

No American citizen, not one, should have to pass anyone else's religious test in order to qualify for a federally-funded tax-supported job.

Under H.R. 7, a church associated with Bob Jones University could put out a sign "Paid for by taxpayers. No Catholics need apply here for a federally-funded job." That is wrong.

Under H.R. 7, federally-funded jobs could be denied to otherwise qualified workers simply because of their personal faith being different from that of their employers. That is wrong.

Under H.R. 7, churches that believe women should not work which use Federal dollars could put out a sign saying, "No women need apply here for a federally-funded job." That is wrong.

Mr. Speaker, we all understand why churches, synagogues, and mosques could hire people for their own religious faith with their own private dollars. But it is altogether different, altogether different as night to day to allow tax dollars to be used to subsidize job discrimination for secular jobs.

There is also something ironic about a bill that is supposedly designed to stop religious discrimination but actually ends up not only allowing but subsidizing religious discrimination.

Mr. Speaker, this is also a bill built on a false foundation, the premise that not sending tax dollars to our churches and houses of worship is somehow discrimination against religion.

Nothing could be further from the truth. In the Bill of Rights, our Founding Fathers wisely built this sacred wall of separation to protect religion from government and politicians. This bill would obliterate that wall and ultimately put at risk our religious liberty, the crown jewel of America's experiment in democracy.

To Members who genuinely want to help religious charities do good work, I would say that present law already allows Federal funding of faith-based groups if they agree not to proselytize with those Federal dollars or to discriminate with Federal funds. This bill is thus a solution in search of a problem.

Should we have Federal funding of our churches? The answer is no. Should

we discriminate in job hiring based on religion when using Federal dollars? The answer is no.

And if Members' answers to these two questions is no as well, they should vote no on H.R. 7. Protecting our churches from government regulation and our citizens from religious discrimination are fundamental principles. They deserve our support today, tomorrow, and every day.

By voting no on H.R. 7, we in this House can defend the principles embedded in the Bill of Rights that have protected our religious freedom so magnificently well for over two centuries.

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE
COST ESTIMATE FOR H.R. 2356,
THE BIPARTISAN CAMPAIGN REFORM ACT OF 2001

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker, House Rule XIII 3(c)(2) requires that a cost estimate prepared by the Congressional Budget Office be filed with a committee report. When the committee report for H.R. 2356 was filed, this cost estimate was not yet available.

Attached for inclusion in the RECORD is the completed cost estimate.

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, July 11, 2001.

Hon. ROBERT W. NEY,
Chairman, Committee on House Administration,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Congressional Budget Office has prepared the enclosed cost estimate for H.R. 2356, the Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act of 2001.

If you wish further details on this estimate, we will be pleased to provide them. The CBO staff contacts are Mark Grabowicz (for federal costs) and Paige Piper/Bach (for the private-sector impact).

Sincerely,
BARRY B. ANDERSON,
(For Dan L. Crippen, Director).

Enclosure.
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE COST ESTIMATE
H.R. 2356—Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act of 2001

Summary: H.R. 2356 would make numerous amendments to the Federal Election Cam-

paign Act of 1971. In particular, the bill would:

Raise the amounts that individuals can contribute to federal campaign each year;

Prohibit national committees of political parties from soliciting, receiving, directing, transferring, or spending so-called "soft money";

Require numerous additional filings and disclosures by political committees with the Federal Election Commission (FEC) for certain expenditures;

Strengthen the prohibition on foreign contributions to federal campaigns, and increase fines for violations of election laws.

Direct the General Accounting Office (GAO) to conduct a study of recently publicly financed campaigns in Arizona and Maine; and

Restrict the advertising rates charged by television broadcasters to candidates for public office.

CBO estimates that implementing H.R. 2356 would cost about \$5 million in fiscal year 2002 and about \$3 million a year thereafter, subject to appropriation of the necessary funds. Those amounts include administrative and compliance costs for the FEC, as well as costs for GAO to prepare the required report.

Enacting the bill also could increase collections of fines, but CBO estimates that any increase would not be significant. Because the bill would affect direct spending and receipts, pay-as-you-go procedures would apply.

H.R. 2356 contains no intergovernmental mandates as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act (UMRA) and would not affect the budgets of state, local, or tribal governments.

H.R. 2356 would impose several private-sector mandates as defined in UMRA. CBO estimates that the direct costs to the private sector of complying with those mandates would exceed the annual statutory threshold in UMRA (\$113 million in 2001, adjusted annually for inflation) primarily as a result of new mandates on national political party committees and television, cable, and satellite broadcasters. Moreover, CBO estimates that they net direct costs to the private sector could exceed \$300 million in a Presidential election year.

Estimated cost to the Federal Government: The estimated budgetary impact of H.R. 2356 is shown in the following table. The costs of this legislation fall within budget function 800 (general government).

	By fiscal year, in millions of dollars—					
	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
SPENDING SUBJECT TO APPROPRIATION						
Spending for FEC under current law:						
Estimated authorization level ¹	40	42	43	45	47	48
Estimated outlays	41	42	43	45	47	48
Proposed changes:						
Estimated authorization level	0	5	3	3	3	3
Estimated outlays	0	5	3	3	3	3
Spending under H.R. 2356:						
Estimated authorization level	40	47	46	48	50	51
Estimated outlays	41	47	46	48	50	51

¹ The 2001 level is the amount appropriated for that year. The estimated authorization levels for 2002 through 2006 reflect CBO baseline estimates, assuming adjustments for anticipated inflation.

Basis of Estimate: Based on information from the FEC, CBO estimates that the agency would spend about \$2 million in fiscal year 2002 to reconfigure its information systems to handle the increased workload from accepting and processing more reports, to write new regulations implementing the bill's provisions, and to print and mail infor-

mation to candidates and election committees about the new requirements.

In addition, the FEC would need to ensure compliance with the bill's provisions and investigate possible violations. CBO estimates that conducting those compliance activities would cost \$2 million to \$3 million a year, mainly for additional enforcement and litigation staff.

CBO estimates it would cost GAO less than \$500,000 in fiscal year 2002 to complete the report required by the bill.

Enacting H.R. 2356 could increase collections of fines for violations of campaign finance law. CBO estimates that any additional collections would not be significant. Civil fines are classified as governmental receipts (revenues). Criminal fines are recorded

as receipts and deposited in the Crime Victims Fund, then later spent.

Pay-as-you-go considerations: The Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act specifies pay-as-you-go procedures for legislation affecting direct spending and receipts. These procedures would apply to H.R. 2356 because it would affect both direct spending and receipts, but CBO estimates that the annual amount of such changes would not be significant.

Estimated impact on State, local, and tribal governments: H.R. 2356 contains no intergovernmental mandates as defined in UMRA and would not affect the budgets of state, local, or tribal governments.

Estimated impact on the private sector: H.R. 2356 would make changes to federal campaign finance laws that govern activities in elections for federal office. The bill would amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 by revising current-law restrictions on contributions and expenditures in federal elections. H.R. 2356 would impose mandates on many private-sector entities, including: national party committees, state and local party committees, candidates for federal office, federal officeholders, television, cable and satellite broadcasters, persons who pay for election-related communications, labor unions, corporations, persons who contribute to political campaigns for federal office, and Presidential inaugural committees. The two most costly mandates in the bill would prohibit the use of soft money by national political party committees, and change the rules that television, cable and satellite broadcasters apply to set rates for political advertisements. At the same time, the bill would reduce existing requirements governing election-related contributions and expenditures.

The mandate on national political party committees prohibiting the use of soft money would impose direct costs that equal the forgone amount of soft-money contributions offset by savings in the bill. According to the FEC, national party committees raised approximately \$400 million in 2000, \$95 million in 1999, \$150 million in 1998, and 475 million in 1997 in soft money. Historically, soft-money contributions increase significantly in Presidential election years. During the 2000 election cycle, for example, soft-money contributions for national political parties totaled approximately \$495 million, which represented an increase in soft-money contributions of 475 percent over the 1992 election cycle. CBO, therefore, estimate that the losses as a result of prohibiting soft money would be at least \$400 million in a presidential election year and at least \$75 million in an other election years.

H.R. 2356 also would provide savings as defined in UMRA. The bill would reduce some existing mandates by allowing higher contributions by individuals and thus offset some of the losses resulting from the soft-money prohibition. The bill would increase the following annual limits:

Individual contributions to Senatorial and Presidential candidates from \$1,000 to \$2,000.
Individual contributions to national political parties from \$20,000 to \$25,000.

Individual contributions to state parties from \$5,000 to \$10,000.

Aggregate limit on all individual contributions from \$25,000 to \$37,500, and

National party committee contributions to Senatorial candidates from \$17,500 to \$35,000 in an election year.

Further, the bill would provide for future indexing for inflation of certain limitations on annual contributions. The bill would also raise limits on individual and party support for Senate candidates whose opponents exceed designated level of personal campaign funding.

The increased contributions limits would allow candidates and national and state

party committees to accept larger campaign contributions. Based on information from the FEC and other experts, CBO expects that the increment in such contributions could be as much as \$200 million in a Presidential election year. Thus, such savings would only partially offset the losses from the ban on soft-money contributions.

Additional mandates in H.R. 2356 would impose costs on television, cable, and satellite broadcasters by requiring the lowest unit rate broadcast time to be nonpreemptible for candidates (with rates based on comparison to prior 180 days) and requiring the rates to be available to national party committees. The bill also would also require broadcasters to maintain records of requests of broadcast time purchases. Based on the latest figures from the National Association of Broadcasters and the FCC, affected political advertising would bring in revenues of \$400 million to \$500 million in Presidential election years and \$200 million to \$250 million in other election years. CBO does not have enough information to accurately estimate the effects of the requirements in the bill on those revenues. Based on information from industry experts, however, CBO concludes that such losses could exceed \$100 million in a Presidential election year.

H.R. 2356 would also impose private-sector mandates in several additional areas. These areas include: restricting the use of soft money by candidates and state political parties; additional requirements to report information to the FEC about political contributions and expenditures by individuals and political parties; restricting contributions from minors and foreign nationals; restricting disbursements for election-related communications by individuals, labor unions, corporations, and political parties; and prohibiting certain campaign fundraising.

The direct costs associated with additional reporting requirements would not be significant. In general, most entities involved in federal elections must submit reports to the FEC under current law. New requirements in H.R. 2356 also would impose some costs for individuals and organizations who pay for certain election-related communications associated directly and indirectly with federal elections. Finally, mandates that restrict the ability of individuals and organizations to make certain contributions or expenditures would impose additional administrative costs.

Previous estimate: On July 9, 2001, CBO transmitted a cost estimate for H.R. 2360, the Campaign Finance Reform and Grassroots Citizen Participation Act of 2001, as ordered reported by the Committee on House Administration on June 28, 2001. That bill contained some of the provisions in H.R. 2356 and CBO estimated that it would cost the federal government \$2 million annually, subject to the availability of appropriated funds. Neither bill contains intergovernmental mandates.

Both bills would impose private-sector mandates by placing new restrictions on contributions and expenditures related to federal elections. The mandates in H.R. 2360 would not impose costs above the statutory threshold. The primary mandate in H.R. 2360 would limit the use of soft-money contributions in certain federal election activities. The primary mandates in H.R. 2356 would impose costs above the threshold by banning the use of soft money for national committees and changing the rules that apply to broadcast rates for political advertisements.

Estimates prepared by: Federal costs: Mark Grabowicz, impact on State, local and tribal governments: Susan Seig Thompkins; impact on the private sector: Paige Piper/Bach.

Estimate approved by: Peter H. Fontaine, Deputy Assistant Director for Budget Analysis.

THE UNIQUE QUALITIES OF THE AMERICAN WEST

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I come before my colleagues this evening to discuss one of my favorite topics, of course, the American West. I plan to spend the next few minutes talking about the differences between the western United States and the eastern United States.

I talk quite regularly about these issues because, of course, being a native of the wonderful State of Colorado, I believe very strongly, very strongly in the American West and the virtues and the values of the American West.

I think it is important, because of our small population out there, that we continue to be heard in this country; that our way of life in the American West somehow be preserved and not trod upon.

I had a wonderful experience this last weekend. I was in Buena Vista, which in Spanish stands for "good view," Buena Vista, Colorado. I and a couple of friends and my wife, Laurie, we went to Buena Vista for one purpose: We wanted to hear a singer, somebody who I had known, a person of great character, a gentleman named Michael Martin Murphy.

This is an individual who is not only able to sing in such a way that it warms your heart, but also has the very canny ability of passing on and communicating through his music about the values of the American West. Not only can Michael Martin Murphy communicate about the values of the American West, he also communicates about the need and the necessity of character, of real character; of the standards that we as Americans ought to live up to.

When we went to Buena Vista and we heard some of the discussions, we had an opportunity not only to listen to the music of Michael Martin Murphy, who I pay tribute to today; not only to meet his good friend, Karen Richie, but also to listen to some of the background and some of the values and the future that people like Gene Autry, Roy Rogers, and Marty Robbins saw about the American West.

I can say that Michael Martin Murphy in my opinion rises to the level of those legends, the legends of Marty Robbins, the legend of Gene Autry, the legend of Roy Rogers; that he rises to their level, because in my opinion he is able to communicate the message as those people did for their generation, and Michael Martin Murphy does that for this generation. I think his music will carry that message to future generations.