hurts voters in our Republic by forcing more contributors and political activists to operate outside of the system where they are unaccountable and consequently more irresponsible.

That is what the Sacramento Bee was talking about in its editorial. That will surely be the effect if we enact the reforms in Shays-Meehan. It is already the effect under the present big-government reform which we have had for 24 years and which has spawned all of these things the opposition claims to deplore: PACs, soft money, hard money, issue advocacy, independent expenditures, all of those things.

And yet, instead of stepping back, rediagnosing the problem and doing something that matters, they just offer all the same tried and failed solutions of before, and we just cannot have any more of that. The present system does not work. It will get worse under their approach. We need to take a different approach.

All right, let me suggest some goals that a genuine campaign reform ought to have. One, we ought to encourage political speech rather than limit it. All these other approaches seek to limit it despite the fact that Constitution is quite clear when it says, ''Congress shall make no law abridging the freedom of speech.''

My colleagues on Shays-Meehan and the others are cheerfully trying to find a way to abridge the freedom of speech while claiming they are not abridging it. But, in fact, they are abridging it. And those provisions will eventually be struck down, just as many of them contained in the present law we have were struck down in the famous Buckley v. Valeo case and reaffirmed dozens of times since then.

Secondly, we ought to promote competition, freedom, and a more informed electorate. We ought to enable any American citizen to run for office. We ought to increase the amount of time candidates spend with constituents in debating issues rather than raising money. And we ought to make candidates accountable to their constituents for the money they accept. Those, I would submit, are the goals of true campaign finance reform.

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

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California (Mr. FARR) is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS) one of the newest Members of Congress.

(Mrs. CAPPS asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Doolittle substitute.

This morning we have heard a review of the history of campaign finance reform in this body, and it is an important perspective to keep in mind. But within this very session, a few weeks ago campaign finance reform was declared dead. I could not believe it, having just arrived, filled with the frustration of the citizens in my district following a special election in which so much outside interest and huge amounts of unregulated monies were involved.

But within this present session, two groups of Members never gave up. They demonstrated the diversity and strength of the reform coalition. The Blue Dogs, conservative Democrats led by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BAESLER) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM), kept pushing the discharge petition and ultimately convinced 204 Members from both parties to sign it.

And the incredibly hard work of the freshmen, led by the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN) and the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON), finally paid off. This work began at the very beginning of the 105th. They defied the odds, hung together, produced a solid bipartisan bill, and persistently kept this issue alive.

The freshman bill is good legislation. My husband Walter was a cosponsor. It makes important reforms. I will vote ''present'' on the freshman bill. I do so only to make sure an even more comprehensive bill is passed.

Mr. Chairman, later today we will finally pass the bipartisan Shays-Meehan bill. This is truly cause for celebration. This is the bill that also has a majority of support in the Senate.

Today I am proud to be a freshman and I am proud to serve in this House. Most important, the American people can be proud that we are taking an extraordinary step to clean up our political system and to restore faith in our democracy.

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) who has been here day and night, has been the voice of advocacy for campaign reform, and who has a strong statement in opposition to this bill.

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

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Chairman, here is what the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLITTLE) is proposing: Open the floodgates; if the swimmer is drowning, pour on more water; let money flow without any limit. Oh, but disclose; as the swimmer is drowning, tell him who is responsible for it. Too much, too late.

Look, if Shays-Meehan were so helpful to the incumbent, why is the majority leadership fighting this bill so hard? It does not make any sense. Raising the limits, when you are running against a millionaire who has $10 million, they can raise the limits to $2,000 or $4,000 that someone can contribute to a poor challenger, and it won't help.

The gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLITTLE) seems to have a crystal ball and he knows what the election results will be this year. But look, we have a chance in the Senate. When we pass Shays-Meehan, the spotlight will be on the other body to show up and to put it on the calendar and let the majority rule. If the majority can rule in the Senate as it does in the House, Shays-Meehan goes to the White House for signature. That is what they really are afraid of.

And do not raise this big-government argument to try to hide the dangers of big money. We do not want big government in this. We want the little person, the average person's voice not to be drowned out by big money in America.

The gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLITTLE) says give more money, open the floodgates, no holds barred for the rich, and everybody else loses. Vote against Doolittle.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute to just observe that the swimmer is drowning and they are killing him, and they are killing him with these types of so-called reforms which in fact are going to make it more difficult for that swimmer to survive.

By the way, right now, under their big-government reform that we presently have, the millionaires are free to spend whatever they like. Under my bill, that person of average means will also be able to go out and raise the money that he or she needs in order to compete with the millionaire.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Idaho (Mrs. CHENOWETH).

Mrs. CHENOWETH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLITTLE) for yielding.

I rise today in strong support of the Doolittle substitute. It is the only proposal being considered in the House

that does not interfere with free speech and the only proposal that is constitutionally sound.

When it comes to campaign finance reform, our goal should be to ensure free speech and full participation in the electoral process. But we are on the wrong track in this Congress. We focus our efforts on finding ways to limit the rights of individuals and candidates.

Instead, this Congress should be working to level the playing field for incumbents and challengers, for all people to be able to enter into this arena and express their points of view, whether we agree with them or not.

I can tell my colleagues, in the last campaign I probably had more targeted outside interest issue ads waged against me than almost any other Member in the Congress. And I stand here protecting the right of those people to express their points of view. But when full disclosure is involved, then the voters are able then to determine who is spending all the money through the outside interests to try to influence elections in their district.

One of my constituents, Kris Provencio of Boise, Idaho, a fine bright young man, should be able to have the ability to get into this political process and be able to speak freely without huge, heavy regulations from the Federal Government.

The Doolittle substitute will require full and immediate on-line disclosure of contributions and contributors by both incumbents and challengers.

The Washington Times said it best in its June 5 editorial when it said, ''If Congress wants to clean up the mess of money in politics, it should do so by encouraging free speech, free discussion, and free debate.''

I have faith in my fellow colleagues and in the citizens of this great Nation, and I urge my colleagues to vote for the Doolittle substitute. This substitute will allow full disclosure and the people then to be able to see who actually is contributing to the free speech. They will be the ultimate arbiters in the political process.

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. WAMP), a great voice on campaign reform.

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

Mr. WAMP. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I come with a little different angle to the floor today, Mr. Chairman, to say that when I made the decision this spring to join the discharge petition and bring this issue back to the floor of the House against the wishes of even my own party, the majority party, I said to the Speaker of the House, ''Mr. Speaker, we should not defend the status quo. We should not defend this current system. We should not be caught dead defending this system. As a matter of fact, we did not create this system.''

And I said it has been around since Watergate and it created some things that are now coming back to haunt us, I think. I said we need to do one of two things: either make the intellectual argument that we should do away with this system and go back to the way things were, which the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLITTLE) does very intellectually in my opinion, or do the best we can to fix the current system.

I do not believe the majority of American people want us to go back to the way things were before Watergate. So I joined the Shays-Meehan effort, did my best to improve it, take out things that I thought were not acceptable and make it as perfect as possible, which it is not perfect, but it is as perfect as possible to build a majority consensus.

I think we must try to fix this system. And Shays-Meehan is the best effort in the last 4 years to do that, and that is why we got 237 votes. I think we need to try to fix this current system.

My colleagues can make an intellectual argument, as the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLITTLE) did, that PACs have created a problem and they kind of got washed out by the proliferation of soft money. But, frankly, all of that is part of this system.

So intellectually I am not going to disagree with him. But practically and pragmatically, we need to do the best we can to fix this current system. That is what Shays-Meehan represents. That is where the momentum is. That is where a majority is. And I am proud that today the House will, I believe, pass as the king Shays-Meehan and encourage the Senate to do likewise.

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, how much time do we have remaining?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from California (Mr. FARR) has 14 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN) who has been leading in the freshman effort.

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

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

This is about whose voices will be heard in this system. It is about voices. It is about speech, who speaks up in this system and who is heard.

The other day the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) the majority whip, who has been the prime opponent of campaign reform, said that money is the lifeblood of politics. Money is the lifeblood of politics. If that is true, the people lose.

The Constitution begins, ''We the people of these United States.'' It does not say, we the big contributors to politicians in Washington. It says, ''We the people.'' It means the citizens. It means the voters.

The Doolittle proposal is anti-reform. This is a suggestion not to contain the influence of money but to expand it. Under the Doolittle proposal, it is okay for someone to give a candidate for Congress $500,000. Now an individual is limited to giving $1,000.

But $500,000, $300,000, any amount we want, the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLITTLE) says is okay. That is the influence of big money in politics. We have to contain it. Disclosure is not enough. The Doolittle proposal is going in the wrong direction.

What is going on here? What is going on here has been a strategy from March to May to June to July and now to August, and here is what it is.

□ 1145

The leadership strategy of the GOP as set out by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) again in a moment of great candor. ''The timing kills them,'' said the gentleman from Texas. ''The DeLay strategy worked. Delay, delay, delay.''

The fact is the time for reform is long past. We need to pass out of this House today the Shays-Meehan bill or the Hutchinson-Allen bill. We have to send major campaign finance reform to the Senate in order to restore the voice of the ordinary citizens, the ordinary people in this country who are being overwhelmed and outshouted by big money.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute, just to observe that even a very prominent, respected liberal Democrat Thurgood Marshall on the Supreme Court made this point, speaking for the unanimous court, quote, one of the points in which all members of the court agree is that money is essential for effective communication in a political campaign. That is why Justice Marshall and all other members of the court ruled that expenditure limits were unconstitutional, because money is the means of making the speech. Today only the millionaire has unlimited free speech. I seek to give this to the average citizen as well running as a candidate. For that reason I have offered my bill.

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

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON).

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend the author of this legislation because I think he comes forward in an earnest manner for something he believes in. I also think it is dead wrong. And when you take a look at where we are today as a society, we have developed along a path that has really redefined representation. Early on it was felt that representation was representing landed individuals with wealth. We then for a while represented geographic areas. Then finally the Supreme Court said, ''No, you don't represent the land, what you represent is the people. One

man, one vote.'' The debate here is essentially whether Congress will be dominated by wealth and money or by representing their constituents and the best needs of this country. It is very clear that the present system has gone to an incredible excess of representing wealth in America and leaving behind every other value we treasure as a society. Yes, we are a capitalist system. We are a free market system. But our government is not simply there for the highest bidder or for the wealthiest individual. If we want to see American participation increase, we have to make sure that every citizen, not just the powerful and wealthy, feel like they can contribute to this democracy. There is nothing worse in destroying the earnest attempt at maintaining a vibrant democracy than telling people that only wealthy people have access to television. If the standard for democratic participation is that you have to have the bankroll that Ross Perot had or the millionaires that now spot the Senate and the House who finance their own campaigns or sufficient millionaire friends to get you here, that is a democracy that is dying. Democracy is not about the economic system. It is about the political system. The political system in this country cannot be based on how much money you can put together and how quickly from how many people to get you elected. If we do what my friend across the aisle suggests, this will be a country for only wealthy Americans and the rest will be left behind.

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL).

Mr. CAMPBELL. I thank my colleague and friend for yielding me this time. Mr. Chairman, the Supreme Court has upheld expenditure restrictions. In Austin v. Michigan State Chamber of Commerce in 1990, the Supreme Court said it was constitutional to limit the campaign expenditures of corporations to—zero! The Supreme Court has upheld contribution restrictions. In Buckley v. Valeo the Supreme Court said that the $1,000 maximum for individuals to contribute was constitutional. And again in 1981 in California Medical Association v. FEC the Supreme Court said that it was constitutional to limit campaign contributions, in this case to PACs.

So it is really quite wrong to say that the first amendment, at least as interpreted by the Supreme Court, prohibits limitations on contributions or limitations on expenditures. What, rather, is accurate to say is that the Supreme Court has interpreted the first amendment to say that restrictions reasonably related to the purpose of communicating speech effectively and honestly are permitted and that undue restrictions are not. And hence we need to reach a balance.

The approach of my good friend and colleague from California is commendable in many ways. I do admire his consistency. His position is that we should have no restraints at all. Within his own point of view, he may be completely legitimate on the merits. I do not think so, but he is entitled to believe he is. What I do not believe is that he is entitled to claim the Constitution compels his result. The Constitution has been interpreted consistently to allow restrictions for the purpose of allowing fair and honest communication in the following manner: The first amendment has not been held to ban restrictions on slander; commercial speech; antitrust violations (where one company will communicate to another, in free speech, what prices it wishes to charge); obscenity according to community standards; group libel; symbolic speech; or speech which leads to a clear or present danger. And I have not exhausted the field.

Mr. Chairman, we have a more difficult job because we are, constitutionally, permitted to regulate in the interest of allowing freer and more honest expression. And that is what we are about today in Shays-Meehan.

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

It is very interesting to watch what is going on here. The gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) talked, a Republican from California, a colleague of mine, also served in the California State legislature where I served as a member of the Assembly, he served as a member of the Senate and we are both opposed, Democrat and Republican, to the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLITTLE) who also served with us. It is obvious that there are just two vast differences of opinion here. Every bill about campaign finance reform, about the system we have in America, wants to change the way money is contributed to campaigns with the exception of one, Mr. DOOLITTLE. He wants to open up thinking that the way to get elected to Congress is to just add more money, throw more money on the problem.

Mr. Chairman, in 1998 the Senate and the House have already spent $112 million and we have not even had a general election. Is the problem there is not enough money? I do not think so.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY).

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, obviously I rise in support of the Doolittle substitute. The question today is really simple. Should we trust the American people and support the first amendment, or should we trust the government and gut the first amendment? The Doolittle bill puts its trust in the American people. It opens up the system, allowing more participation by more people. The Shays-Meehan approach puts its trust in the government. It rachets down political expression, making the system more complicated and more dangerous for the average American. It does not sound like reform to me.

Mr. Chairman, the people should not have to consult their lawyers before they contribute to a political campaign. The Doolittle substitute represents the only true and honest effort to reform our campaign system.

I am amused by all the contortions of some of my colleagues who complain about the evils of soft money on one hand and who work very hard to raise that same soft money on the other. For example, just a few nights ago, the House minority leader worked overtime to pass the Shays-Meehan substitute. He spoke of the menacing nature of soft money, how it corrupted the political process. But on that same day, the minority leader personally worked the phones raising millions of dollars in soft money for his party, the money that he has repeatedly condemned and voted to ban.

Now, this is a case of one hand not caring what the other hand is doing. If the minority is so concerned about soft money, it should put its mouth where its money is. Mr. Chairman, money will always be spent in support of campaigns and candidates and causes. The Shays-Meehan bill will drive that money underground. The Doolittle bill will require the light of day to shine upon it.

The Doolittle bill makes a number of improvements to the current system of disclosing contributions. First, the bill requires electronic filing of campaign reports, instant filing, including 24-hour filings during the last three months of the campaign. It is time for Congress to recognize and to utilize the advances in technology that have enabled campaigns to communicate information to the Federal Election Commission much more efficiently than in the past. The Doolittle bill is needed to make elections more competitive. The Doolittle bill is needed to level the playing field so that millionaires are not given free rein to purchase congressional seats. And the Doolittle bill is needed to give working Americans a chance to participate in our democracy.

Every other reform proposal is based on the faulty premise that we can limit spending and limit speech. These big government reformers propose more government regulations and more government power, more big brother in order to stifle debate and suppress speech. The effect of all this Federal regulation is to chill free speech and political participation. This new government power will make people think twice before they participate in this process. But the Doolittle bill will encourage political participation in our democracy. The Doolittle bill will encourage more speech in our political system. The Doolittle bill upholds our Constitution.

Let us really reform the system. Let us pass the Doolittle substitute.

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. DAVIS).

(Mr. DAVIS of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, the bill before us today lifts limits on campaign giving. What an outrage. What is at stake here are the rights of citizens at home who simply sent us up here to do our job. Why should they have to compete with all the people who choose to actively participate by giving unlimited sums of money in the campaign system today? If the public knew more about what we know, about the level of giving, the amount of unlimited contributions that are going into the campaigns of both parties, they would be outraged, they would be sickened, they would ultimately be saddened. The public expects less money going into campaigns today, not more. The strategy on campaign finance reform, which will fail here today on the floor of the House, has first been to do nothing, then to do little, then to delay. Today here is the ultimate tactic. It is a surrender. It is a surrender to the growing cancer in this city and across the country of the disproportionate amount of money that is flowing into campaigns and is swamping and competing with those people who simply want us to do our jobs, they want to speak with us, they want to lobby us on issues and they want to vote. They should not have to compete with the growing and inordinate sums of money that are getting into our campaign system.

□ 1200

The Doolittle bill is a surrender to this problem. We need to defeat this bill, we need to get to meaningful campaign finance reform, we need to pass it today on the floor of the House.

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman also from California (Mr. FAZIO), my distinguished colleague.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, I just could not resist getting involved with my California friends in the debate in this measure, which I would like to tombstone as the Richard Mellon Scaife Empowerment Act of 1998. This gentleman from the well-known banking family of course has inordinate influence in our political system, giving through nonprofit entities, certainly through think tanks, contributing soft dollars through organizations that he has little influence or interest in other than his desire to be helpful to his friends in the Republican party.

This bill, of course, would give him the same kind of unlimited influence in Federal elections directly by taking all the caps off on what people are allowed to contribute to PACs, to candidates, to the national parties, to the State parties. So the Cook brothers from Kansas, for example, who have made a career out of pushing term limits around the country or Libertarian causes and Republicans who support them would have an unlimited amount of ability to be involved in each and every congressional race, races for the Senate.

Mr. Chairman, this is really an amendment that offers the concept of free speech as defined by the size of wallets, and that really is my response to the comments the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) has made, and others, about empowering people and giving them their First Amendment rights. If people are only heard in our society by their ability to buy media, to pay for mail, to contact the voters directly through the very expensive vehicles that are available to them, if that is the only way they can be heard in this society, there is then no real equivalent ability to campaign on the basis of their ideas, on the basis of their platform, what they believe in, who they are. It becomes just a question of who has the biggest megaphone and who can be heard the loudest.

This amendment is really nothing more than an effort to empower the wealthiest people in our society to have even more dominant influence on our elections than they already do.

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) the leader of the Shays-Meehan bill.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I oppose this substitute because the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLITTLE) would allow candidates to raise unlimited sums from individuals. Right now the limit is $1,000; from PACs it is $5,000. He would have an unlimited amount. The national parties are limited to $20,000; he would have an unlimited amount. The State parties have $5,000. Under our bill they can do $10,000, but he has an unlimited amount. He has an unlimited amount to the aggregate that can be contributed in all campaigns.

But in addition he does not even have full disclosure, particularly as it relates to third party proposals. When third parties come in, all they have to disclose is the name of their organization. It is a very clever thing. He calls it disclosure, but we do not know who that organization is. They can just have a sham name: The Committee for Better Government. We do not know who is part of that, we do not know who contributed, we do not know if there were five people, a hundred, a thousand. We do not know if a individual contributed $1 million, $2 million, $10 million, a dollar.

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Respecting that the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLITTLE) has a right to close, I just want to reiterate what we are closing on. We are closing on a bill that changes the law, proposes to change the law.

Under existing law, if someone wants to contribute to a candidate, it is a $1,000 limit for each cycle, for a primary campaign and for a general election. Under Mr. Doolittle's it is unlimited, unlimited amount of money.

Right now under current law it is $5,000 a cycle, $5,000 in the primary, $5,000 in the general maximum for PACs, political action committees, and that is authorized by law, and that does not change, the limits are not changed, in the Shays-Meehan bill. But they sure are changed in the Doolittle bill because it goes to unlimited amounts.

Under current law the national parties can receive $20,000. Under the Doolittle bill, unlimited amount of money, unlimited.

State parties under existing law can receive $5,000. The Shays-Meehan goes to $10,000 for the reasons that were talked about. But Doolittle, unlimited, unlimited amount of money. In all of the above in aggregate it is about $25,000. Under the Doolittle bill it is unlimited.

Mr. Chairman, the Doolittle bill is going in the wrong direction. It is doing the wrong thing, giving the wrong message.

This country is about ''We the people.'' In order to get people involved in politics we have got to make it accessible, affordable, not owned by millionaires, not owned by campaigns where we do not even see who is contributing.

Defeat this measure. It is probably one that should receive the biggest defeat of all of the bills that are trying to hurt the attempt to get Shays-Meehan to the Senate and to the President's desk.

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

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, as my colleagues know, to those who support big government and more regulation my bill is going in the wrong direction. But to those of us who believe that here the problem is the regulation which has directly spawned PACs, soft money, issue advocacy, independent expenditures, et cetera, then we are going to offer a new direction.

And, as I said before, there is no way this bill, Shays-Meehan, is ever going to become law of this Congress, so we are really laying the foundation now for next Congress, and I invite all the people sincerely concerned about campaign reform to cast a ''aye'' vote on mine, even if they voted for the Shays-Meehan bill or the Farr or will vote for the freshman bill coming up.

Mr. Chairman, we are taking a new approach.

As my colleagues know, I have to smile when I hear the rhetoric of my opponents about this. One would think I was proposing something that was out in Mars or out in left field, but of course it could not be ''left'' field because that is the big government approach.

Let me just make this observation:

The largest State in the union, California, has had this system for decades. The Commonwealth of Virginia has had this system for decades. We do not hear in Virginia any problems over the election they just went through. I think

the current governor is the son of a butcher. The former governor, his immediate predecessor, was the son of a football coach.

So the issue of millionaires, that is a red herring, it is a false issue the other side brings up. We are the ones who are against the present situation where are only millionaires can spend whatever they like. I would like to have the average citizen running for office to be free to compete against the millionaire, which today he cannot do. Why? Because of the strict contribution limits that are in place.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, this philosophy of deregulation is important to support. I believe it will clean up our system. We have very strict disclosure. And let me say to the gentleman, ''You won't need all this soft money. It will largely wither away once you allow the natural flow of money from contributor to candidate with full disclosure, and then let the voter decide.''

Take the governmental czar out of the equation. I ask my colleagues to support my substitute.

AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. DOOLITTLE

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. EWING). The Clerk will designate the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

Amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 5 offered by Mr. DOOLITTLE:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Citizen Legislature and Political Freedom Act''.

SEC. 2. REMOVAL OF LIMITATIONS ON FEDERAL ELECTION CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS.

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

''(9) The limitations established under this subsection shall not apply to contributions made during calendar years beginning after 1998.''

SEC. 3. TERMINATION OF TAXPAYER FINANCING OF PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION CAMPAIGNS.

(a) TERMINATION OF DESIGNATION OF INCOME TAX PAYMENTS.—Section 6096 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(d) TERMINATION.—This section shall not apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1997.''

(b) TERMINATION OF FUND AND ACCOUNT.—

(1) TERMINATION OF PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION CAMPAIGN FUND.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 95 of subtitle H of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''SEC. 9014. TERMINATION.

''The provisions of this chapter shall not apply with respect to any presidential election (or any presidential nominating convention) after December 31, 1998, or to any candidate in such an election.''

(B) TRANSFER OF EXCESS FUNDS TO GENERAL FUND.—Section 9006 of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(d) TRANSFER OF FUNDS REMAINING AFTER 1998.—The Secretary shall transfer all amounts in the fund after December 31, 1998, to the general fund of the Treasury.''

(2) TERMINATION OF ACCOUNT.—Chapter 96 of subtitle H of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''SEC. 9043. TERMINATION.

''The provisions of this chapter shall not apply to any candidate with respect to any presidential election after December 31, 1998.''

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—

(1) The table of sections for chapter 95 of subtitle H of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''Sec. 9014. Termination.''

(2) The table of sections for chapter 96 of subtitle H of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''Sec. 9043. Termination.''

SEC. 4. DISCLOSURE REQUIREMENTS FOR CERTAIN SOFT MONEY EXPENDITURES OF POLITICAL PARTIES.

(a) TRANSFERS OF FUNDS BY NATIONAL POLITICAL PARTIES.—Section 304(b)(4) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 434(b)(4)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''and'' at the end of subparagraph (H);

(2) by adding ''and'' at the end of subparagraph (I); and

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

''(J) in the case of a political committee of a national political party, all funds transferred to any political committee of a State or local political party, without regard to whether or not the funds are otherwise treated as contributions or expenditures under this title;''.

(b) DISCLOSURE BY STATE AND LOCAL POLITICAL PARTIES OF INFORMATION REPORTED UNDER STATE LAW.—Section 304 of such Act (2 U.S.C. 434) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(d) If a political committee of a State or local political party is required under a State or local law, rule, or regulation to submit a report on its disbursements to an entity of the State or local government, the committee shall file a copy of the report with the Commission at the time it submits the report to such an entity.''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to elections occurring after January 1999.

SEC. 5. PROMOTING EXPEDITED AVAILABILITY OF FEC REPORTS.

(a) MANDATORY ELECTRONIC FILING.—Section 304(a)(11)(A) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 434(a)(11)(A)) is amended by striking ''permit reports required by'' and inserting ''require reports under''.

(b) REQUIRING REPORTS FOR ALL CONTRIBUTIONS MADE TO ANY POLITICAL COMMITTEE WITHIN 90 DAYS OF ELECTION; REQUIRING REPORTS TO BE MADE WITHIN 24 HOURS.—Section 304(a)(6) of such Act (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 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 and shall include the name of the candidate involved (as appropriate) and the office sought by the candidate, the indentification of the contributor, and the date of receipt and amount of the contribution.

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

(c) INCREASING ELECTRONIC DISCLOSURE.—Section 304 of such Act (2 U.S.C. 434(a)), as amended by section 4(b), is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(e)(1) The Commission shall make the information contained in the reports submitted under this section available on the Internet and publicly available at the offices of the Commission as soon as practicable (but in no case later than 24 hours) after the information is received by the Commission.

''(2) In this subsection, the term 'Internet' means the international computer network of both Federal and non-Federal interoperable packet-switched data networks.''.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply with respect to reports for periods beginning on or after January 1, 1999.

SEC. 6. WAIVER OF "BEST EFFORTS" EXCEPTION FOR INFORMATION ON IDENTIFICATION OF CONTRIBUTORS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 302(i) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 432(i)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''(i) When the treasurer'' and inserting ''(i)(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), when the treasurer''; and

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

''(2) Paragraph (1) shall not apply with respect to information regarding the identification of any person who makes a contribution or contributions aggregating more than $200 during a calendar year (as required to be provided under subsection (c)(3)).''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to persons making contributions for elections occurring after January 1999.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The amendment is not further debatable.

The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLITTLE).

The question was taken; and the Chairman pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 131, noes 299, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 403]

AYES—131

Aderholt	Collins	Hastings (WA)
Armey	Combest	Hayworth
Baker	Condit	Hefley
Ballenger	Cooksey	Herger
Barr	Cox	Hobson
Bartlett	Crane	Hoekstra
Barton	Cubin	Hostettler
Bliley	DeLay	Hunter
Blunt	Dickey	Hyde
Boehner	Doolittle	Jenkins
Bonilla	Dreier	Johnson, Sam
Bono	Dunn	Jones
Brady (TX)	Ehrlich	Kasich
Bryant	Everett	Kim
Burton	Fawell	King (NY)
Buyer	Fossella	Kingston
Callahan	Fowler	Knollenberg
Calvert	Gekas	Kolbe
Camp	Gibbons	Largent
Cannon	Goodlatte	Latham
Chambliss	Goss	Lewis (CA)
Chenoweth	Gutknecht	Lewis (KY)
Christensen	Hall (TX)	Linder
Coble	Hansen	Livingston
Coburn	Hastert	Lucas

Martinez
McCrery
McDade
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Mica
Miller (FL)
Nethercutt
Northup
Norwood
Oxley
Packard
Paul
Paxon
Pease
Peterson (PA)
Pickering
Pombo
Pryce (OH)
Radanovich
Redmond
Riggs
Riley
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Royce
Ryun
Salmon
Scarborough
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Sessions
Shadegg
Shimkus
Shuster
Skeen
Smith (OR)
Snowbarger
Solomon
Spence
Stump
Sununu
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Traficant
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Young (AK)

NOES—299

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Bachus
Baesler
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Berry
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Boehlert
Bonior
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bunning
Burr
Campbell
Canady
Capps
Cardin
Carson
Chabot
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Conyers
Cook
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Crapo
Cummings
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Emerson
Engel
English
Ensign
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Filner
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Furse
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goode
Goodling
Gordon
Graham
Granger
Green
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Hill
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Holden
Hooley
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hutchinson
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, E. B.
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
Kleczka
Klink
Klug
Kucinich
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manton
Manzullo
Markey
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHale
McHugh
McIntyre
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Metcalf
Millender-McDonald
Miller (CA)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Neumann
Ney
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pappas
Parker
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pitts
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Price (NC)
Quinn
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Schumer
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Adam
Smith, Linda
Snyder
Souder
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Stupak
Talent
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson
Thune
Thurman
Tierney
Torres
Towns
Turner
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—4

Castle
Cunningham
Gonzalez
Inglis

□ 1230

Ms. LEE and Messrs. BURR of North Carolina, SMITH of Texas, McCOLLUM, HUTCHINSON, and MORAN of Kansas changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Mrs. BONO and Messrs. CAMP, REDMOND and GOODLATTE changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. EWING). Pursuant to the order of the House of the legislative day of Wednesday, August 5, 1998, it is now in order to debate the subject matter of the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as No. 4.

Pursuant to House Resolution 442 and that order, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and a Member opposed each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to ask for a vote on the proposal that I am offering, but I have some things that I have wanted to say for a long time and now is the best time to say them.

The general public knows, and any politician with a conscience ought to know, that our existing campaign finance system is a disgrace. What people do not know is that we are not operating under the laws written by Congress. We are operating under what was left of reforms passed by the Congress after the Court shredded those reforms in a series of misguided decisions.

Under the Buckley v. Valeo decision, the Court equated dollars with speech, and in the process prevented the establishment of real limits on campaign spending. Through so-called independent expenditure and advocacy ads, they have allowed the cynical manipulation of campaign laws by special interests with the deepest pockets in this country.

In trying to come up with an honest solution to the problem of campaign finance, we need first to understand what the basic problems are. The biggest problem is the lack of public participation. At least 50 percent of Americans do not vote. That means the question of who runs the country is decided in most elections by a majority of the minority.

Ninety-four percent of Americans never contribute to a political campaign. They believe in political campaigns through immaculate conception. They do not want to contribute, and they do not like it when anybody else does, either. Many of them do not contribute because they cannot afford it. Some do not care. Some do not know how. Some do not believe that their contributions would make a difference. Some do not contribute simply because they have never been asked.

That means that in terms of financing campaigns, politics for most people has become a sideline sport. That is unhealthy. Only one-third of 1 percent of all Americans make contributions of $200 or more, and that constitutes over half of all of the money given by individuals in campaigns. That is one reason that 75 percent of the public says, in the Yankelovich poll, that our system of government is democratic in name only and that special interests run things.

When Congress passed campaign finance reform after Watergate, and I was here when we did, we thought we had created a system under which no individual could give more than $1,000, and no organization could give more than $5,000. Today corporate and party attorneys have expanded loopholes which enable corporations and high rollers individually to routinely give $200,000 contributions to both parties. The system is bad for both parties, because it makes the public gag when they think about politics. That is not the way it is supposed to be in this country.

I will vote for the Shays-Meehan bill today because I think it does some good, but I think it does some very modest good. It does not go nearly far enough, in my view, and will be ineffective, if passed, on the question of independent expenditures and issue advocacy, because, like almost all other proposals, it is forced to dance around the court decisions such as Buckley v. Valeo and the Colorado case.

It seems to me that as long as we accept Buckley v. Valeo, that what we are doing is pretending that we can get meaningful reform without modification of Buckley v. Valeo.

There is a group of legal scholars in this country, exemplified by Joshua Rosencrantz from New York University School of Law, who believes that if the Congress passes legislation containing a congressional finding that the existing system has become so fundamentally corrupting of America's faith in our institutions that it is necessary to limit campaign activities by candidates and special interests, that the

court might modify its original decision in light of those changing circumstances.

I would like to think that is true, but I am dubious. But I am willing to try it, because it offers one of only two meaningful ways to get out of our dilemma. That is why I am offering the proposal that I am offering today.

This proposal contains a congressional finding that America's faith in our election system has been fundamentally corrupted by big money, especially soft money, and cynical, manipulative expenditures by outside interest groups.

This bill would establish a voluntary system of 100 percent public financing for candidates who agree to take no private money whatsoever from any private source in general elections. It provides that candidates who receive public financing would agree to reasonable spending limits to finance congressional campaigns. The bill creates a grass roots citizenship fund into which individual public-spirited Americans may contribute on a voluntary basis.

The Federal Elections Commission would be authorized to conduct a major advertising campaign each year alerting the public to the existence of that fund, and explaining that they can help take back their government from special interest domination by voluntarily contributing virtually any amount they want. That is accomplished in the form of a dollar check up, not a check-off on their Federal tax return. So this is not mandated public financing, and it has not one dime of impact on the deficit.

In addition to that, we would supplement that by a one-tenth of 1 percent fee charged to all corporations whose profits are above $10 million. That is not going to break any of them.

The bill ends the scam of corporations and unions and special interest groups spending money to influence elections, all the while pretending that they are not doing what they in fact are doing. It would simply say that for a short 90-day period before the election, no independent expenditures and no issue advocacy ads would be allowed, period, if they could reasonably be determined to be aimed at influencing the outcome of the election.

If the court overturns those limitations, then this bill contains a requirement for an expedited procedure for the Congress to consider a narrow constitutional amendment only for the purpose of limiting such expenditures for that narrow 90-day period before the election.

Under normal circumstances, I frankly detest the idea of a constitutional amendment, because, with all due respect, when I look around this House floor, I see as many Daffy Ducks as I do James Madisons. But I would make an exception to my general resistance to a constitutional amendment, because this issue involves the very survival of our democratic form of government.

Today our system is grotesquely warped to respond to those in this society with money. The court did not know it at the time, but the result of the Buckley v. Valeo case has been to subvert the court one man-one vote decision on a reapportionment. We really do not have a meaningful one man-one vote system at the ballot box, when one man's vote can be magnified by $1 million times if he has $1 million bucks. It turns ''One-man One-vote'' into ''Big Bucks, Big Megaphone'' and that is a lousy way to run what is supposed to be the greatest democratic system in the world.

I have served in this institution for quite a while. I love what it is supposed to be. I cannot walk by the Capitol building at night without continuing to be thrilled about what our form of government is supposed to mean for every man, woman, and child in this country. But I have been profoundly angered by what the dominance of the economic elite in this country has done to public policy in this country, and to the process by which that policy is determined.

I have read a lot of things in public opinion polls that mystify me. I read some that profoundly disturb me. The most disturbing is that 2 years ago, one pollster asked the public, ''Who does the Republican Party best represent, the rich, the middle class, or the poor?'' The response overwhelmingly came back, ''The rich!'' When the same question was asked about the Democratic Party, and who it represented, the rich, the middle class, or the poor, the response again came back: ''The Rich!''

The public, it is clear, thinks that both parties are far too influenced by people who have the most money; and do you know what? They are absolutely dead right. The only way we can restore public confidence in this election system, and the very democratic processes enshrined in the Constitution, is to take private money totally out of general elections by providing 100 percent public financing.

Elections are supposed to be public events, not private events. They are not supposed to be auctions. They are supposed to be competing between ideas, not bank accounts.

In the middle of the 19th century, my district was represented in Congress by Congressman Cadwallader Washburn.

□ 1245

He also had two brothers serving in the Congress at the same time. One of the brothers represented the timber companies, a second represented the railroads, and the third represented the mining companies. They had all the big bases covered.

Times have changed since then. But unless we make dramatic changes to campaign finance, this Congress is slowly but surely reverting to a situation in which individual Members are being seen as tools or mouthpieces of major economic interests in this country.

Our principal responsibility as Members of this sacred body is to see to it that that does not happen. That is why I have tried to raise this issue today, and that is why, while I will support Shays-Meehan and I will oppose the freshman bill, I honestly believe that after the court gets done mucking up again honest efforts at reform, we will have to, in all honesty, turn to the recognition that we are going to have to look at a narrow constitutional amendment, if we are to save this Republic from the clutches of the wealthy elite which would turn ''One-man One-vote'' into ''Every man for the elite!''

That is not the way this country is supposed to be shaped, but our election politics right now guarantees that is the way it is going, without fundamental reform.

I congratulate the supporters of Shays-Meehan. They are trying to do the best they can under ridiculous court decisions, but they cannot go very far under those ridiculous decisions.

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. EWING). Does any Member rise in opposition to the amendment?

The gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLITTLE) is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I respect the honesty of the gentleman. I completely disagree on the solution, but I think some of the problems he has identified are real problems.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOOLITTLE. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, all that demonstrates is what Will Rogers meant when he said, when two people agree on everything, one of them is unnecessary.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Well, I assure the gentleman, there is lots of room for debate in this.

The Buckley case, of course, is completely consistent with prior cases on the First Amendment and has been upheld repeatedly, dozens of decisions since then, so it is not an exception to the Supreme Court's rulings in this area. It is not an aberration. It is completely consistent with mainstream constitutional law. It was correctly decided for the most part, I have quibbles with parts of it, but in general the idea that you cannot place expenditure limits on people who are running for office is desirable and constitutionally correct.

The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) really, in his substitute, does what I think most of the sponsors of Shays-Meehan really want, and that is to get the public financing. That is highly unpopular, and I wish the gentleman would bring it up for a vote. I have taken a radically different course

than most of the other bills with my full disclosure and deregulation. I would like to see the complete antithesis—offered by Mr. OBEY—voted on in this House as well. Perhaps the gentleman will change his mind at the end and perhaps not.

Anyway, I guess I would just like to quote, again the Sacramento Bee, virtually the Washington Post of the West Coast, when it editorialized yesterday against Shays-Meehan, but the two criticisms, I think, go right to the heart of the bill of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) as well.

And it says in the editorial page, ''it centers on two big, wrong-headed reforms: Prohibiting national political parties from collecting or using soft money contributions and outlawing independent political advertising that identifies candidates within 60 days of a Federal election.'' I think in this case the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) may have said his was 90 days.

The editorial continues: ''That means the law would prohibit issue campaigning at precisely the time when voters are finally interested in listening, hardly consistent with free speech. Since that kind of restriction is likely to be tossed by the courts as a violation of constitutional free speech guarantees, the net effect of the changes will be to weaken political parties while making the less accountable 'independent expenditure groups' kings of the campaign landscape.

So, indeed, we see that far from bringing control from the elite back to the average person, the bill of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), according to the Sacramento Bee, and I believe this as well, would go exactly in the opposite direction and further strengthen the hand of the elite, just as Shays-Meehan would do along with the other big government types of reforms.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I think we need to understand what issue advocacy campaigns are and what independent expenditures are.

What happens is, if a corporation or a union or any other private interest gets mad at any Member of this Congress, they can run an unlimited amount of ads savaging their reputation without ever telling who they are, where they get their money or what their real agenda is. They pretend that these are not campaign ads when they are, to the core, efforts to influence campaigns. They are public lies that slip by because nobody on the Supreme Court ever ran for sheriff.

If any member of the Supreme Court had ever run for public office, they would understand what an idiocy they have performed when they produced Buckley v. Valeo. They would understand the scams that routinely go on to pretend that you are not involved in a campaign when you are going hell-bent to savage the reputation of one of the candidates in a campaign.

So what I believe is that if any money is going to be contributed to affect the campaign, it ought to be contributed on top of the table, not under the table. My first preference is to have no private money at all, because that is the only way that you truly do assure one-man one-vote.

Shays-Meehan cannot do that because they are trying to be very careful, so they produce something which lives within the constraints of Buckley v. Valeo and the other decisions. I respect them for their efforts, and I applaud them. But somebody in this Congress has to speak forthrightly about the stupidity of those court decisions and how the big money interests of this country have been able to manipulate those decisions through the years. And that situation is getting worse, it is not getting better.

I would hope that passage of Shays-Meehan will lead to creating more pressure and more awareness in the public of the need to have fundamental reform. If it were accepted by the other body, it would be a welcome first step forward.

Let us not kid ourselves, it is a modest, modest approach in comparison to what really needs to be done if this country is going to some day, some day, for at least a moment or two in our history, have truly equal access to government on the part of every American, regardless of connections, regardless of economic circumstances, regardless of who you know.

Your ability to influence government ought to be based on what you know, not who you know and what you have in your bank account. Right now, the system is just reversed, and that is why it is so sick.

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

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume, just to observe, the system is sick and the system rewards the elites, particularly the media elite. Overwhelmingly the liberal media elite in this country is going to get even stronger under the bill of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and the Shays-Meehan bill and under these other big government types of reforms.

That is why, if we really want to do something for the average person, we will go in the opposite direction and deregulate, not further encumber the system with even more regulation.

By the way, just as a point of note, Justice Sandra Day O'Connor, just to name one, was, I believe, an elected Republican leader in the Arizona legislature, so she certainly was familiar with elections. While it is true that she was not on the court when Buckley was decided, she has certainly been participating in all the various decisions which without fail have continued to sustain and uphold the rationale in Buckley ever since it was rendered in 1976.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, what the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLITTLE) is really doing is defending the status quo. I respect his right to do that. But what he is defending is a system which says on the books that individuals can only contribute $1,000 to a candidate in a general election, and political action committees can only contribute $5,000 in a general election, but if some rich guy gets his nose out of joint, he can spend a million dollars affecting the outcome of a political campaign.

Now, that, on its face, is ludicrous. You talk about guaranteeing the supremacy of elites, you have got to be kidding if you do not think that that guarantees the supremacy of economic elites in this country.

All you have to have in order to destroy a decent balance in politics in this country is a big ego and a big bank account and a big grudge against somebody who is trying to behave in the public interest. That is why I think we need the fundamental reform I am talking about.

Mr. Chairman, absent any speakers on my side, if the gentleman is willing to yield back, I am willing to yield back.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me say, at the end of my brief remarks, I am prepared to yield back. We have no more speakers.

I would just like to observe that I am really not defending the status quo. I loathe this present system as much as anybody. But it is the big government types who gave us the present system. The present system has created this absurd situation which you identified where a millionaire can do anything he likes for his own election, but he can only give $1,000 to somebody else's.

The converse of that is that the individual, as a candidate who is not a millionaire, who has no money, so to speak, of average means and has to get it from others, he has to go grub for money and spend 70 percent of his time, like Lamar Alexander was quoted as doing, because the present system limits him what we can do.

So the millionaire, under the big government elite system, the sky is the limit to the billionaire, he can spend whatever he likes, and that is okay. But the average person is limited in what he can raise in order to be able to spend it in his campaign.

It is just not fair. It is not right. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and I have different solutions for this.

I just want to make clear, I think in many ways, in fact, I do not think, I know my proposal is clearly the most dramatic in terms of the change that it would make, because it totally overthrows the existing order and does not leave even a vestige of it. We institute instead thereof full disclosure.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

I would simply say, Mr. Chairman, the system the gentleman is proposing as an alternative would simply say that the way you solve the problem is by letting the big guys contribute more than they contribute today. I do not find that to be much of a solution at all.

I would also point out, again, the system the gentleman is defending by way of independent expenditures allows people to affect the outcome of elections secretly rather than having their contributions on top of the table.

The best way to relieve politicians from the need to go after those thousand dollar contributions is to simply take away their ability to take any money, period. Elections are supposed to be public events. They are not supposed to be a competition between private interests. They are supposed to serve the public interest, not the private interests with money. That is why we will never truly have a government ''of, by and for the people'' until there is no private money at all allowed in campaigns and we have 100 percent public financing.

That may not be stylish, but that happens to be what I believe. I believe it with all the fiber of my being. I am not going to be like the country preacher that Mo Udall cited once, who says, ''Well, folks, thems my views, and if you don't like them, well, then I will change them.''

I am not going to change my views. I believe this is the only way to truly give us a truly Democratic system.

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. All time has expired.

The amendment No. 4 not being offered, pursuant to the order of the House of the legislative day of Wednesday, August 5, 1998, it is now in order to debate the subject matter of the amendment printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as No. 8.

Pursuant to House Resolution 442 and that order, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON) and a Member opposed, each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON).

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes of my time to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN), and I ask unanimous consent that he be able to yield blocks of time as he deems necessary.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

□ 1300

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As we have learned in this debate, campaign finance reform can certainly be a complex and confusing issue, but the public always has a way of making common sense out of nonsense. To the public, this issue boils down to the meaning of democracy. Democracy in our country, in Washington, is being changed from ''the people rule'' to ''big money governs'', and that is what must be reversed.

In order for democracy to be strengthened, we have to empower the individual. The Hutchinson-Allen freshman bill does exactly this. The freshman bill empowers individuals so that their voices can be heard in Washington, even above the clamor of special interests.

The freshman bill, most importantly, protects the Constitution and free speech, but it also gives the American people a greater voice in our political process. It does this in three ways.

First of all, it restrains the uncontrolled excesses of big monied special interests and labor unions by banning soft money, the millions of dollars these groups pump into our national political parties in a similar fashion as the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR) indicated this morning that his legislation did, banning it to the Federal parties but not restricting the States.

It strengthens the individual voices by increasing the amount individuals and political action committees can give by indexing their contribution limits to match inflation. The freshman bill is the only proposal that strengthens the individual contributions in this way.

Thirdly, it provides information to the public, and it strengthens individuals in that way, by giving them and the media information about who is spending money to influence campaigns. Knowledge is power and we empower individuals.

Mr. Chairman, the freshman bill has been criticized by extremists on both sides of this debate. On the one hand there are those who would claim this bill goes too far and should not ban soft money. On the other hand, there are those who claim this bill does not go far enough and is not real reform. I am not sure we could have asked for a better compliment. The opposition from both extremes suggests the freshman task force has succeeded in producing a balanced and fair bill that does not tip the scales in favor of one faction or another.

And so the freshman bill is simple, but in this town being simple and straightforward confuses a lot of people. But because it is bipartisan, because it is simple, it has the best opportunity of going through the Senate, being passed and becoming law.

I am delighted with my fellow freshmen who have worked so hard on this and I will look forward to hearing them in this debate. Our goal is the best route for reform, and that is the freshman bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. EWING). Is there a Member who stands in opposition?

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this process is clearly at a point where we are going to make a choice, and the choice is relatively simple. We will either move forward with the Shays-Meehan legislation, that has some chance, although a difficult hurdle with the parliamentary ability of Senators to stop legislation, and move forward with campaign finance reform.

I happen to think it is also a preferable piece of legislation, in that it has stricter controls on soft money and issue advocacy ads. It does a better job in a number of areas. It does not increase expenditure limits as large as this bill does. Under this particular piece of legislation an individual's ability to give, per election cycle, goes from $25,000 to $50,000. I am against increasing any of these contribution limits.

The average American must be sitting home and scratching their heads when they look at legislation that increases how much an individual can give in each election cycle from $25,000 to $50,000. That is not the challenge to entering the political process for most families who make less than $50,000 a year. The only reason to increase the amount of money that people can contribute to campaigns is if we think wealthy people do not have enough access to the political process. That is clearly not the problem.

I would hope we would defeat this bill. It has been a noble effort. They have clearly wanted reform. We have a better vehicle before us. We have a vehicle that has a chance of becoming law and we ought to take that. Defeat this particular piece of legislation and let us pass Shays-Meehan.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEJDENSON. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Chairman, I was really pleased that the gentleman was able to cosponsor the freshman bill.

Mr. GEJDENSON. I will reclaim my time, Mr. Chairman, because I have very little, and say I did so to try to move this process forward.

I cosponsored almost every piece of real reform legislation at the beginning of this Congress to see which one we could get to the forefront. I had my own. This is not about ego or authorship. This is about what we can get done, and what we can get done today is Shays-Meehan.

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

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DAVIS), who has been a real leader in the effort on campaign finance reform.

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, as soon as the 42 Democratic freshmen arrived in Washington we chose as our highest priority to reform the campaign finance system in this country. And we knew there were two things that had to be done to accomplish that: First, the bill had to be bipartisan; and, second, it had to be incremental.

So the gentleman from Maine (Mr. TOM ALLEN) is the leader on our side, working hand-in-hand with the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. ASA HUTCHINSON), and a few other Republican freshmen who wrote a bill attacking two of the most gaping loopholes in our campaign finance system: Soft money, unlimited contributions given to political parties, not for good government, I would submit in many cases. And anonymous, and often misleading and inflammatory political ads run by third-party groups from outside the congressional districts, in most cases, where the ads were being run.

And that bill was opposed. Matter of fact, at least one group said that the courts had upheld their rights to run political advertising. In fact, they went on to admit that if they were forced by our bill to put their names on their political ads, they would not run the ads.

That is exactly why we were doing the bill. If somebody is not willing to put their name on a political ad, they are not willing to stand behind the representations they are making to voters in attempting to influence the outcome of an election.

Now, many of us who supported this bill have voted for Shays-Meehan, and we will continue to do so. And we will continue to adopt as our highest priority to reform this excessive and out-of-control campaign finance system.

I want to say one thing about the freshmen who did this. We did so not because we were concerned about the risk as to who was going to benefit, Democrats or Republicans; we were concerned about the risks of continuing with a system out of control. We will continue to push, when this bill passes the House today, for meaningful campaign finance reform.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Montana (Mr. RICK HILL), who has been an outstanding leader on this freshman task force's efforts for reform.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Many people refer to the freshman bill as the Shays-Meehan light bill. Frankly, that is not fair to the Shays-Meehan bill or to the freshman bill, because these two bills have a different underlying philosophy to them. They do have one thing in common. They both seek to ban soft money.

But the real question is, how and why are we trying to reform campaign finance? Again, we agree that we should ban soft money and the soft money abuses of labor unions and corporations. And the argument for the Shays bill is that we should ''level the playing field,'' that is, level the playing field between incumbents and outside groups.

They would limit these outside groups by determining how they get money and how they spend it and when they spend it. Is that constitutional? Probably not. Even the advocates for Shays-Meehan believe it may not meet constitutional muster. More important, is it a good thing to do? I do not think it is. I think it is a bad idea.

Shays basically says incumbents should control, that others should play on the same playing field as incumbents, and so they seek to limit these outside groups. I do not think we should level the playing field by limiting the political speech. And so the freshman took a fresh approach. Probably because we were not incumbents allowed us to take that fresh approach.

We said that we should level the playing field, but the playing field ought to be level between incumbents and challengers. The result of the Shays bill is that it is going to protect incumbents and it is going to restrict the opportunities for challengers. The freshman bill seeks to expand the opportunities for challengers.

How does it do that? It takes the shackles off political parties and their ability to help challengers. Challengers lose because they cannot get the resources. Our bill says let parties help challengers and, in the process, let us make campaigns competitive, and we think that is good.

The Shays bill weakens parties. It forecloses the ability of parties to help their candidates. It will pit parties against their own candidates to raise money.

When the Court declares Shays unconstitutional, which it will, incumbents are virtually guaranteed reelection. They are the only ones that will get the resources. They will be completely free of criticism from outside groups. And the problem is that challengers are going to be further locked out of the political process. Incumbents have all the power today. And what the freshmen bill says is that let us let challengers, let us let outsiders get access to the resources.

I would ask my colleagues today to support the freshman bill.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) be allowed to take 10 minutes of my time and distribute it as he sees fit.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN).

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this year's freshman class, the Democratic freshman class, and I compliment them on their commitment to passing campaign finance reform.

Here we are on the verge of this historic vote, and as I look over, I see the gentleman from Florida (Mr. JIM DAVIS), and the gentleman from Maine (Mr. TOM ALLEN), and the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. BOB WEYGAND), and the freshmen Members who have worked so hard on this bill for so long. I think of the hours that we put in debating the pros and cons of different provisions in our legislation. It is really a warm feeling to think that here we are, we are going to pass a bill.

Now, I hope it is the Shays-Meehan bill, but I want to compliment the ability of the freshman class to work in a bipartisan way, the ability of the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. HAL FORD), and the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. VIC SNYDER), and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ALLEN BOYD), and so many of the Democratic freshmen to work hard, diligently, to get us to a point in time where not only we are finally getting a debate and a vote on campaign finance reform, but we are going to make a real difference by advocating tirelessly for reform. The result is going to be that we are going to send a bill over to the other body, and the freshmen Democrats ought to be recognized for their outstanding efforts.

I also rise today in opposition to the Hutchinson-Allen legislation, because I think we have a unique opportunity to pass a stronger bill, the Shays-Meehan substitute. And due to the structure of the debate, a vote for the Hutchinson-Allen bill would be a vote against the Shays-Meehan bill.

We have a bill that would definitely end the million dollar contributions that have funneled through the parties. It would also end the sham issue ads that influence Federal elections. Why? Because our legislation would not allow States to funnel unlimited money into Federal races. Moreover, the Shays-Meehan bill reins in those sham issue ads that ought to qualify as campaign ads.

Another major loophole is this whole issue of undisclosed corporate money. We can do better. The Shays-Meehan legislation will do that. Mr. Chairman, I can honestly tell my colleagues that the Shays-Meehan legislation will cut the ties between unlimited contributions and the legislative process. I cannot draw the same conclusion about the Hutchinson substitute. Therefore, I cannot, in good conscience, endorse the freshman bill.

But I think it is important, as we reach this critical hour, that we recognize the Members of the Democratic freshman class who signed the discharge petition to enable us to have this debate and this vote; who stood tall with the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. CHRIS SHAYS), myself, and the other Democratic Members, who got an outstanding 237 majority in this House on Monday evening, and those Members who, I believe, will stand tall in sending the Shays-Meehan bill over to the other body so that we can get real campaign finance reform.

I congratulate Members of the freshman class and look forward to having

them join with me at the end of this debate in making sure we send to the Senate the Shays-Meehan legislation.

□ 1315

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute to say that, first, I thank my colleague the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON) for yielding me the 10 minutes, and to acknowledge the fact that he has been an extraordinary leader on campaign finance reform and succeeded in drafting legislation that got to the President's desk, and excellent legislation as well.

I also want to stand to congratulate both the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON) and the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN) and all the freshmen for what they have done.

The difficult thing is, we have worked well to bring this legislation forward. We tried not to, as reformers, to attack each other and to present a clear case. But today is the day in which we have to distinguish the differences.

I would just say that I think in order to have a ban on soft money, we have to ban it not on just the Federal level but on the State level for Federal elections. And I think we cannot leave the current loophole of sham issue ads being allowed to continue when they are truly campaign ads. We need to make them campaign ads. They need to follow the campaign rules in order to eliminate that extraordinary loophole. We do have to continue to move forward with reform.

So I thank my colleagues, and I look forward to this debate.

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

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS).

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Hutchinson amendment, the substitute, and, as it is known, the freshman substitute. Of all the choices out there, I think it deserves support.

Mr. Chairman, if this were a perfect world lifting present restrictions on campaign financing and substituting only one requirement of immediate and full disclosure—with transparency—would be a perfect solution. This would allow a candidate to run his or her campaign in their own way in a free country while giving the voters immediate access to who is funding the candidates campaign. An informed electorate could then fully participate freely knowledgeably casting their ballots. But it's not a perfect world and we need to look at other choices.

I have heard from many individuals, special interest groups, newspaper editorial boards regarding which bill is the correct and only solution to the problem. There's no such choice, and if we are honest with ourselves—we all know it.

I happen to favor the Hutchinson substitute for a few very good reasons. Unlike the Shays/Meehan proposal, the freshman bill does not limit issue advocacy. Instead, it requires organizations to disclose any advertisement expenditures over a certain limit.

The freshman bill bans national parties from raising soft money, and also prohibits Federal office holders and candidates from raising soft money for State parties. But, unlike the Shays/Meehan bill, the Hutchinson substitute does not impose Washington's views and regulations on the State parties. As someone who believes strongly in States' rights, I believe this is an important distinction.

It's important to remember that the GOP majority in Congress has brought forward this open and extensive debate. The Democratic Party after 40 years in power in Congress never did do campaign reform and left us in the mess we are today. I commend Mr. HUTCHINSON for his leadership on this issue and I urge adoption of the freshman substitute. All rhetoric aside, it's the most workable choice and though I'm not a freshman I think their bill deserves strong support.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF).

(Mr. WOLF asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous material.)

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support. I was one of the Republican Members that signed the discharge petition to get this process moving, and one of the reasons I did it is because soft money is beginning to and may have already corrupted the political process and will continue.

One of my major reasons for supporting this proposal is that both political parties, the Democratic Party and the Republican Party, are taking money from the gambling interests, record money.

Look at today's Washington Post: ''Survivor of Father's Shooting Dies.'' Dad was $10 million in debt, gambling and other debt ''totaling more than $10 million, some of it from gambling losses at Atlantic City.''

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 6, 1998]

LONE SURVIVOR OF FATHER'S SHOOTINGS DIES

(By Wendy Melillo and Brooke A. Masters)

An 11-year old Herndon girl died yesterday after initially surviving the slayings of her mother and brother and the suicide of her father, Who authorities now say had defrauded area banks of nearly $2 million and had $10 million in gambling and other debts.

Reha Ramachandran was grazed by a bullet that struck the back of her head as her father, Natarajan Ramachandran, killed his wife and 7-year old son Sunday night. Reha died yesterday afternoon at Inova Fairfax Hospital after her brain swelled as a result of the injury.

Sources familiar with the investigation said that before his death, Ramachandran had written nearly $2 million in bad checks in an attempt to cover mounting debt totaling more than $10 million, some of it from gambling losses at Atlantic City casinos. He had been under investigation by the FBI and had been interviewed several times by agents who were building a case against him, a source said.

''It is sad day when the love of money and the fear of failure drives a man to destroy his entire family,'' said Lt. Bruce Guth, a Fairfax County police homicide investigator.

Ramachandran was writing checks on several bank accounts, all with insufficient funds, authorities said. The time it took for checks to clear between accounts in the different banks allowed Ramachandran to stay one step ahead of being caught, authorities said.

''Our case concluded at the time he killed himself and will subsequently be closed,'' John L. Barrett Jr., special agent in charge of the criminal division in the FBI's Washington field office.

Authorities said Ramachandran's business partner, Nagaraja Thyagarajan, became aware of the financial problems and went to Ramachandran's home in the 12300 block of Clareth Drive at 12:45 p.m. Monday to discuss the matter. When Thyagarajan knocked at the door, Reha, shaken, disoriented and bleeding from a bullet wound, answered the door.

She was admitted to Inova Fairfax Hospital and her condition improved somewhat Tuesday—she even spoke with police—before she died of complications yesterday.

Fairfax County police said Reha told them that after being shot, she somehow thought it was all ''just a bad dream.'' She said she stumbled from the master bedroom, where Ramachandran had gathered the family, into another room and fell asleep until she was aroused by Thyagarajan's knock at the door.

Autopsies performed yesterday on Ramachandran; his wife, Kalpara, 36; and son, Raj, determined that they died of gunshot wounds to their upper bodies.

Sources said Ramachandran left a note detailing his financial problems. They said his wife was not aware of his financial difficulties.

Records from New Jersey Superior Court show three judgments for an Atlantic City hotel and casino against Ramachandran, who apparently also used the name Nat Ram there. The judgments, in 1991 and 1992, totaled $2,240.

Ramachandran worked for Universal Finance Solutions, a Vienna investment firm that he founded with Thyagarajan. Ramachandran and Thyagarajan paid $252,000 in cash for the office condominium in a low-rise building on Gallows Road, according to land records and the previous owner of the property.

Thyagarajan has declined to comment on the case.

Ramachandran and his wife bought their Herndon home, with four bedrooms, and 4½ bathrooms, for $585,000 in April 1997, with a mortgage of $438,000. The house sits on an acre amid only 10 other homes in a subdivision called Crossfields.

The family had not sold its previous home in Prince William County. It was purchased in July 1989 for $170,400. County land records show the couple had a $153,350 mortgage on that property, and an additional loan in October for $15,700.

Mr. WOLF. Why would the Democratic Party, why would the Republican Party want to take money from the gambling industry that brings about corruption and addiction?

I also saw a study that came out the other day from Vermont where it says, the medical journal *Pediatrics*, ''High school students who gamble are more likely to engage in other health-risk behaviors.''

The study surveyed 21,000 8th through 12th graders in Vermont, median age 15. More than half of these young people reported they gambled in

the last 12 months. Those who gambled in the last 12 months had a number of things in common: Male; frequent illegal drug use; not using seat belts, and driving after drinking alcohol.

I sent a letter to both the Democratic national chairman and the Republican national chairman asking them to stop taking soft money, and neither have agreed.

I think this bill is the best bill, the most balanced bill, the one that can pass, and the one that can be signed into law. For those reasons, I urge that no one vote ''present'' on this one. I urge everybody on both sides, whether they voted for Shays-Meehan or voted against Shays-Meehan, here is an opportunity. Support the Hutchinson-Allen bill, which will do away with soft money once and for all, so the gambling interests and other special interests can no longer corrupt the political process.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLF. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I applaud the point of view of my colleague on the gambling interests. I think he is courageous. I am only concerned about the State soft money not being closed in this bill, which it is closed in Shays-Meehan; and I wonder if the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) had a comment on that.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I would favor closing it. The concern I have with Shays-Meehan is it prohibits people from expressing themselves, and I am concerned it is an incumbent protection bill.

I think anybody in the country ought to have the right to criticize us any way they want to in any kind of ad. And, for that reason, I am a little concerned. But on soft money for the states, I totally agree with the gentleman from California.

Mr. CAMPBELL. If the gentleman would yield further, to me it is a difficult balance, but that would be a flaw in the freshman bill, that we would still have soft money which is potentially corruptible and involves gambling interests going to the State.

My State of California, look at the race for attorney general, last time Democrat and Republican. We are going to see gambling money on both sides. For what? For the attorney general, who is obviously making decisions on that.

Mr. WOLF. Reclaiming my time, I agree with the gentleman. I urge strong support for the Hutchinson-Allen bill.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Bipartisan Campaign Integrity Act (H.R. 2183), also known as the ''Freshman bill.''

I think this is a balanced bill, and one that can pass. One of my main concerns has been the need for a total ban on soft money to the major national political parties. It was because of this that I was one of those who signed the discharge petition to keep the campaign finance reform process alive. I wanted to do everything I could to help to bring about a total ban on soft money to the national political parties.

There are a lot of reasons why we need to take this step. I am deeply concerned about the obscene amounts of soft money going to the Republican and Democrat parties, especially from the gambling interests. As the author of legislation to create a commission to study the impact of the growth of gambling in America, I have seen firsthand the willingness of the gambling lobby to throw around vast sums of money to protect their own self-interests and preservation—at the expense of the average citizen. And do they have the money to do it. The gambling industry rakes in $50 billion in profits each year.

We might not think of gambling as something that hurts anyone. But study after study shows thats just not true.

We've been hearing a lot about gambling addiction among you people, and now another study has come out confirming those earlier findings.

A recently published article in the medical journal Pediatrics showed that high school students who gamble are more likely to engaged in other health risk behaviors as well. The study surveyed more than 21,000 eighth- through 12th-graders in Vermont schools. The median age of the students surveyed was 15 years old. More than half of these young people reported that they had gambled in the past 12 months. Those who had gambled in the past 12 months had a number of things in common: being male; frequent illegal drug use; not using seatbelts; driving after drinking alcohol; carrying a weapon; being involved in a fight; and years of sexual activity.

Teen gambling addiction is just one example of this industry's ill effects. There are many others. I've been concerned by data like this, so I sent a letter to the chairmen of both major political parties, which I will include for the RECORD, asking them to take the first step in campaign finance reform by refusing to take soft money campaign contributions from the gambling industry. Unfortunately, they're still taking that money.

Earlier this year, the New York Times reported that the gambling interests have ''more than quadrupled their contributions to federal candidates and political parties since 1991.''

According to Common Cause, the national Republican and Democratic party committees have raised a record high of $90 million in soft money during the first 15 months of the 1998 election cycle. This is more than double what the parties raised during the first 15 months of the 1994 cycle. In the first three months of 1998 alone, the parties raised almost $23 million.

The Freshman bill protects free speech. It provides a level playing field for all federal candidates. It bans soft money on the federal level, and prohibits funny business between state and federal parties by eliminating loopholes. The Freshman bill stops state parties from laundering soft money for federal candidates.

Soft money to the national political parties is the 900-pound gorilla of campaign finance reform. It's time to ban it. The Freshman bill does it. That's why I'm going to vote for it. I urge my colleagues to do the same.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, April 3, 1998.

Mr. JIM NICHOLSON,
Chairman, Republican National Committee, Washington, DC.

Mr. ROY ROMER,
General Chairman, Democratic National Committee, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. NICHOLSON AND MR. ROMER: With today's gridlock on campaign finance reform—which many of us believe is essential to this country, and must have, at its core, a ban on soft money—I would like to offer a suggestion to get the process started. There is something that can be done to help with this problem right now. A good first step toward meaningful reform could happen today if both major political parties would refuse to accept one more dollar from the gambling industry.

We couldn't even watch the NCAA basketball championship without thinking of the recent headlines about the gambling scandal involving two former basketball players from Northwestern University who were just indicted for shaving points in three games during the 1994–95 season. Although betting on college sports is illegal, The Washington Post reports that $80 million was wagered on this year's NCAA tournament. (See attached.)

But there is something else we need to think about as political leaders. There is a definite link between gambling and political corruption. Pro-gambling forces are well-funded and lobby hard—at federal, state and local levels. In the 1995–96 election cycle alone, the casino interest poured $7 million into campaign coffers, according to a study conducted by the Campaign Study Group for The New York Times. I don't know if you saw the article that details this, but I'm enclosing it for you. It says that these political contributions have quadrupled since 1991 and that money has been given both to federal candidates and to political parties. This sends the wrong message about what kind of government we have.

Is it not hypocritical to call for campaign finance reform while simultaneously receiving large sums of soft money from gambling interests? I urge you today to jointly call a halt to taking this money. With both major parties taking this action, neither party would have an advantage over the other. The winners in this would be the American Family—to moms, dads and kids everywhere.

All across the country, the nation's newspapers are filled with stories of corruption related to gambling. Sometimes the parties involved are the gambling operators themselves, as was the case recently when the manager of a Virginia charitable gambling operation pleaded guilty to nine counts of embezzlement, The Virginia Pilot reported in January. Earlier, four officials pleaded guilty and two workers are under indictment in bingo corruption cases in a neighboring Virginia town.

But many times the corruption related to gambling has political overtones. Recent land-grabbing cases by the city led George magazine to list Las Vegas in its ''Ten Most Corrupt Cities'' in the March 1998 issues. A former city councilman told the magazine, ''This is government for the casinos, of the casinos, and by the casinos.'' A former deputy attorney general said, ''The city takes the money that would have gone back into the community—schools, hospitals, police—and instead they have given it to the casinos for their development.''

A federal investigation into charges of illicit gambling-related deals led Missouri's House Speaker, who had held the office for 15 years, to resign, the Kansas City Star reported in October 1996.

Several years earlier, 19 Arizona legislators and lobbyists were paid off after promising to see legalized gambling come to the state, USA Today reported. That incident has been caught on videotape and became known as ''AzScam.''

Corruption charges have brought down four of the last seven Atlantic City mayors, the New York Times reported.

In Indiana, the former chairman of the state's House Ways and Means Committee was indicted on charges of bribery, perjury and filing false financial reports involving a proposed riverboat casino.

NBC recently aired a movie called, ''Playing to Win,'' which was about teen addiction to gambling. The movie ended by citing a new Harvard study which says two million teenagers in America are struggling with gambling addiction. A telephone number for the National Council on Compulsive Gambling was flashed on the screen. According to the NCCG's executive director, their phones have been ringing off the hook, almost around the clock, since the airing of the movie. People are looking for help—for themselves, for their loved ones—because of gambling addiction.

What is it that convinced NBC to air this movie? What was it that motivated the citizens of Oklahoma, their state legislators and their governor to reject gambling casinos by more than a 2-to-1 margin earlier this year?

They know the other side of the story. They knew that gambling is no game. It leaves in it path the wreckage of human misery. Addiction, crime, corruption, loss of revenue to local business, bankruptcy, and even suicide—these are the fruits of this industry which is sweeping America.

That's why I'm writing you this letter. Although gambling proponents make promises of increased jobs and revenue to communities, gambling is no risk-free game. There is another side of the story. It's time for the leaders and policymakers of this country to face the evidence that gambling is bad for families, bad for business and bad for communities. It's time to say ''no'' to the money lure the gambling industry has cast.

GAMBLING IS BAD FOR FAMILIES.

Many families cross the country have been ruined by gambling. This is a problem that affects everybody—high school students, retired persons, blue-collar workers, and some of our nation's leaders.

Across the country, social service agencies report the incredibly negative impact that gambling is having on American families. The Mississippi State Health Department reported in 1994 that one of its state's localities, Harrison County, has averaged 500 more divorces per year since casinos appeared.

In Illinois, a 1995 survey of compulsive gamblers showed that for 25 percent of the respondents, gambling led to divorce or separation.

In Maryland, a 1995 report found that domestic violence and child abuse skyrocket when gambling arrives into a community.

The executive director of the Gulf Coast Women's Center in Biloxi, Mississippi, reported that since gambling came to the area, the center is averaging 400 more crises calls per month. In Central City, Colorado, child protection cases rose six-fold the year after casinos arrived, a 1994 study found.

The fastest-growing teenage addiction today is gambling, according to Howard J. Shaffer, director of Harvard Medical School's Center for Addiction Studies. Shaffer found that the rate of pathological gambling among high school and college-age people is twice that of adults.

The gambling industry is not doing enough to prevent these problems. For example, although the minimum legal age for casino patrons in Louisiana is 21, six underage young people boarded all three New Orleans-area riverboats in January and gambled freely, the Associated Press reported. A local television station used a hidden camera to tape the youths gambling, cashing winnings and being offered alcoholic beverages by cocktail waitresses on the boats.

Bakruptcy, too, is skyrocketing in America, crippling American families. Obviously, sometimes businesses fail and investment go sour. But too often personal bankruptcies happen as a result of spiraling gambling debt. When that's the case, not only is the gambler affected, but so is his or her entire family.

There is a link between gambling and personal bankruptcies. The U.S. Treasury Department is in the process of conducting a study to examine this link. According to the American Bankruptcy Institute, Nevada had the fourth-highest bankruptcy rate in America in 1996. Mississippi ranked fifth in the country in per-capita bankruptcy filings. It is also the state with the second-highest level of gambling per capita.

Last year, bankruptcies in South Mississippi were up nearly 18 percent, according to the Gulfport Sun Herald. The president-elect of the Mississippi Bankruptcy Conference said that gambling is a major cause of this increase. (See attached news clip.)

A recent SMR Research Corporation study on bankruptcy states, ''It now appears that gambling may be the fastest-growing driver of bankruptcy.'' The report also points out that the bankruptcy rate was 18 percent higher in counties with one or more gambling facilities, and 35 percent higher in counties with five or more gambling establishments. All one needs to do is to look at a map to see the link between gambling and bankruptcy, the report says. One example: Atlantic City, N.J., has the highest bankruptcy rate in the state. (A portion of this study is attached.)

Sometimes the pressure of trying to deal with one's gambling debts proves too much. One of the most tragic of gambling's ill effects on the family is when the gambling family member sees no other way out and ends his or her life. In the latest report in Suicide and Life-Threatening Behavior, the officials journal of the American Association of Suicidology, the study, ''Elevated Suicide Levels Associated with Legalized Gambling,'' showed that there is a link between gambling and increased levels of suicide. Dr. David Phillips of the University of California at San Diego wrote, ''Our findings raise the possibility that the recent expansion of legalized gambling and the consequent increase in gambling settings may be accompanied by an increase in U.S. suicides.''

The study said that it was not just visitors who have higher levels of suicide in major gambling communities, but residents, too. Las Vegas has the highest levels of suicide in the nation, both for residents and visitors.

What is the gambling industry's response? They claim this phenomenon is due to geography—that people in the Southwest tend to be more isolated, remote and more prone to suicide. And yet, it is not merely a Southwestern phenomenon. Atlantic City has ''abnormally high suicide levels'' for visitors and residents, but that only appeared after gambling casinos were opened, the study said. The high levels of suicide in these two cities are not merely the result of a high number of visitors nor due to suicidal individuals being attracted to these cities, the study showed. Surely there can be nothing more tragic for a family than to lose a family member to suicide, and the fact is, many times gambling is behind this tragic loss.

GAMBLING IS BAD FOR BUSINESS

In addition to claiming to bring a mere form of entertainment, the gambling industry often claims it will bring jobs and increased revenue to local economies through tourism. But when a casino wins, legitimate local businesses lose. Gambling consumes income that would have been spent on local tourism, services, movies, recreation and clothing.

As legalized gambling has spread throughout the United States in recent years, these activities have been subsidized by the taxpayers—directly and indirectly. A 1992 Better Government Association study and 1994 Florida Budget Office report both indicated that for every dollar that legalized gambling contributes to taxes, it costs the taxpayer at least three dollars. There are higher infrastructure, regulatory, criminal justice system and social welfare costs when legalized gambling enters a community.

Although gambling interests claim their entry into a community will bring economic growth, many would disagree. One corporate president and CEO in Mississippi recently said he's been having difficulty in recruiting employees to his company due to the state's reputation as ''the gambling state of America,'' according to the Jackson, Mississippi, Clarion-Ledger. The CEO said that Mississippi ''has the second largest amount of square footage of gambling of any state in the nation.''

Researchers from Iowa State University conducted a 1996 study of one Iowa city to see how a new riverboat casino affected the local economy. They found that 29 percent of local business owners reported decreased activity. Local economies in the state of Minnesota have also been hurt by gambling. One statewide survey found that 38 percent of local restaurant owners said they had lost business to gambling.

Sometimes the damage to local economies comes simply because of too many gambling casinos. When one Illinois city's casino revenues dropped due to competition from casinos in a neighboring state, the city had to rebate almost $1 million in gambling taxes.

The state of Louisiana made an ambitious tax deal with one casino builder in hopes of bringing the world's largest casino to New Orleans. But the deal proved too costly to Harrah's Jazz Co., which went bankrupt, Time magazine reported in April 1996. The sight of a half-built, rusting casino on the edge of the French Quarter converted the state's governor into an anti-gambling advocate, according to Time. Louisiana voters agree with him, according to a Baton Rouge newspaper's year-end poll, reported earlier this year. The Advocate found that only 16 percent of voters said legalized gambling has had a good impact on the state. Almost two-thirds of respondents said gambling is a serious or extremely serious problem in Louisiana.

GAMBLING IS BAD FOR COMMUNITIES

Many communities have been misled and duped into accepting gambling. The gambling industry—with about $50 billion in yearly profits—is well-financed, and conducts an incredibly smooth public relations campaign. Government is supposed to be the protector of societies. But many local governments have turned predatory in an effort to raise revenues for their communities. The gambling industry entices cash-hungry communities with their slick promises of quick revenues.

But here are the facts. Although pro-gambling forces vehemently deny it, criminal activity does indeed increase in communities to which gambling has been introduced.

Crime has shot up 43 percent in the Mississippi Gulf Coast area in the four years

after casinos were introduced, according to the state's crime commission report, published in May 1997. Connecticut's Foxwoods Casino is one of the largest and most prosperous in the country. But the mayor of one nearby town reports that its police department's annual number of calls skyrocketed from 4,000 to 16,700 within five years after the casino opened. After casinos came to Deadwood, South Dakota, the annual number of felony cases increased by 69 percent, the Eight Circuit Court reported in November 1997.

An FBI agent recently pleaded guilty to stealing more than $400,000 from the agency to pay off his gambling debts. For five years the agent embezzled money, wrote bogus memos and falsified expense reports to raise money so he could gamble, The Washington Post reported. He was supposed to be investigating an organized crime squad, but ended up entangled in their activities himself after placing big bets on sporting events with them. ''My client has a gambling problem'' his attorney told the Las Vegas Sun.

In California, prosecutors have charged four men with murder or attempted murder for following, robbing and shooting women after they were gambling at a Hollywood casino, the Los Angeles Times recently reported.

Sometimes increased crime shows itself not only outside the casinos, but inside as well. Federal banking regulators nailed the Trump Taj Mahal Casino Resort with a $477,000 fine for money laundering—the biggest such fine ever, the Philadelphia Inquirer reported recently. Authorities said that drug traffickers, counterfeiters and others are known to use casinos as places to launder money. They do this by finding people to buy chips in denominations just under $10,000, gamble a little bit of it, then cash in the chips for ''clean'' money.

A 78-year-old man allegedly shot and wounded five people in a casino in Reno, Nevada, according to an Associated Press story earlier this year. He was caught when he tried to shuffle away using his walker. The man was booked for investigation of two counts of attempted murder and three counts of battery with a deadly weapon. Two of the wounded people refused to go to the hospital and remained at the casino to gamble, according to a casino spokesman.

America deserves to know the whole story behind gambling: The good, the bad and the ugly. As more and more families are struggling to make ends meet, the idea of making easy, quick money can be an attractive lure. But there is a dark side to gambling. Its ill effects are taking their toll on too many under our care. Families are being ruined, businesses are being hurt, and communities are suffering.

What a message it would send to America's families for both party leaders to end political contributions from gambling. What a dramatic step it would be to begin cleaning up the political process and the fund-raising mess that exists today. The time has come to ''just say no'' to gambling money. I urge you to take that step today.

Sincerely,

FRANK R. WOLF,
Member of Congress.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND) who has been a member of the Freshman Task Force that produced the freshman bill, a strong advocate of campaign finance reform.

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

Mr. KIND. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I want to first commend the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN) and the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON) for the fine leadership that they have performed during this very tough and rigorous process.

I am a proud member of the Freshman Task Force that worked on finance reform. I am very proud of the work product that we have produced during the course of the year and a half that we have been working together. I am very proud of the Task Force members with whom I have had the privilege of associating myself.

I am especially proud of the freshman class that really stood up and took on this issue early last year at the beginning of this 105th session of Congress, when it looked as if the issue was dead in the water. Perhaps it does take a new perspective and fresh energy to come to this body, to add some life to an issue that is incredibly important to people back in my district in Wisconsin and throughout the entire country.

What united us freshmen was a common experience that we all shared in 1996 in winning our first election to the United States Congress. Those were typically very negative campaigns that was unbelievably costly, and we all realized that the system had run amuck and we need to do something about it.

Those who have supported Shays-Meehan, and I was a sponsor and supporter of Shays-Meehan, and those who are going to support the freshman bill can all be proud of the label that we all share. Reformers, because there has been a great philosophical divide on this issue.

Some in this body believe that the problem with the political system is not that there is too much money in it but that there is not enough money. That is not what motivated us freshmen. We believe we need to get the big money out of the political process and hopefully, therefore, the influence of money out of the political process, so we can restore some integrity and some credibility to this body again.

I would encourage my colleagues to support finance reform, and ask the Senate to pass it this year.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

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

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Chairman, we are at the moment of a major victory, not final, but major. And the freshmen have helped us move to this moment, but their proposal is seriously flawed. Let me mention a few of the provisions.

It has a loophole for soft money relating to State parties. And that is not the question of the role of State parties, it is leaving a loophole for soft money.

Secondly, it would increase the contribution maximums from $25,000 to $50,000. That means a couple over 2 years could contribute $200,000 overall. I think that is unnecessary and too high.

But, thirdly, let me talk about issue ads. It is not a matter of curtailing free speech. It is whether speech that is really a campaign ad should be within the purview of our regulatory system.

The Supreme Court said this in Buckley: ''To the extent that large contributions are given to secure political quid pro quo's from current and potential office holders, the integrity of our system of representative democracy is undermined. Of almost equal as the danger of actual quid pro quo arrangements is the impact of the appearance of corruption stemming from public awareness of the opportunities for abuse inherent in a regime of large individual financial contributions.''

The Court in *Furgatch* said, Ten years later, as these ads began to proliferate, ''we begin with the proposition that 'express advocacy' is not strictly limited to communications using certain key phrases.'' And it goes on to say . . . ''independent' campaign spenders working on behalf of candidates could remain just beyond the reach of the act by avoiding certain key words while conveying a message that is unmistakably directed to the election or defeat of a named candidate.''

Shays-Meehan brings campaign ads within present campaign regulations. Democracy needs it. Vote for Shays-Meehan.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

I just want to respond to the comments from the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) concerning what they call the loophole about State soft money. We approached it in different way. We do not believe that the Federal Government ought to be mandating to the State governments and the political parties as to what they should do. Thirteen states, I believe it is, have already banned soft money to them.

What we do is take away the Federal candidates and office holders from raising soft money for the States and leave the rest of the regulation to them.

I do not think we ought to prohibit a State party from getting out the vote efforts for a legislative candidate just because a Federal candidate is on the ballot. And so that is the distinction, and I think it is the right approach to campaign finance reform.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 seconds to say this is well-intended but it is also a gigantic loophole. In order to prevent the abuse of soft money, we have to ban it on the Federal level and the State level for Federal elections. We do not ban soft money for State elections.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. BASS) from the great state of ''Live free or die.''

Mr. BASS. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague from Connecticut for yielding.

I rise in opposition to the freshman substitute, not to denigrate in any way

the fine efforts of this team and the time that they have dedicated to developing a solution to the problem of reforming our campaign financial system, but to suggest that Shays-Meehan is a better product, wire-brushed by the public, if you will, over the last year or so, debated for countless hours in this body, perfected through the adoption of amendments offered, and worthy of our acceptance as the only product that has a reasonable chance of being enacted into law, which should be the ultimate goal for those of us who truly believe that the time is ripe for reform.

Now, I would point out, as has been discussed a minute ago, that the freshman substitute does not end the corrupt soft money system. And we can debate whether the States can do it or not, but the fact is we can still raise soft money for financing campaigns. And of particular interest to me, it leaves in place the current loophole through which unlimited corporate and union treasury funds are funneled into elections and there is no accountability.

Now, Shays-Meehan is not a perfect product. There are many provisions that I would like to see added. But this is not the day to demand a wish list. There is a commission established in this bill that will deal with all these other issues at another day. This is the day, my colleagues, to prove the cynics wrong and send Shays-Meehan to the Senate.

Now, over the last month or two, many amendments have been offered to Shays-Meehan, some with good intent, some to stymie the process. As painful as it may be to admit, the freshman bill now has become Custer's last stand for those who oppose reform. I would suggest to my colleagues that we make no mistake about it.

For better or for worse, a vote for the pending motion is a vote against moving forward with meaningful reform. I urge opposition to the pending motion.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. GRANGER), a great freshman and a great Member of this body.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the campaign finance reform of the freshman class. I am proud to be a part of that class. It is a class that vowed to work in a bipartisan way toward real solutions to problems.

Now, while all the campaign finance proposals we are debating have the best of intentions, I am afraid some of them have not produced the best results. The freshman bill will have the most positive effect on campaign finance because it addresses the most profound problems. Not one of them, not just some of them, but all of them. It covers soft money. It covers issue advocacy. And it covers the rights of union workers.

Mr. Chairman, if we truly are going to treat the patient, should we not treat all the symptoms, not just some? For this reason, I am proud to be a part of the freshmen bill and I certainly support it.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Chairman, it is a great privilege for me to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR), the whip for the minority.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague for yielding the time.

Mr. Chairman, for a very long time many of us have worked hard to pass campaign finance reform and give America's electoral system back to the people that it belongs to, the voters of this country. And for more than a year a group of freshmen Members have worked very, very hard to make this happen. They have been pushing, cajoling, arguing, they have been at the forefront of this debate when people were absent and were not there.

□ 1330

They came here with a commitment to reform the way our electoral system works, and they have shown, I think, an incredible energy and determination in getting this body to take up this issue. I speak of Members on both sides of the aisle in the freshman class. We would not be at this point in passing the first real campaign finance reform legislation without their commitment and their passion and their drive. I want to congratulate them on their work.

Having said that, I also believe that the Shays-Meehan bill is America's best hope for real campaign finance reform. I think our unity now and in the future is dependent upon how we react to this proposal that is before us and how we vote on final passage which is just a few minutes away. We need to stick with the Shays-Meehan bill. We must resist the temptation to vote for any alternative that would block Meehan-Shays no matter how appealing it may seem.

In conclusion, I just want to again commend the freshman colleagues for their work, for their commitment to change, and I think the best way to meet that commitment to change, the best vehicle to move to the other body so we can have a really important debate on the final outcome of this drama is to pass Meehan-Shays today.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. FORD), one of the class officers who has worked on this issue throughout the course of the past two years.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to urge my colleagues to search their conscience and to support a campaign finance bill that will truly restore some confidence to our political system. I worked with both the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN) and the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON) who have earned the respect and admiration and praise that we have showered upon them today, but I will reluctantly not support the bill in order to advance the Shays-Meehan effort. I do this because I refuse to be a party to those who are sponsoring and leading an effort to use the freshman bill to kill reform.

I urge a ''present'' vote on the freshman bill not because it represents artificial reform as some on both sides of the aisle have argued but because it has now become a tool for those in this body who want to kill reform once and for all.

I say to my freshman colleagues, let us not forget how we arrived at this moment. For authorship does not translate into ownership or leadership, it merely represents a component. For we helped this body, we helped Democrats, our leadership and their leadership arrive at this moment and we should take credit, if not all, certainly partial credit for that effort. For we helped inject the energy and a new product into this debate. For that we ought to be proud.

It is because we want, as others have so eloquently stated, to restore integrity and confidence to the policymaking process, because we want to see money limited in terms of its pervasive influence in this process that we worked so diligently. For Shays-Meehan includes everything we saw in the freshman bill and more.

For the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN), for the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL), for the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND), for the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TAUSCHER), for the gentleman from Texas (Mr. LAMPSON), who all who worked on this bill, you ought to stand tall and stand proud, for American history is about to be made and we in the freshman class will help usher it in. I thank the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN) for his leadership. I thank the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON) for his leadership.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''present'' on the freshman bill.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. WEYGAND) who has done such a fine job here as a freshman Member.

Mr. WEYGAND. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my colleague and neighbor the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON) for yielding me this time. I rise in support of the freshman bill today, Mr. Chairman, not in hostility or disappointment with the Meehan-Shays bill but clearly to identify what we think is most important, and, that is, the atmosphere of unity that we have here today. The issue that we are debating, campaign finance reform, was embraced wholly by both the Democrat and Republican freshmen as we came into office this year. We came upon this issue and we agreed as a unified body that we would not include poison pills that would damage the potential of passage not only here in this House Chamber but also in the Senate. The unity that we are talking about and the many Members that are here talking about true campaign finance

reform, from our task force, to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN), to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS), to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. WAMP), to everyone who is here, we must recognize that one of the most dangerous parts of what we are talking about is not in this Chamber, it is in the other Chamber.

If you read the paper this morning, the comments by the majority in the other Chamber is that this bill, meaning Shays-Meehan, is dead on arrival. ''Been there, done that, forget about it.''

That kind of leadership over there is what we should be unified against. The importance of the freshman bill was that we stripped away all the poison pills that we thought would have a detrimental impact on their side and our side. I love the idea of the gentleman from Massachusetts' bill with regard to issue advocacy being curtailed. The other side loves the idea of labor advocates being curtailed. We pulled those out because we wanted a bill to pass. What we are having here today is a unity rally amongst all of us. The problem is on the other side, who will kill every bill that we put before them because they do not agree with campaign finance reform.

I hope that we will be unified once we pass one of these bills as we are at this moment, to rally against what they intend to do and to rally for true campaign finance reform in the spirit of what we began here two years ago.

I want to compliment the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN) and the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON), the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN) for the excellent leadership and the participation in this process.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. COOK) my good friend and task force member.

Mr. COOK. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend from Arkansas for yielding me this time. As a supporter and someone who voted for Shays-Meehan, I nevertheless rise in support of the freshman bipartisan campaign finance reform bill. I reject the notion that a vote for this bill is a vote against Shays-Meehan. I believe in Shays-Meehan. I believe in limits on soft money. I think we are all joined in that, and clearly a majority of the Members of the House believe there ought to be limits on soft money. Let us be brutally honest. Shays-Meehan curbs it more directly and more severely. But what the freshman bill does have going for it is a better chance at constitutionality and getting passage in the Senate, and that is why I think we ought to quit arguing among each other and realize that either one of these versions will be a great victory for the American people. We should all be free, those of us that want to limit soft money, of voting for both if we want as a way to check out which one the majority of our Members thinks might have the best chance at final success.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2¼ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment, not because it is bad but because we have an alternative that is significantly better. Our new Members who are here offering this amendment, I believe, have provided essential momentum in the course of this long reform process. Indeed, I do not believe that it is an overstatement to say we might well not be at the point we find ourselves this morning had not we had leadership from our newest Members in this Congress, on both sides of the aisle, coming together, trying to overcome differences and working together to move this process which faced so many roadblocks in the way, to move it forward. I applaud them as I have previously, as I have both Republican and Democratic Members of the freshman class previously on this floor for the role that they have played. I believe they deserve our sincere commendation, but I do not believe that this proposal deserves our vote.

None of the proposals, to be very clear, that are offered today by anyone on this floor is perfect. None of them accomplishes all of the reform and cleaning up the campaign mess that I would like to see happen. But I believe that we need to move forward doing as much as we can when we can do it, and the strongest proposal that we have, as even the last speaker candidly conceded, is the Shays-Meehan proposal. That is why I believe we need to continue working together to try to get this approved during this very year.

The amount of soft money that is being raised by both political parties is just going off the charts. From 1984 to 1996, the amount of soft money raised by the two political parties from corporations, unions and other interests went up 20 times, twentyfold, from $12 million to $262 million. That issue is dealt with by simply banning soft money.

In short, we say today our opponents have used every other tactic to try to block Shays-Meehan in the books. Let us not let the good be used to get in the way of the better. Today let us vote down this amendment and move on to have the most campaign reform we can have. Clean up this special interest money. Approve Shays-Meehan.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds to recognize the freshmen on both sides of the aisle but particularly to salute seven GOP freshmen, Republican freshmen, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON) has been recognized and deserves to be, the gentleman from Montana (Mr. HILL), the gentleman from Utah (Mr. COOK), the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. GIBBONS), the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS), the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HULSHOF). I recognize them because we would not be here today if it was not for them.

The Speaker of the House said that he was willing to bring this bill forward because admittedly of the petition drive and agree that it would be a bipartisan bill, and we only had that bipartisan freshman bill that he would have accepted. I am extraordinarily grateful to them.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. ROUKEMA), an early supporter of campaign finance reform.

(Mrs. ROUKEMA asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment and urge my colleagues by all means to stand firm in support of Shays-Meehan. The freshman bill at one time was a respectable fallback position. But we are now on the brink of a historic moment, historic legislation. This is not the time to fall back. It is the time to leap forward with Shays-Meehan in this historic debate. I recognize that there are some elements of reform in the freshman bill, but it has loopholes that have been more than adequately substantiated here in this debate. It makes the bill substantially weaker than Shays-Meehan. The freshmen have an opportunity here today to be a breath of fresh air here in Washington and help restore the faith of the American people in our democracy. The cynicism, I do not have to tell my colleagues about. Help us restore faith in our democracy. And then these freshmen will be able to stand tall in November as we all face the voters and show that we have been part of a historic moment in time to restore faith in democracy and bring back our people to the democracy where every vote counts.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Hutchison-Allen amendment and urge my Colleagues to stand firm in their support for Shays-Meehan. Mr. Chairman, the freshman bill at one time was a respectable ''fall back'' position. But we are now on the brink of an historic leap forward—namely passing Shays-Meehan.

I want to commend the authors of this amendment, the gentleman from Arkansas, Mr. HUTCHINSON, and the gentleman from Maine, Mr. ALLEN. Throughout their relatively short Congressional careers, they have proven themselves to be active and creative reformers. Indeed, we have found ourselves arguing from the same side of the table more often than not. However, while it has some element of reform—it has loopholes and is substantially weaker than Shays-Meehan.

The American people have become hardened cynics when it comes to our electoral process. They believe—with some justification—that elections are bought by the interest group with the fattest wallet.

The freshmen have the opportunity to be a breath of fresh air and help restore the faith of the American people in our democracy. And

these freshmen will stand tall before their voters as part of this historic legislation.

Perhaps the most corrosive development in modern American campaigns has been the explosion of so-called ''soft money''—donations from wealthy corporations, individuals, labor organizations and other groups to the major parties.

These funds are raised and spent outside the reach of federal election law and are directly connected to many of the scandalous practices now the focus of numerous investigations in both parties—White House coffees, overnights in the Lincoln bedroom, alleged contributions from the Chinese military to the DNC, and more.

Therefore, to be effective, any reform bill must deal with soft money. Unfortunately, the amendment we have before us only goes halfway. It contains a loophole large enough to drive an armored care stuffed with campaign cash through. This bill shuts down the federal soft money faucet, but allows these funds to be funneled through the various state parties. That's no reform at all.

My Colleagues, if we do nothing else—let's ban soft money. My Colleagues—soft money is at the heart of each and every one of these scandals we see in the headlines today.

Let's restore the integrity of the American political process.

The Shays-Meehan bill is the only substitute amendment that contains a hard ban on soft money.

Reject the Hutchinson substitute. Support Shays-Meehan.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY) who has been extraordinarily instrumental and supportive of this battle for reform.

□ 1345

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON) and the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN) for the leadership they have had on this issue. I think we do have to agree that we need to enforce the laws on campaign finance in America, whether they are existing laws or the new laws we are talking about, because without enforcement they are meaningless, what we are talking about is meaningless.

Let me tell my colleagues this. I am proud to be in support of the freshman bill because my concern is that every election year we seem to drift farther and farther away from a citizen Congress, one made up of people from all walks of life. Today an open seat in Congress costs about a million dollars to win. A lot of people do not have a million dollars, they do not know where they would get a million dollars.

And that is means that some day, and it is doubling every four years, by the way, so some day we are going to wake up and find out only the very wealthy people can serve in Congress. And I know a lot of people who may not be rich, but they are wealthy in common sense, they are prosperous in their principles, they have tremendous values, and while they may not live in the biggest house on the hill in my town, they would do America proud serving this House on this Hill, and I think the freshman bill moves us back toward a citizen Congress.

Now let me tell my colleagues what the freshman bill is not. It is not a gutting bill on campaign finance reform. We have heard that mindless empty mantra so long that when applied to this bill it simply does not fit, because I have watched how hard our freshmen from both sides of the aisle have thoughtfully worked to push and move this bill forward, that it simply is silly, and we deserve better. And those leaders, freshmen leaders, deserve better.

And finally, Mr. Chairman, I was disappointed to see today that our colleagues were urged to vote ''no'' or ''present'' on the freshman substitute. Let me just urge everyone to take a stand on this bill. There is a reason the present light is yellow. It is reserved for those timid and meek souls who refuse to take a stand on the issue and whose legacy in the debate on campaign finance is: Want to be recorded as being in the room.

Vote ''yes'' or vote ''no'', but take a stand on the principles against or for banning soft money, preserving free speech, preserving States' rights, encouraging people to raise money in their district, and let us move forward, yes or no, but record and take a stand and, I hope, in support of the freshman bill.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1¼ minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL) who has been an outstanding member of the Freshman Task Force.

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

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Chairman, first to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN) and the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON), who have helped, each of them, to begin to reestablish the integrity of this body. If I did not mean it, I would not say it. When our institutions are under attack, they choose not to be timid. They choose not to be the yellow light. They choose to come forward. Every one of the folks on each side stated what they wanted to state in all honesty. We were very frank with one another.

This is about restoring integrity to the Congress of the United States of America. We propelled the discussions. Who would have thought we would be here today in February of 1997? It was our wildest imagination. I want to thank each of them. I am honored to have served with them and the members of the committee.

This is not a day of proponents or opponents. This is a day for this body to come together, to be very clear where we stand on campaign finance reform. Good luck to the gentleman from Connecticut; good luck to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY), a staunch advocate of campaign finance reform.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Mr. Chairman, again, when we all came together as a freshman class, one of the first things that we said, what was the most horrible thing about going through our campaign? And we were all tired, and we were all sick of the things that happened to us, and that is when this idea came together. Our freshman class has nothing to be embarrassed about. We worked together, we stood together, and because we did that, that is why we are going to see campaign finance reform.

Before we go home we will have campaign finance reform, and do my colleagues know what? The people outside this Beltway, and a lot of us are new to that, can hold our heads up high. We will fight for the people back home.

I do not want to spend 20 to 30 hours a week raising money, and I have not done that. None of us want to do that. But until we have campaign finance reform, and I am sorry, I do not want someone to say, ''Let me donate to you, but I want your vote.'' We have to get rid of that.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HULSHOF), the president of the freshman class at the time this task force was created and who has been a tremendous inspiration for our class in leading this effort.

Mr. HULSHOF. Mr. Chairman, the headlines on Tuesday morning's paper in the city proclaimed: House Votes to Ban Soft Money and Increase Disclosure Requirements for Candidates. Guess what? If my colleagues vote for the freshman bill, they will get those same kudos tomorrow morning from the press because our freshman bill does just that.

And let me say that I applaud and appreciate all the positive comments that our more senior Members have said here today, somewhat patronizing, I say, but I do appreciate those comments. And to the gentleman from California who talked about the problems in California, I respectfully believe that the freshman bill is a better bill than Shays-Meehan for a couple of reasons:

We ban soft money. We prohibit the gentleman from California or any Member of Congress or any candidate for Federal office from raising soft money. We ban the State of California from allowing contributions of soft money to go to them. And yet is it up to us in this body to tell California what it should do? Is it up to those of us in this body to say what the election laws in Maine or Arkansas or in the State of Missouri should be?

And for that reason I respectfully say that the Shays-Meehan bill is overreaching. It is fatally flawed in that effort because State parties might want to have and raise resources for get-out-the-vote efforts or for educating voters in the respective States on party platforms.

Now secondly, I believe, respectfully again, I say to the gentleman from

Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN), that their bill is flawed because of this arbitrary 60-day bright line, before-election line that they put in the sand. Members know, as they have been coming over for these votes for various days, there is an ardent reform group that has been parked on the street corner with a ticking clock saying that we need to enact reform because the clock is ticking, and they have been handing out literature propaganda like this that says: Urge a vote against the freshman bill.

It is interesting, I see the gentleman from Montana (Mr. HILL) here who had a recent election in the State of Montana, a primary election. This same zealous group was trying to defeat him in his election with this same type of information, and the ultimate irony of this is if Shays-Meehan were law, if Shays-Meehan were the law of the land, this group would be lawbreakers because of the distribution of this information. Shays-Meehan is flawed in that regard.

Not to mention all of the dispute that we have had about the constitutionality. Even the liberal-leaning St. Louis Post Dispatch editorial board says that there are constitutional problems with Shays-Meehan. And as the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) talked about the other day, that if Shays-Meehan is declared null and void by the Supreme Court of this land, that they will then be writing law. At least the freshman bill would come back to this body.

As a final point, I am a bit disappointed that some Members have come here, especially my freshman Members, who said we urge a ''present'' vote. I want to talk about integrity. This bipartisan bill has 77 cosponsors, 77 cosponsors, 21 Republicans and the remaining Democrat Members. To this Member, as a brand new Member of Congress, when we cosponsor a piece of legislation what we are saying is that we are willing to put our names on the line because we support what is in the bill.

This is called, the freshman bill is called, the Bipartisan Campaign Integrity Act. It is time for the integrity of the elections process to begin today. So to the 77 cosponsors of our bill, I say it is time to put their vote where their name was on this bill. Instead of the Hutchinson-Allen bill, this bill could be called the Gejdenson-Wamp bill. It could be called the Campbell-DeLauro bill.

So I urge the cosponsors of the freshman bill, do not take a pass. It is time for the integrity to begin today, because I believe, as the other freshman Members believe, we have the better bill, and I urge a ''yes'' vote.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise first to correct the gentleman. No sheet like the gentleman from Missouri showed would have been outlawed. The 60-day test relates to radio and TV and not a handout.

Secondly, I just would suggest to the gentleman that cosponsoring a bill means we support the bill, but when we have a Queen of the Hill situation we can support two bills, and then we have to choose which is the better of two bills we sponsor or even cosponsor.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON), my colleague, a gentle and very strong lady, and very courageous.

(Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Hutchinson bill, but do commend the freshmen for their bipartisan effort and their dedication to moving the issue of campaign finance forward.

We all believe we need to restore confidence and accountability to our Federal election system. I believe the Shays-Meehan bill is the best way to achieve our goals. We must give the American public what they are demanding, an open and fair system of elections.

The Hutchinson bill fails to address one of the most serious loopholes in our campaign finance law, the so-called sham issue ads. In recent elections we have watched special interest money exploit this loophole by pouring millions of dollars into campaign ads in elections all over the country. No one knows how much money these special interest groups are spending or where that money is coming from, because these groups do not have to disclose that information.

Shays-Meehan clamps down on this loophole by requiring these outside groups to play by the same rules as everyone else. It restores accountability to the political process by requiring these groups to disclose who they are and where their money is coming from.

Shays-Meehan in no way takes away the right of these groups to participate in the political process. It does not limit their freedom of speech, as some of my colleagues have suggested. Rather, it increases public awareness about where the special interest money is coming from, and that is something the American people are demanding and deserve to know.

Today is our chance to tell the American public that we are committed to a system of clean and fair elections. I urge my colleagues to vote against the Hutchinson bill and pass the Shays-Meehan bill.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. HOOLEY), who has been one of our class officers in the freshman class and a staunch supporter of the Freshman Task Force process.

□ 1400

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, first of all I would like to congratulate the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON) and the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN) for the work they have done, and the entire task force.

Let me talk a little bit about how this came about. When we came here as freshmen, we said one of the things we wanted to do, let us look for some commonality amongst our freshman class. All of us were elected in a year after the 104th Congress. We said there was too much finger pointing, too much bickering. Let us find our commonality and our common goals. We said campaign finance reform, we are coming in with new eyes as freshmen, let us deal with campaign finance reform, and let us deal with it in a bipartisan way.

So we had a task force literally from the first month we were in session begin to work on campaign finance reform, and they worked and worked and had hearings and had hearings, and when the leadership said, well, we are not too excited about campaign finance reform, the freshmen pushed and the freshmen pushed and the freshmen pushed.

I have to say congratulations to all of the task force for the work that they have done. We would not be here today without the freshmen and the work that they have done. It is time to give elections back to the people.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL), my close partner in this effort.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized for 2¼ minutes.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I thank my dear friend, I have the highest admiration for all that the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) has done for the cause of campaign finance reform. It has been an honor to work with the gentleman on this.

Mr. Chairman, I am not the most partisan member of this body, but there is a huge point that just has not been said bluntly enough, so here it is. With regard to soft money, more or less, generally speaking, Republicans have an advantage. With regard to issue ads in the last 60 days, more or less, Democrats have an advantage. We saw this in New England. In the last 60 days, the AFL–CIO puts tons of money out of union treasuries into supposedly issue ads, slamming Republican candidates, and with devastating effect.

To my fellow Republicans, if you vote for the freshmen bill, you are signing on to the part of a compromise that deals effectively with soft money, but you do nothing about those ads in the last 60 days that mention the name of the candidate—the tactic that was so devastating to Republican candidates in New England.

A compromise is a balance; both sides give, both sides get, both sides give a little back. If we go ahead with the freshman bill, we have done nothing against the most abusive practice that was used against Republicans in the last election cycle, ads that

claimed to be discussion of issues, but were slams on candidates in the last 60 days, using their names.

I cannot support the freshman bill. It is not balanced.

And even for what it does on soft money, the freshman bill only solves a bit of the problem, because as long as there is a single state candidate on the ballot, you can shuffle all the money in and say it is soft money for the state candidates' benefit.

As to constitutionality, I can say that if the soft money issue is in trouble, it is in trouble with the freshman bill as much as with Shays-Meehan. If the 60 day issue is in trouble, we have a severability clause so the Supreme Court can decide and uphold that which is constitutional.

But let us at least try. Let us try to get a balance that helps the honest voter get a true statement of who is behind the ads, instead of having the kind of unfair attacks in the last 60 days, where you do not know who is putting the money behind them.

I do not know what more I can do. I know this: I have given up my own alternative, I voted against amendments that I wished, and I have done it consistently, because only one bill has a chance in the Senate, and that is not a bill that has never had hearings in the Senate, it is not a bill the Senate has never voted on. It is not the freshman bill. It is Shays-Meehan.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds for the purpose of asking the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) a question.

I would say to the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL), first of all, I appreciate you cosponsoring the freshman bill, and I know that you are a supporter of Shays-Meehan. But would the gentleman acknowledge today, so we have a clear understanding, that Shays-Meehan as currently drafted would violate the Supreme Court decision of Buckley v. Valeo, and it is the gentleman's hope that the Supreme Court will change their mind?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUTCHINSON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CAMPBELL. No, sir. I think that may be the accurate description of some. It is not mine. Here is why. Shays-Meehan does not violate Buckley v. Valeo's prohibition on expenditure. Buckley v. Valeo allowed limits on contributions.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I will cover that later.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the people of this country watching this debate, as few or many as they are, obviously feel some confusion. Everyone gets up and claims that they have the product that personifies reform, and, as you look through history, leaders good and bad, propositions decent and evil, all claim to be reform. It is a hard cut. I think Lenin, Stalin and Brezhnev all claimed that they brought reform to the Russian people.

I can tell you what will create the most change, what will take power away from those that have too much and will give some power back to the people, and that is Shays-Meehan.

The discussion of integrity in the process, and I forget which gentleman raised the issue, and I am sure he is earnest, oversimplifies the situation. Many of us in this Chamber cosponsored and introduced a number of bills. The Farr bill is a bill that I have worked on for almost 10 years now. I did not vote for it; I would not have voted for it if it came up for a vote, because we are in the process that the Republican leadership of the House has set up intentionally to make it very difficult to get a bill that has any chance in the other body of succeeding. The only way to do that is to vote down the freshman bill, do not vote for any of the other bills, as we have not, and then pass Shays-Meehan.

Lastly, I would say to the American people that this debate would be awfully discouraging. Many of the Members in this Chamber admit the influence of large contributions and the chase for cash on their time and possibly even some Members' commitments.

I can tell you this: Nothing a Member in this Chamber says will change the outcome in the Senate. But the average citizens of this country can change the outcome in the Senate. If, when this bill passes, when Shays-Meehan passes this House, the citizens of this country write and call their Senators and tell them they demand to see this very small and incremental step be taken, they can change the outcome of this process.

We Members of Congress are far more limited. We can hopefully today get Shays-Meehan over to the other body, to the Senate. But it is the people of this country that have within their capability, within their power, to affect this system and then send a signal for future reforms as well.

I have been here all too many times when big shots were on a stage clamoring for position in front of the cameras, where the real spokesmen and strength came from 100,000 or 200,000 people on the mall. As important as the Members of Congress and others who came to the mall and stood there for freedom were, for Soviet Jews, for human rights and for so many other issues, it was that there were tens and hundreds of thousands of American citizens who came to this town to speak that changed civil rights laws, that changed Soviet policy, that taught us and led us in the area of human rights.

I believe if the American citizens speak out with a loud and clear voice, the Senate will get its additional votes, and we will have the beginning of campaign finance reform.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the freshman task force process began because we were veterans of the 1996 elections. We came to this House, and we knew we wanted to do something about what had happened to us in the 1996 elections. We had survived that process because we were here. But we were not happy with the process. We were not happy with the amount of soft money that had been poured into campaigns, on both the Republican side and the Democratic side. We were not happy with the amount of issue advocacy money that had been poured into campaigns from groups on the left and groups on the right.

We created a freshman task force, which I was proud to cochair with the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON), and, over the past year and a half, we have worked on this issue diligently. We have never given up.

There have been those reformist groups on the outside who have said we have not gone far enough. There have been groups on the outside who have said we are doing too much. We have kept our course, we have stood by the product, and we have stood by the process.

I have to say that my cochair, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON), has, throughout this process, demonstrated the kind of courage and commitment that you need to survive in this place and get anything done, and it has been. I am proud to have served with him.

Mr. Chairman, let me address just a couple of issues about the freshman bill. There are those who say there is a loophole, and it will allow state money to be raised at the state level. Well, let us face it: Minor differences become major differences when you get to the final point between two bills that in fact are very close together.

What do we do? We take Federal elected officials, we take Federal candidates, we take national parties, national party committees and their agents, and we take them out of the business of raising soft money. That is real reform. That is a real soft money ban. It is a soft money ban that works.

We do not go as far on issue advocacy as Shays-Meehan does in many respects, but if you listen to the diversity of opinion in this Chamber, you understand that this is the most complicated issue we have to deal with. It is personal to every Member. We are all experts.

What we have done is created a good, solid campaign reform bill. I am going to be proud to vote for it today. I voted for Shays-Meehan, but I will vote for this freshman task force substitute. I am proud of the committee, and I am proud of what we have done. It is good, solid substantial reform.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Chairman, it is my privilege to yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BAESLER), who has led the effort on campaign finance reform, not in this Congress but several previous

Congresses, and led the effort on the discharge petition that actually got us here today.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized for 3¼ minutes.

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

Mr. BAESLER. Mr. Chairman, this is it. They said we never would get here, they said it could not be done, the anti-reformers, the pundits and the cynics, but here we are. We proved them all dead wrong.

They all said there was no chance, no chance, that bipartisan campaign finance reform would pass the House. They said the public did not care. They said that Members would never vote to change a system that got them elected. They said Republicans and Democrats would never be able to work together on reform.

In January 1997, when Shays-Meehan was introduced, they said it was dead on arrival. In February 1997, when the freshman task force was launched, they said it was futile. Last October, when McCain-Feingold was filibustered, they said campaign support was dead for this Congress. Last February, when the Senate reformers resurrected it, they filibustered it again. Then they said it was really, really dead for Congress.

Last fall, when we introduced the Blue Dog discharge petition, they said it would not go anywhere. They said no Republican would ever sign it. They said that the petition would never, ever get 200 signatures.

In March, when they used sham suspension votes to try to kill it, they said ''Now campaign finance reform is really, really dead.'' In April, when the Blue Dog discharge petition was going to win, they finally promised a bill. Still they said ''We will kill your bill with poison pill amendments.''

Still, Mr. Speaker, there were some things they forgot and some things they did not count on. They did not count on a bipartisan majority coming together because they believe passing bipartisan campaign reform is the right thing to do. They did not count on the absolute faith of the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) in the justice of his cause, or the hard work of the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN). They did not count on the freshman task force's extraordinary courage, leadership, and perseverance.

They did not count on the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR) rallying to the cause of reform. They did not count on business leaders like Warren Buffet and Jerry Kohlberg supporting a soft money ban. They did not count on a dozen brave Republicans, like the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. WAMP), the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH), the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. ROUKEMA), and others, signing the Blue Dog discharge petition, and they did not count on 237 Members of the House putting aside partisan politics and once, just once, doing the right thing.

Now, some still say none of this matters, that the Senate will not even vote on this bill, that we will see Elvis before this bill is passed. But those are the same people that said the House will never pass it.

So I urge Members of Congress, I urge all Americans, remember this day and take heed. Against all odds, the 105th Congress will pass bipartisan campaign reform, and soon, next month, maybe later, bipartisan campaign reform will be signed into law and this government will be given back to the people.

I urge my colleagues to vote for the Shays-Meehan bill.

□ 1415

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, it is the final hour in this debate on campaign finance reform. In life, if you are in the final hour you are all of a sudden seeing the big picture, what is important in life versus what is trivial. In this House, it is the final hour on reform, and we need to take the long look at life, the long look at reform.

First of all, take a look back. If we look back at where we started in our freshman task force, we started that task force because the current proposals on campaign finance reform, including the Shays-Meehan proposal, were going nowhere. They were going nowhere.

We said, let us have some principles. Let us avoid the extremes. Let us agree upon what we can mutually say both sides will vote on. We said, let us not challenge the Constitution, let us have that which is constitutional and will be upheld. Let us do something which can pass this body, the next body, be signed into law, and be upheld.

Those were the principles that we had. The final principle was that we were going to have a commitment to bipartisanship. One of the lasting things that I will take out of this debate is my friends on both sides of the aisle, freshmen who are warm to reform and who are committed to this process, who are friends, and who will continue to fight for this through the lifetime we are here in this body. That is the long look.

We also have to take a look forward. If we look forward, we want the headline tomorrow that, ''Campaign Finance Reform Passes''; yay. We also do not want a subsequent headline that says, ''The Senate Kills Reform; the Senate Fails to Take It Up; the U.S. Supreme Court Strikes It Down.'' That is where we go back to where we started from. Where we started was, let us get together and see what is constitutional, and let us get it passed. That is where we are today. We need to remember where we started.

If we look forward again as to what can happen, what are we going to pass out of this body? Are we going to pass a political statement? Are we going to pass something that will advance a particular agenda? No. Let us pass something that is important, what will get through the United States Senate.

If we look at what has been said already, TRENT LOTT has been made reference to. He happens to be the leader on the other side. ''Without any chance of 60 votes, why bring up Shays-Meehan? It would be a waste of time.'' That is what he says.

Then there are those who say, well, the Republican leadership wants the freshman bill to be a stalking horse and to put down Shays-Meehan. That is not the case. In today's Roll Call, one leadership source says that they are afraid of the freshman bill going to the Senate, not the Shays-Meehan but the freshman bill, because that is what can be taken up over there. They know they do not have the votes on Shays-Meehan. It will die over in the Senate.

Let us keep our eye on the big picture. Then, what will happen in the courts? The gentleman from California thinks, well, it will be upheld. Thinking is not enough. I do not believe we should base our efforts on reform on the mood of the United States Supreme Court. They have said clearly what they offer in Shays-Meehan is unacceptable, it will not pass. Why challenge that? Let us not risk our efforts. Let us vote for the freshman bill, because that is reform.

I said this is the final hour. Let us make it the finest hour in this body and pass the freshman bill.

Mrs. TAUSCHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise as a strong advocate of campaign finance reform, a member of the Freshman Bipartisan Campaign Finance Reform bill, and a supporter of the Meehan-Shays reform plan.

Eighteen months ago, I joined with 11 of my colleagues to form the Bipartisan Freshman Campaign Finance Reform Task Force. Our goal was to bring the issue of campaign finance reform to the forefront of the Congressional agenda. I am pleased that we were able to achieve that goal.

We conducted months of meetings, including two public forums, which effectively served as the only hearings the House of Representatives conducted on this issue. The Task Force committed to developing legislation that would represent a bipartisan effort on campaign finance reform and ultimately a first step in the process of bringing true reform to the political process.

I believe that one of the greatest achievements of the freshman Task Force is that it helped build momentum for House consideration of campaign finance reform. When the leadership made it clear that it would not bring Meehan-Shays to the floor of the House for a vote, the Task Force hoped its bill would serve as a starting place for debate on campaign finance reform. Our work has proven to be more than a starting place, it is the platform on which the most comprehensive campaign finance reform legislation has been successfully built.

Passage of the Meehan-Shays amendment Monday was an historic moment. If we pass

the bill today with the Meehan-Shays language, we will have endorsed the most comprehensive political reform this body has seen in 20 years.

So, it is unfortunate the Republican leadership of this House has chosen to use the Freshman bill as a tool in a cynical attempt to block final passage of the Meehan-Shays proposal. The rule dictating debate of campaign finance reform means that a vote for the Freshman bill is a vote against the Meehan-Shays bill. As a result, I will vote "present" on the Freshman bill in order to ensure the passage of Meehan-Shays.

We owe it to the American people to pass the most comprehensive campaign reform legislation in front of the House. That bill is Meehan-Shays. By passing comprehensive campaign finance reform, we take a much needed step to restore the faith of the American electorate in our political system.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. All time has expired.

AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. HUTCHINSON

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The text of amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

Amendment in the Nature of a Substitute No. 8 printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and offered by Mr. HUTCHINSON:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Bipartisan Campaign Integrity Act of 1998".

TITLE I—SOFT MONEY AND CONTRIBUTIONS AND EXPENDITURES OF POLITICAL PARTIES

SEC. 101. BAN ON SOFT MONEY OF NATIONAL POLITICAL PARTIES AND CANDIDATES.

Title III of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 431 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"BAN ON USE OF SOFT MONEY BY NATIONAL POLITICAL PARTIES AND CANDIDATES

"SEC. 323. (a) NATIONAL PARTIES.—A national committee of a political party, including the national congressional campaign committees of a political party, and any officers or agents of such party committees, may not solicit, receive, or direct any contributions, donations, or transfers of funds, or spend any funds, which are not subject to the limitations, prohibitions, and reporting requirements of this Act. This subsection shall apply to any entity that is established, financed, maintained, or controlled (directly or indirectly) by, or acting on behalf of, a national committee of a political party, including the national congressional campaign committees of a political party, and any officers or agents of such party committees.

"(b) CANDIDATES.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—No candidate for Federal office, individual holding Federal office, or any agent of such candidate or officeholder may solicit, receive, or direct—

"(A) any funds in connection with any Federal election unless such funds are subject to the limitations, prohibitions and reporting requirements of this Act;

"(B) any funds that are to be expended in connection with any election for other than a Federal office unless such funds are not in excess of the amounts permitted with respect to contributions to Federal candidates and political committees under section 315(a)(1) and (2), and are not from sources prohibited from making contributions by this Act with respect to elections for Federal office; or

"(C) any funds on behalf of any person which are not subject to the limitations, prohibitions, and reporting requirements of this Act if such funds are for the purpose of financing any activity on behalf of a candidate for election for Federal office or any communication which refers to a clearly identified candidate for election for Federal office.

"(2) EXCEPTION FOR CERTAIN ACTIVITIES.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to—

"(A) the solicitation or receipt of funds by an individual who is a candidate for a non-Federal office if such activity is permitted under State law for such individual's non-Federal campaign committee; or

"(B) the attendance by an individual who holds Federal office or is a candidate for election for Federal office at a fundraising event for a State or local committee of a political party of the State which the individual represents or seeks to represent as a Federal officeholder, if the event is held in such State.

"(c) PROHIBITING TRANSFERS OF NON-FEDERAL FUNDS BETWEEN STATE PARTIES.—A State committee of a political party may not transfer any funds to a State committee of a political party of another State unless the funds are subject to the limitations, prohibitions, and reporting requirements of this Act.

"(d) APPLICABILITY TO FUNDS FROM ALL SOURCES.—This section shall apply with respect to funds of any individual, corporation, labor organization, or other person.".

SEC. 102. INCREASE IN AGGREGATE ANNUAL LIMIT ON CONTRIBUTIONS BY INDIVIDUALS TO POLITICAL PARTIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The first sentence of section 315(a)(3) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 441a(a)(3)) is amended by striking "in any calendar year" and inserting the following: "to political committees of political parties, or contributions aggregating more than $25,000 to any other persons, in any calendar year".

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 315(a)(1)(B) of such Act (2 U.S.C. 441a(a)(1)(B)) is amended by striking "$20,000" and inserting "$25,000".

SEC. 103. REPEAL OF LIMITATIONS ON AMOUNT OF COORDINATED EXPENDITURES BY POLITICAL PARTIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 315(d) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 441a(d)) is amended by striking paragraphs (2) and (3).

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 315(d)(1) of such Act (2 U.S.C. 441a(d)(1)) is amended—

(1) by striking "(d)(1)" and inserting "(d)"; and

(2) by striking ", subject to the limitations contained in paragraphs (2) and (3) of this subsection".

SEC. 104. INCREASE IN LIMIT ON CONTRIBUTIONS BY MULTICANDIDATE POLITICAL COMMITTEES TO NATIONAL POLITICAL PARTIES.

Section 315(a)(2)(B) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 441a(a)(2)(B)) is amended by striking "$15,000" and inserting "$20,000".

TITLE II—INDEXING CONTRIBUTION LIMITS

SEC. 201. INDEXING CONTRIBUTION LIMITS.

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

"(3)(A) The amount of each limitation established under subsection (a) shall be adjusted as follows:

"(i) For calendar year 1999, each such amount shall be equal to the amount described in such subsection, increased (in a compounded manner) by the percentage increase in the price index (as defined in subsection (c)(2)) for each of the years 1997 through 1998.

"(ii) For calendar year 2003 and each fourth subsequent year, each such amount shall be equal to the amount for the fourth previous year (as adjusted under this subparagraph), increased (in a compounded manner) by the percentage increase in the price index for each of the four previous years.

"(B) In the case of any amount adjusted under this subparagraph which is not a multiple of $100, the amount shall be rounded to the nearest multiple of $100.".

TITLE III—EXPANDING DISCLOSURE OF CAMPAIGN FINANCE INFORMATION

SEC. 301. DISCLOSURE OF CERTAIN COMMUNICATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Any person who expends an aggregate amount of funds during a calendar year in excess of $25,000 for communications described in subsection (b) relating to a single candidate for election for Federal office (or an aggregate amount of funds during a calendar year in excess of $100,000 for all such communications relating to all such candidates) shall file a report describing the amount expended for such communications, together with the person's address and phone number (or, if appropriate, the address and phone number of the person's principal officer).

(b) COMMUNICATIONS DESCRIBED.—A communication described in this subsection is any communication which is broadcast to the general public through radio or television and which mentions or includes (by name, representation, or likeness) any candidate for election for Senator or for Representative in (or Delegate or Resident Commissioner to) the Congress, other than any communication which would be described in clause (i), (iii), or (v) of section 301(9)(B) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 if the payment were an expenditure under such section.

(c) DEADLINE FOR FILING.—A person shall file a report required under subsection (a) not later than 7 days after the person first expends the applicable amount of funds described in such subsection, except that in the case of a person who first expends such an amount within 10 days of an election, the report shall be filed not later than 24 hours after the person first expends such amount. For purposes of the previous sentence, the term "election" shall have the meaning given such term in section 301(1) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971.

(d) PLACE OF SUBMISSION.—Reports required under subsection (a) shall be submitted—

(1) to the Clerk of the House of Representatives, in the case of a communication involving a candidate for election for Representative in (or Delegate or Resident Commissioner to) the Congress; and

(2) to the Secretary of the Senate, in the case of a communication involving a candidate for election for Senator.

(e) PENALTIES.—Whoever knowingly fails to—

(1) remedy a defective filing within 60 days after notice of such a defect by the Secretary of the Senate or the Clerk of the House of Representatives; or

(2) comply with any other provision of this section,

shall, upon proof of such knowing violation by a preponderance of the evidence, be subject to a civil fine of not more than $50,000, depending on the extent and gravity of the violation.

SEC. 302. REQUIRING MONTHLY FILING OF REPORTS.

(a) PRINCIPAL CAMPAIGN COMMITTEES.—Section 304(a)(2)(A)(iii) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 434(a)(2)(A)(iii)) is amended to read as follows:

''(iii) monthly reports, which shall be filed no later than the 20th day after the last day of the month and shall be complete as of the last day of the month, except that, in lieu of filing the reports otherwise due in November and December of the year, a pre-general election report shall be filed in accordance with clause (i), a post-general election report shall be filed in accordance with clause (ii), and a year end report shall be filed no later than January 31 of the following calendar year.''.

(b) OTHER POLITICAL COMMITTEES.—Section 304(a)(4) of such Act (2 U.S.C. 434(a)(4)) is amended to read as follows:

''(4)(A) In a calendar year in which a regularly scheduled general election is held, all political committees other than authorized committees of a candidate shall file—

''(i) monthly reports, which shall be filed no later than the 20th day after the last day of the month and shall be complete as of the last day of the month, except that, in lieu of filing the reports otherwise due in November and December of the year, a pre-general election report shall be filed in accordance with clause (ii), a post-general election report shall be filed in accordance with clause (iii), and a year end report shall be filed no later than January 31 of the following calendar year;

''(ii) a pre-election report, which shall be filed no later than the 12th day before (or posted by registered or certified mail no later than the 15th day before) any election in which the committee makes a contribution to or expenditure on behalf of a candidate in such election, and which shall be complete as of the 20th day before the election; and

''(iii) a post-general election report, which shall be filed no later than the 30th day after the general election and which shall be complete as of the 20th day after such general election.

''(B) In any other calendar year, all political committees other than authorized committees of a candidate shall file a report covering the period beginning January 1 and ending June 30, which shall be filed no later than July 31 and a report covering the period beginning July 1 and ending December 31, which shall be filed no later than January 31 of the following calendar year.''.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—(1) Section 304(a) of such Act (2 U.S.C. 434(a)) is amended by striking paragraph (8).

(2) Section 309(b) of such Act (2 U.S.C. 437g(b)) is amended by striking ''for the calendar quarter'' and inserting ''for the month''.

SEC. 303. MANDATORY ELECTRONIC FILING FOR CERTAIN REPORTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 304(a)(11)(A) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 434(a)(11)(A)) is amended by striking the period at the end and inserting the following: '', except that the Commission shall require the reports to be filed and preserved by such means, format, or method, unless the aggregate amount of contributions or expenditures (as the case may be) reported by the committee in all reports filed with respect to the election involved (taking into account the period covered by the report) is less than $50,000.''.

(b) PROVIDING STANDARDIZED SOFTWARE PACKAGE.—Section 304(a)(11) of such Act (2 U.S.C. 434(a)(11)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraph (C) as subparagraph (D); and

(2) by inserting after subparagraph (B) the following new subparagraph:

''(C) The Commission shall make available without charge a standardized package of software to enable persons filing reports by electronic means to meet the requirements of this paragraph.''.

SEC. 304. WAIVER OF "BEST EFFORTS" EXCEPTION FOR INFORMATION ON OCCUPATION OF INDIVIDUAL CONTRIBUTORS.

Section 302(i) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 432(i)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''(i) When the treasurer'' and inserting ''(i)(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), when the treasurer''; and

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

''(2) Paragraph (1) shall not apply with respect to information regarding the occupation or the name of the employer of any individual who makes a contribution or contributions aggregating more than $200 during a calendar year (as required to be provided under subsection (c)(3)).''.

TITLE IV—EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 401. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act and the amendments made by this Act shall apply with respect to elections occurring after January 1999.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The amendment is not further debatable.

The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON).

The question was taken; and the Chairman pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 147, noes 222, answered ''present'' 61, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No 404]

AYES—147

Aderholt
Allen
Archer
Bachus
Baker
Ballenger
Barton
Bateman
Berry
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Bono
Boswell
Boyd
Brady (TX)
Bryant
Buyer
Canady
Chabot
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Cook
Cooksey
Crapo
Davis (FL)
Davis (VA)
DeGette
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
English
Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fowler
Gekas
Gibbons
Gillmor
Goode
Goodlatte
Goss
Graham
Granger
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastert
Hill
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hooley
Horn
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Jenkins
John
Johnson (WI)
Jones
Kennedy (RI)
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Klug
Kolbe
LaHood
Lampson
Largent
Lewis (CA)
Linder
Livingston
Lucas
McCollum
McCrery
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
Mica
Miller (FL)
Moran (KS)
Myrick
Ney
Northup
Nussle
Packard
Pappas
Pastor
Paul
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Pryce (OH)
Riggs
Riley
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ryun
Salmon
Sanchez
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer, Dan
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Shaw
Shimkus
Shuster
Sisisky
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Snowbarger
Snyder
Solomon
Spence
Stabenow
Stearns
Sununu
Talent
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Turner
Upton
Wamp
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weygand
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Young (AK)

NOES—222

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews
Armey
Baesler
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Bass
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Bilbray
Bishop
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Borski
Boucher
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cannon
Cardin
Castle
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Clay
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Cubin
Cummings
Danner
Davis (IL)
Deal
DeLay
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Dunn
Edwards
Ehrlich
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Foley
Forbes
Fossella
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gilchrest
Gilman
Goodling
Green
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Hefner
Herger
Hilliard
Hinchey
Holden
Hostettler
Houghton
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
Kleczka
Klink
Knollenberg
LaFalce
Lantos
Latham
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (KY)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lowey
Luther
Maloney (NY)
Manton
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McHale
McInnis
McIntosh
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Metcalf
Miller (CA)
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Nethercutt
Neumann
Norwood
Oberstar
Obey
Ortiz
Owens
Oxley
Parker
Pascrell
Paxon
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Pickett
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Redmond
Regula
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Sanders
Sanford
Schaffer, Bob
Schumer
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shays
Skeen
Smith (TX)
Smith, Adam
Smith, Linda
Souder
Spratt
Stark
Stokes
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Taylor (MS)
Thompson
Thurman
Tierney
Towns
Traficant
Vento
Visclosky
Walsh
Waters
Watts (OK)
Weller
Wise
Woolsey
Yates
Young (FL)

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—61

Baldacci
Barcia
Blagojevich
Bonior
Brown (CA)
Capps
Carson
Clayton
Conyers
DeFazio
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dooley
Engel
Etheridge
Filner
Ford
Frost
Furse
Gephardt
Gordon
Gutierrez
Hinojosa
Hoyer
Kilpatrick
Kucinich

LaTourette
Lee
Lewis (GA)
Lofgren
Maloney (CT)
McDermott
McGovern
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Minge
Olver
Pallone
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rangel
Reyes
Rivers
Rodriguez
Sabo
Sandlin
Sawyer
Sherman
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Stenholm
Tanner
Tauscher
Torres
Velazquez
Waxman
Wexler
Wynn

NOT VOTING—4

Cunningham
Gonzalez
Inglis
McDade

☐ 1440

Messrs. HEFLEY, STUMP, PAXON, CHRISTENSEN, and CALLAHAN changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. EVERETT, PITTS, WELDON of Pennsylvania, SNOWBARGER, WATT of North Carolina, and GOODLATTE changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

Mr. FROST changed his vote from ''no'' to ''present.''

Mr. BLUMENAUER and Mr. WAMP changed their vote from ''present'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. EWING). Pursuant to House Resolution 442, the amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 13 offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) is finally adopted and shall be reported to the House.

Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose, and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska) having assumed the chair, Mr. EWING, Chairman pro tempore of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2183) to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to reform the financing of campaigns for elections for Federal office, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 442, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on the amendment in the nature of a substitute adopted by the Committee of the Whole? If not, the question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 252, noes 179, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 405]

AYES—252

Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Bachus
Baesler
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bass
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Berry
Bilbray
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Boehlert
Bonior
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Campbell
Capps
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Condit
Conyers
Cook
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Cummings
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Duncan
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Filner
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Furse
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gordon
Graham
Green
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hamilton
Harman
Hefner
Hill
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Holden
Hooley
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, E. B.
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kim
Kind (WI)
Kleczka
Klink
Klug
Kucinich
LaFalce
Lampson
Lantos
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manton
Markey
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McDade
McDermott
McGovern
McHale
McHugh
McIntyre
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Metcalf
Millender-McDonald
Miller (CA)
Minge
Moakley
Moran (VA)
Morella
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Packard
Pallone
Parker
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Petri
Pickett
Pomeroy
Porter
Poshard
Price (NC)
Quinn
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Riggs
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Schumer
Serrano
Shays
Sherman
Shimkus
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith, Adam
Smith, Linda
Snyder
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson
Thune
Thurman
Tierney
Torres
Towns
Turner
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weldon (PA)
Wexler
Weygand
White
Wise
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates

NOES—179

Abercrombie
Aderholt
Archer
Armey
Baker
Ballenger
Barr
Bartlett
Barton
Bateman
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Blunt
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brady (TX)
Bryant
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cannon
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Cooksey
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cubin
Davis (VA)
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dreier
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fossella
Fowler
Gibbons
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Granger
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hostettler
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Istook
Jenkins
John
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kasich
King (NY)
Kingston
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Largent
Latham
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Livingston
Lucas
Manzullo
Martinez
McCollum
McCrery
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Mica
Miller (FL)
Mink
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Murtha
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oxley
Pappas
Paul
Paxon
Pease
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Pickering
Pitts
Pombo
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Radanovich
Rahall
Redmond
Riley
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Royce
Ryun
Salmon
Scarborough
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shuster
Skeen
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Snowbarger
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Talent
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Traficant
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—3

Cunningham
Gonzalez
Inglis

☐ 1458

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 2183, the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.