

**MARKUP OF H.R. 1316
THE 527 FAIRNESS ACT OF 2005**

MARKUP
BEFORE THE
**COMMITTEE ON HOUSE
ADMINISTRATION**
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
ONE HUNDRED NINTH CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

MARKUP HELD IN WASHINGTON, DC JUNE 8, 2005



Printed for the Use of the Committee on House Administration

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

WASHINGTON : 2005

22-244

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Internet: bookstore.gpo.gov Phone: toll free (866) 512-1800; DC area (202) 512-1800
Fax: (202) 512-2250 Mail: Stop SSOP, Washington, DC 20402-0001

COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

BOB NEY, Ohio, *Chairman*

VERNON J. EHLERS, Michigan

JOHN L. MICA, Florida

CANDICE MILLER, Michigan

JOHN T. DOOLITTLE, California

THOMAS M. REYNOLDS, New York

JUANITA MILLENDER-McDONALD,
California

Ranking Minority Member

ROBERT A. BRADY, Pennsylvania

ZOE LOFGREN, California

PAUL VINOVIK, *Staff Director*

GEORGE SHEVLIN, *Minority Staff Director*

MARKUP OF H.R. 1316, THE 527 FAIRNESS ACT OF 2005

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 8, 2005

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, DC.

The committee met, pursuant to call, at 4:00 p.m., in room 1310, Longworth House Office Building, Hon. Robert W. Ney (chairman of the committee) presiding.

Present: Representatives Ney, Ehlers, Mica, Miller, Millender-McDonald, Brady, and Lofgren.

Staff Present: Paul Vinovich, Staff Director; Matt Peterson, Counsel; Chris Otilio, Professional Staff; George Shevlin, Minority Staff Director; Charles Howell, Minority Chief Counsel; Tom Hicks, Minority Professional Staff; and Matt Pinkus, Minority Professional Staff.

The CHAIRMAN. The meeting will come to order. We are expecting minority members of the Committee to be here within a couple of minutes, so we will go ahead and begin with opening statements. And the Committee is now in order for the purpose of consideration of H.R. 1316, the 527 Fairness Act of 2005.

The Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act, known as BCRA, threw our Federal campaign system out of balance when it passed 3 years ago. Despite the claims of its proponent, BCRA did not ban soft money, but merely diverted its flow. Power and influence were shifted to unaccountable, ideologically driven outside groups; and our political parties, I believe, were weakened as a result.

Additionally, the first amendment rights of individuals and associations were trampled upon as a result of BCRA's many onerous restrictions and harsh criminal penalties, and yet for reasons I will never understand, the supporters of BCRA crow about how all this represents progress. Confronted by the failures of the law they supported, BCRA supporters now propose even more government clampdowns on political speech. For them, reform has only one meaning, more regulation.

I do believe there is a better approach. Today, I will be offering an amendment in the nature of a substitute to H.R. 1316, an amendment that seeks to restore some of the balance that was lost when BCRA was enacted. This amendment removes some of the regulatory situations that hinder the ability of party committees, PACs and individuals, to compete on a level playing field with the 527s.

Furthermore, it is an amendment that recognizes the crucial role of our political parties and what role they play as mediating insti-

tutions within our political system. It understands that the health of our democracy is inseparably linked to the health of our political parties.

The amendment that I am introducing retains all of the provisions from H.R. 1316, as introduced, which is a bipartisan bill co-authored by Congressman Mike Pence and Congressman Albert Wynn, both of whom testified before this committee about their bill last month. At that hearing, Congressman Pence described the purpose of his bill, stating that instead of pushing down the 527s, as some have proposed, our bill aims to lift up the other players by injecting more freedom into the campaign system.

And Congressman Wynn explained that the bill would allow national political parties to more effectively raise hard money campaign contributions for their candidates and to promote their parties' agenda.

The Pence-Wynn bill makes the following changes to the current campaign finance system: First, it lifts the aggregate election cycle contribution limit. This change will not only end the unproductive competition against political party committees and PACs for donors' dollars, but it will encourage more giving to the entities, subject to disclosed requirements and contribution limits.

Next, the bill removes the limit on expenditures coordinated between party committees and candidates. The current limit is based on the untenable notion that candidates are in danger of being corrupted by their own political parties. Eliminating this limit removes an unfortunate wedge that has been driven between parties and their own candidates.

One of BCRA's numerous adverse effects was federalizing many activities traditionally carried out at the state and local level. The so-called reformers often bemoan the fact that many voters are estranged from the political process, but then impose laws that hamstring the very groups whose mission it is to bring them in. The Pence-Wynn bill aims to correct this by allowing state and local parties to use funds permitted under relevant state law to engage in voter registration activities and to present and distribute sample ballots, which I think is a fine provision in this bill.

The bill also lifts restrictions that prevent many tax-exempt organizations from engaging in electioneering communications on equal terms with 527 groups and eliminates the prior approval requirement for trade associations.

In addition to these provisions, the amendment that I am introducing today includes language that furthers the underlying objectives of H.R. 1316. The amendment raises the contribution limits for PACs and indexes them for inflation. The current PAC limits have been eroded by 30 years of inflation, and so a modest increase has been long overdue.

The amendment also helps cash-strapped state parties by extending the limits on contributions to state party committees.

The amendment will furthermore permit unlimited transfers between leadership PACs and national party committees. This provision remedies an unnecessary disparity in the law that allows the candidate's authorized campaign committee to make unlimited transfers to a national party committee, but prevents a candidate's leadership PAC from doing the same thing.

The amendment protects small political organizations from burdensome FEC regulations by raising the committee registration thresholds to \$10,000.

BCRA places unfair and unreasonable restrictions on the ability of Federal officeholders to fully participate in elections in their home states and in the communities they represent. The amendment we are considering today dismantles some of the barriers by allowing Federal officeholders to simply endorse state and local candidates without such endorsements being considered coordinated contributions that must be paid for with federal hard dollars.

Federal candidates will also be able to declare their positions on state ballot initiatives and endorse other federal candidates. This amendment also clarifies the original intent of a BCRA provision that permits federal officeholders and candidates to speak at and fully participate in fund-raisers for state and local parties. This is one provision, as I have talked to Democrats and, Republicans, I think we can agree upon, that it is ridiculous that a federal officeholder cannot endorse a candidate, but a state senator or a state rep or anybody else can in the states.

The amendment strengthens the foreign money ban by prohibiting foreign nationals from making contributions or expenditures to 527 organizations. Neither the Federal Election Campaign Act nor the Internal Revenue Code specifically bars foreign nationals from making contributions to 527 groups. If you looked on the web sites last year, you would see where foreign nationals can do that. In fact, there were solicitations for foreign nationals.

So foreign money, despite what BCRA said, came into the system. This amendment corrects that omission.

The amendment also promotes disclosure of the activities of 527 groups by requiring that such entities report according to the same schedule and under the same terms and conditions as federal political committees. And I think this is a very fair provision.

Finally, the amendment protects the ability of our citizens to participate in the national political dialogue using Internet Web sites and blogs without the fear of being subject to burdensome regulation under the federal campaign finance laws.

The internet has been a revolutionary tool for engaging our citizenry in the democratic process. Its expanding use should be fostered and encouraged, not hindered by heavy-handed regulatory restrictions. The internet provision contained in this amendment enjoys wide bipartisan support. It is identical to language introduced by Senate Democrat leader, Harry Reid and Representative Hensarling.

I believe the amendment that I am introducing today will significantly improve our nation's campaign finance system by making it fair and more balanced, and I ask my colleagues here on the committee to support it.

I again want to thank the sponsors of the bill, H.R. 1316, Congressman Pence who is here today, and also Congressman Wynn, who is not here in the committee today; but I appreciate their bipartisan effort, a truly bipartisan effort for a good, solid bill and their efforts on this matter. I believe they are both men of deep integrity and keen understanding about how our campaign finance

system operates. It has been a pleasure working with them on this legislation.

I also express my gratitude to my colleagues on the committee for their hard work and useful suggestions for improving this legislation. Mr. Mica was the author of the 527 disclosure provision. I greatly appreciate his efforts to shed more sunlight on the activities of 527 groups.

Ms. Miller was the driving force behind strengthening the ban on foreign contributions to 527 groups and she, along with Mr. Ehlers and Mr. Reynolds, also offered very useful provisions for enhancing the amendment's endorsement provision.

Mr. Doolittle has also been very helpful throughout this entire process.

In addition, I again want to thank Congressman Hensarling for his efforts to keep political activities on the internet free and open.

The formulation of this amendment has been a collaborative effort and the final product has been greatly enhanced as a result of the individuals that I have just mentioned.

And with that, I will yield to Mr. Brady.

Mr. BRADY. Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman. And again, thank you for your amendments.

I really would like to thank Mr. Pence and Mr. Wynn for the job that they are trying to do to try to make the bill a little bit better. Unfortunately, I cannot vote for it simply because of other components that are in this. But I do want to again thank you for putting an amendment up that I happen to wholeheartedly agree with, especially where it says, where we state parties can't issue a sample ballot without both parties being on it. I think that that hinders the political system. It is a good system of different parties against each other, and they should be able to air their views.

Also, without question, I don't agree with Federal officeholders not being able to endorse a local candidate. I am also a party chairman in the city of Philadelphia and I do, and I will, endorse local candidates. I don't know what position that puts me in. I understand somebody has said it may be criminal and they may incarcerate me. But I would really be embarrassed to go to jail with murders and rapists and be there for endorsing a local candidate. I would probably have to beat up a guard on the way there just to make myself legitimate.

So you happen to know how I feel about that.

Ms. LOFGREN. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADY. Yes.

Ms. LOFGREN. On that point, and I have just been consulting, it is not illegal for a Federal officeholder to endorse a candidate for local office. Raising money is a different issue, but you can endorse whoever you want to. And you do and I do and probably all of us do. So I think we ought to clarify that.

There is nothing that constrains any of us from doing an endorsement of a candidate. It is when we get into raising money that we get into the problem.

And I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. BRADY. Well, just reclaiming my time. In the city of Philadelphia when you endorse a local candidate, they expect you to contribute to their party. So I am at a big catch 22 here.

But I do appreciate you trying to make it better for me, Mr. Chairman. I thank you, and I thank you for your time.

The CHAIRMAN. I want to thank the gentleman for his comments. Before we move on to Mr. Ehlers, let me clarify the point.

The gentlelady is right about the clarification—it is illegal in the sense that 120 days before the primary, 120 days before the general election, if a candidate walks up to you, a State senator, and says, “Can you endorse me?” and you say, “Sure, use a quote, you are a good person,” once that quote is used, you have to divvy into where that quote is used in a brochure or a TV ad. I think a lot of Members have not realized that they have accidentally violated this law.

In some cases, and this has come from Democrats and Republicans, they went to the candidate and said, “I can’t do it unless I pay a certain amount of your brochure,” which is going to cause a major problem. How do you divide it up? Then the candidate says, “Well, my state senator endorsed me; but you know, you are a high and mighty Member of Congress, you can’t endorse me.

I think the gentlelady is right for clarification purposes, but if you endorse a candidate 120 days before the election—and I know when I have said this before, people say, “You have got to be kidding,” and they are thinking back, “Wow, I gave quotes to people.” So I think they are in a potentially illegal situation if they don’t contribute after they endorse.

Mr. Ehlers.

Mr. EHLERS. I simply want to thank the chairman for his work on this bill and his openness to suggestions from members of the committee.

I think BCRA has a number of problems which should be corrected, but also the emergence of the 527s, in my mind, totally destroys the political system that we tried to put in place with BCRA, and that is complete and total accountability and openness. And at the very least, we have to make certain that all 527s report financial contributions received and disbursements made precisely the same way that political parties, political candidates, political PACs have to report.

It is unreasonable to us to have these stringent requirements on ourselves, on our PACs, upon the parties and then have it wide open for 527s to receive and disburse any funds they want. The only thing necessary are reports to the IRS which do not meet the standards of the FEC.

And so it is very important to me that all 527s have to be—if they are going to engage in receiving and disbursing political contributions, have to meet the same requirements that any other political committee meets and report to the FEC in precisely the same manner. And I am pleased to see that that is now going to be incorporated in the chairman’s mark.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlelady from California.

Ms. LOFGREN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

First, I have thanks for continuing this hearing while our ranking member was recovering from surgery. But also, an objection that I did not see the manager’s or chairman’s substitute until just

today, and I think it could have been a better process had that been shared earlier.

On the merits of the measure itself, there are a few small things, for example, not regulating the Internet that hopefully we are all going to agree that we should not regulate the Internet.

I think certainly one can have a discussion and I probably would come down with all of us about endorsements being publicized. That could be fixed. But you can put lipstick on a pig, and it is still going to oink. And I think that is what this bill is. It is still an oinker.

The courts have said that you must tread very lightly, or “carefully” would be a better word, when regulating free speech. And this is what we are talking about, political speech, first amendment rights; and really, basically the courts have come down, you can regulate fund-raising when the purpose is to avoid corruption. And that is why campaign finance reform has basically been upheld because the courts have noted that when officeholders solicit funds, there is an opportunity for corruption to enter the system and therefore a justification and a reason to regulate the raising of funds by officeholders and candidates.

And that reminds me really that this week there has been a lot of talk because the identity of Deep Throat was finally revealed after so many years. Thirty-two years ago, really, just about this time, Senator Irvin was beginning his historic hearings.

And I have been thinking a lot about those times because I was, at that time, a young staffer for Congressman Don Edwards, who was a member of the Judiciary Committee and involved in the impeachment of President Nixon; and it was one of the most trying experiences of my professional career.

It was a constitutional crisis. And really, in a lot of ways, that came down to money.

I will never forget being in the, then the majority side of the committee rooms as a young person and coming across a fellow who actually was a good person. He had been a fund-raiser for the President, had a distinguished career as a lawyer, and he was just crushed because he had been caught up. And he was a good person, but he had been caught up in this wave of money and corruption, and his career was ruined; and he knew it. And I think the only good thing that really came out of Watergate, one of the good things, was campaign finance reform.

Basically, the bill before us would bring us back to the bad old days of the kind of money and fund-raising that was the signature of the pre-Watergate days. And I will just go quickly. I know the ranking member is here; I started before she came in.

The kind of money that was compiled under the existing rules, under campaign finance reform, the DNC last election cycle raised \$311,524,000, the RNC, 392,413,000, a lot of money. Certainly we don't need more than that. The DCCC, 92.8 million; the NRCC, 185.7 million; the Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee, 88.6 million; and the Republican Senate committee, 78.9 million.

This bill before us would change the current limit of \$101,400 per election cycle. That would actually eliminate that limit, and I think the ranking member is prepared to say how high it would go.

This bill is bad for two reasons. It brings back campaign finance reform to the Watergate era and will increase corruption, and it impermissibly attempts to regulate free speech in the 527 arena. We don't have the justification to avoid corruption of officeholders there because it is prohibited for Federal officeholders to solicit money for 527s, and if that is happening, it ought to be referred to the Justice Department because it is illegal.

And so the rationale for limiting free speech is surely not present. If we pass it, it will be struck down, I am sure. I think groups on both sides of the political spectrum from the NRA to Planned Parenthood will go after it; and they should, because they have a right to speak their mind so long as they are not entangled with a corruption of the political system.

So I believe my time has probably expired. The ranking member is here. I think we are engaged in an effort here that we will regret deeply, and I yield back.

The CHAIRMAN. I want to welcome the ranking member back. And so we are pleased to have you here today, and if you would—

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Thank you so much, Mr. Chairman. And before I make my statement, let me clearly thank you for your sensitivity, your kindness, and your persistence in ensuring that this markup did not take place until I had come back from recovery. So I thank you gentlemen for your greatness and for your expression of floral arrangements to me. And so, thank you so much for the great chairman you are.

Mr. Chairman, again I would like to thank you for your efforts in the area of election reform. With the limited amount of time that we have between now and the next election, we should be listening to and solving the problems of voters, the citizens who were disenfranchised or experienced voting and registration problems in 2004.

And we know exactly the many folks who were disenfranchised. We were in Ohio. We know that over 100,000 provisional ballots were not counted; and this is really just the beginning of many, many States where ballots were not counted.

So not facilitating political access for those whose voices have not been heard, but making sure that access by wealthy contributors whose perceived notions as gaining unlimited influence is really unconscionable. This is why we brought about BCRA. BCRA was intended to give ordinary citizens a greater say in the political process by eliminating the influence of six to seven figure donations to Federal campaigns.

The first amendment rights and getting more Americans involved in the political process is what we should be all about; not to muffle those whose voices have not been heard, but to give them better access to this whole notion of the political process.

We have seen that there have been record numbers of voter registration—young people by greater margins—and this all came about because of those independent organizations going out doing their due diligence for those folks whose voices were not heard. Yet, this legislation that is before us today is being pushed by the opponents of BCRA in an effort to repeal aspects of the very campaign

finance laws which were enacted in 1974 to address the Watergate scandal.

I hope we can continue to work together on electoral issues.

Mr. Chairman, you have been willing—as you demonstrated this past March, to hold a hearing in Ohio, which was at the center of the 2004 election debacle, you have been willing to step up front to talk about those issues of disenfranchisement. You have not been afraid to examine the sticky issues occasioned by voter disenfranchisement, and you have been willing to take this across the country.

Well, it is time for us to do this, Mr. Chairman. With the time that we have left in this session, I hope that we continue to conduct additional field hearings throughout the country to protect HAVA and promote our robust democracy. We should be discussing how to get those 40 percent of Americans who did not vote in the last election to the election box to exercise their franchise, not working to find more ways to get more money from wealthy contributors.

As I stated before, I voted for BCRA to sever the connection between Federal officeholders and the raising of soft money. BCRA was necessary to cut the perceived link between officeholders, the formation and adoption of Federal policy, and non-Federal money. I feel that passage of this bill will be a huge step backwards towards the six figures of hard dollar checks by soliciting again by Federal officeholders.

I will give you reasons why I will not be supporting this bill. The proponents of this legislation were among the strongest opponents of BCRA and are using public concerns over so-called 527s, as a pretext for rolling back and rolling back BCRA. The debate over Pence-Wynn should be focused on BCRA and whether the current aggregate donor and expenditure limits should be maintained.

Secondly, claims that Pence-Wynn needed to put the parties back in charge are untrue. BCRA did not kill the parties. After the passage of BCRA, the parties raised a record 1.2 billion, as in “B”, dollars, in hard dollars this last election cycle. This is \$200 million more in hard dollars than the combination of hard and soft money raised in the past pre-BCRA cycle.

The parties do not need the Pence-Wynn bill to get back into the game. They are already in this game. BCRA became law just over 3 years ago. It was passed by a Republican Congress and signed by a Republican President, yet it has only been given one election cycle to work. Just as you have said about HAVA, Mr. Chairman, we should not amend a law that has not been given time to become fully functional.

The Pence-Wynn not only amends, but undermines a law that is working. By removing the caps on coordinated expenditures, Pence-Wynn would allow a national party committee to completely underwrite a multimillion-dollar campaign against any candidate that it targets, since it eliminates the limits on party-coordinated expenditures in the general election. This would provide the political party in power with a great advantage.

The national parties should be on equal footage. This legislation impedes this. H.R. 1316 is not the vehicle for reform.

This legislation would weaken BCRA by stripping away the aggregate limits on what an individual could give to the parties and

candidates. Currently, an individual can give up to \$101,400 to all political parties, PAC committees and candidates in a 2-year Federal election cycle; this amounts to an individual giving up to 40,000 to Federal candidates and 61,400 to political parties and PAC committees. This is what we want.

But if the Pence-Wynn bill becomes law, an individual could give \$160,200 to the three multinational—to the three national committees of a political party, or \$1 million to the State party committees of that party, 20,000 to each for the 50 State party committees and 1.8 million to each of the 435 Members' races for a particular party, for a total of almost \$3 million. This will peel away the FECA aggregate limits, which were put in place as a direct result of the scandals of Watergate.

With the passage of BCRA, a loophole was closed that allowed corporations and unions to donate soft monies to Federal candidates. As a result of BCRA, the parties raised a record 1.2 billion again in hard dollars. By encouraging grass-roots organizing and the use of the Internet, BCRA helped to transform political fund-raising and attracted millions of new, smaller donors, making the entire fund-raising process more democratic. By doing so, it gave greater prominence to average Americans in the political process.

The Pence-Wynn bill stands to reverse those gains by returning to an increasing reliance by the party on wealthy donors. It would increase the role of special interests in campaigns, most notably trade associations, by allowing trade associations to make unlimited electioneering communications.

It has not been demonstrated that the money raised and expended by 527 organizations has the same potential corrosive influence on Federal policymakers. 527s, in fact, helped increase voter turnout to the highest levels since 1968. I can attest to that, because my area of Watts and Compton in Los Angeles, and other minority groups and areas around this country, there was a vast amount of energy that was given to those who had thought that their voices were not heard.

I say to you, Mr. Chairman, I want that to remain. Minorities, women and others, want to at last have a speaking role in this political process. Bills like this do nothing to make that happen.

So on behalf of the minority on this side in this committee and all the minorities throughout this country, I hereby give notice that the minority intends to file additional and minority views to the committee report. I will also be encouraging my colleagues who oppose this unnecessary and damaging piece of legislation.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the time.

The CHAIRMAN. I thank the gentlelady.

Gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MICA. Well, thank you, Mr. Chairman. And it is good to see the ranking member back. She appears to be in excellent health and just as feisty as ever.

But I would have to disagree with her and strongly support the chairman's mark. I think it is a vast improvement. And first of all, I want to thank you, Mr. Chairman, for including my amendment. You referred to it as an amendment that would shed light on the political process and what 527s are doing to participate.

Not coordinating our statements to that, I call it a “sunshine amendment” which requires the 527 groups to submit reports to the FEC in the same manner applicable to Federal political committees.

I have no problem with 527s, but 527s, when they participate in political advocacy—and we have seen that dramatically in the last election—are basically an attempt to skirt the intent of our campaign finance laws. So if we are sort of stuck with them, and stuck with them in the process, the very least we can do—and I think this will be the best amendment in this bill, and I am not taking credit for authorship because others have also proposed the same thing—but it forces the 527s to abide by the same disclosure rules as every other political group, forces the 527s to give detailed and itemized reports to the Federal Elections Commission, and it also requires all contributions and expenditures to be public information accessible.

So if we can’t control their political activities—and I have no problem with them being part of the process and increasing voter participation, but when they are trying to influence an election, and we know they are actually doing that, the very least we can do is shed light on who gave what and how much, and have full public disclosure.

So again, Mr. Chairman, I thank you for including this provision, and yield back.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you.
Gentleman from New York.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I came in having some understanding of both the bill and the chairman’s mark and by listening to some of the opening comments, and I was not going to make any.

But first of all, the best way to have an understanding of individuals as candidates for Federal officials would be to have prompt and accurate reporting, I think similar to the Doolittle provision that was offered. And what I see here, as a guy who has been both elected and a former party chairman, is the law of the land is now BCRA. But in listening to the gentlewoman from California discussing that first amendment—if anything, I certainly, in listening to our lawyer’s anticipation of what the courts might do, found a shock in the fact that BCRA actually limited first amendment rights in the final decisions by the court on the law of the land prohibiting certain actions by individuals under the law. But nevertheless, as I have said on this committee before, BCRA is the law of the land.

Now, I haven’t heard any one of our colleagues, other than maybe the author, say this is a perfect bill. And in hammering together, section by section, the BCRA law, it was designed in those efforts to get 218 votes; and it did. And it passed in both bodies, it was signed by the President, it was affirmed by the courts.

However, the discussion, as we move forward on 527s and the fact that anyone can say it is a level playing field or that this is some great way of limiting temptation by elected officials or candidates from having too much money in the thing, when I look at the fact of how much 527s have invested, along with (c)(4)s and others, on circumventing the BCRA law because 527s apparently

were silent in the law, although some authors have indicated that it was their intent to have it, or certainly now they are going to address this somehow, there is more money that is outside of regulation of the FEC of either us as candidates or our parties, and those parties on both sides, whether they be senatorial, congressional or the national parties.

And we now find that while we govern ourselves in the party by felonies—we have civil and IRS and late filings—and it will be in the next cycle, after 2006, that we will even know what types of things might have been committed incorrectly by 527s this cycle.

So it is clear, in my view, that we need to address a level playing field of 527s and (c)(4)s and those who want to enter and fully engage in the political process. And there may be two thoughts, whether it is Pence-Wynn on looking at leveling the playing field of 527s in our national parties; or it may be that Shays-Meehan and our House have just let us go after 527s. Then the question will be, when 527s kind of dissolve and they move to (c)(4)s, are we going to keep going down the line till we find ourselves trying to chase each and every loophole that is in the law other than for Federal candidates and parties.

And I still come from an aspect—and I hope there are some on both sides of the aisle—that party structure does matter and that party structure on a level playing field will hold its own. But today, 527s and their donors—and before this is done, I will have the information of the top four donors that are in the 527s.

And you talk about money into the plates. This is unregulated investment that is coming into the arena by both sides, but it is under no auspices of BCRA today.

And so this committee starts the challenge of whether we are going to have a level playing field or whether we are going to find ourselves where we are going to turn our heads and allow an unregulated enterprise to come in and tilt both candidates, elect the officials and the party structure as we know it.

Yield back.

The CHAIRMAN. Gentleman from California.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I missed the, all the opening statements, so Mr. Reynolds, I think—

Mr. MICA. You are fortunate.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. He is unfortunate.

Mr. DOOLITTLE [continued]. Makes a very valid point.

Theodore Roosevelt and the Progressives started us off on this terrible road that we are far down our way on. And the best thing that you could do would be to undo all of that and be completely unregulated, have full disclosure. Let candidates run their campaigns. Let free speech prevail. Don't create perverse incentives where the candidate, because of fund-raising increase restrictions increasingly, over time the speech moves away from the candidate where you have either independent-type expenditures, or 527s or whatever, that are increasingly spending money to influence the campaign.

These ardent proponents of more and more regulation will not hear anything that contradicts what their, I am going to call it, "religion" is. Facts don't matter. They have pure faith, misguided

faith, not in God, but in regulation. And the more regulation we have, the less accountable the campaigns become.

I just think it is tragic. We have lost a good deal of our free speech as a result of that Supreme Court opinion upholding McCain-Feingold, Shays-Meehan. You are never going to take the money out of politics. You have hobbled candidates and, increasingly, you are allowing third-party groups to get involved here. You create an incentive for them to get involved.

This bill, the Pence-Wynn bill, makes some needed reforms to create—to level the playing field so that at least political parties are competing equally with 527s. I don't know how these proponents of big government regulation could tell us that, you know, the Pence-Wynn bill is going to take us back to pre-BCRA or pre-Watergate reforms. I wish it would take us back to those days. We would be a lot better off.

Instead, we are where we are. And last year, five millionaires in California contributed \$78 million to anti-Bush 527s. How anyone can sit here and claim that with those facts that somehow, you know, the money is out of politics, that is just absurd on its face.

I don't mind money. It is a neutral tool. It just that both sides ought to be able to have equal access to it. And as long as it is reported, I don't see any problem with that. This is a free republic and, you know, that is how we win our elections.

I do think that the system is skewed and I think that we ought to pass the Pence-Wynn bill in order to improve the situation.

And I thank you, Mr. Chairman, for this opportunity.

The CHAIRMAN. I thank the gentleman.

I think the gentleman from New York wants to enter something for the record and probably say the first four I assume.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I thank the chairman, because I didn't have these in front of me. The top four Democratic donors to 527s, as published on the PoliticalMoneyLine, which is certainly an accepted use of reporters in finding this information and sharing it: Soros, \$27 million; Lewis, 24 million; Marion Sandler, 14 million; Stephen Bing, 14 million.

And even when we look at the Republicans, some were noted that the Swift Boat, while they are not as generous or able to share their dollars in the arena: Perry, 8 million; Boone Pickens, 6 million; Arnall, 5 million; Alex Faye Spanos, 5 million—those eight individuals almost like 80 percent of the types of investment that have come in here in the name of free speech in an unregulated aspect of what we now have in the Federal election law.

And I am happy to make available from the PoliticalMoneyLine the money and political databases of the large 527 donors for the election cycle, 2004. And for anyone to believe that this has not got big, unregulated money in a terrible policing aspect of the law of the land, we are kidding ourselves.

I thank the chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, that will be entered as part of the record.

[The information follows:]



The home of
FECinfo
and tray.com

Order Now

Money In Politics Databases

Logoff

Large 527 Donors for Election Cycle 2004

Rank	Donor Name	Amount
1	Soros, George	\$27,080,105
2	Lewis, Peter B	\$23,997,220
3	Sandler, Herbert M and Marion O	\$14,009,039
4	BING, STEPHEN L MR	\$13,952,682
5	Service Employees Int'l Union	\$9,078,338
6	PERRY, BOB J	\$8,090,000
7	American Fedn of St Crty & Municipal Empls	\$6,196,700
8	US CHAMBER OF COMMERCE	\$5,688,000
9	PICKENS, T BOONE MR	\$5,620,000
10	WATT, TED AND JOAN	\$5,100,000
11	ARNALL, ROLAND E AND DAWN	\$5,000,000
12	Spanos, Alexander Gus and Faye	\$5,000,000
13	Koppasport, Andrew & Deborah LC	\$4,668,400
14	Pericichio, Andrew Jerrold & Margaree	\$4,200,000
15	Sustainable World Corp	\$4,100,000
16	Simmons, Harold C and Annette	\$3,900,000
17	Messinger, Alida Rockefeller	\$3,830,000
18	LEVY-HINTE, JEFFREY & JEANNE	\$3,550,500
19	Pritzker, Linda	\$3,435,000
20	Evchauer, Fred and Mildred	\$3,075,000
21	McHale, Jonathan and Mattson, Christine L.	\$3,000,000
22	RAGON, TERRY & SUSAN	\$3,000,000
23	CULLMAN, LEWIS B & SUSAN	\$2,658,000
24	Walton, Alice	\$2,600,000
25	BLAKENSHIP, DON L	\$2,460,000
26	Lindner, Carl H and Edyth H	\$2,435,000
27	HARRIS, JOHN A IV AND MRS	\$2,365,000
28	American Fedn of Teachers	\$2,307,500
29	GLASER, ROBERT D	\$2,229,000
30	McClendon, Aubrey	\$2,125,000
31	Singer, Paul	\$2,110,000
32	DeVos, Richard and Betsy	\$2,050,000

- 3 Candidates
- US House Sen and Pres Campaigns
- Presidential Races
- Incumbent
- Senate Members
- Political PACs
- Defense Funds
- Foundations
- Candidate \$ Leaders
- Travel - Gov't Paid
- Disbursements
- Search Payments Made
- Donors
- Donor Name Lookup
- Donor ZIP Lookup
- Employer / Occupation Lookup
- Out of State Donors
- PACs & Parties
- PAC / Party Profiles
- PAC Names and Addresses
- Party Summary
- Figures
- Industry Total \$
- PAC \$ Leaders
- Top Corporate PACs To Condo
- New Corp PACs
- Labor Union \$
- Illegal Corp \$

Political Money Line

Convention \$			\$2,016,000
33 . Varric, Agnes and Karl Leichtman			\$2,000,000
34 . VANDEL, JAY & MRS			\$1,915,501
35 . AFL-CIO			\$1,682,000
Foreign Agents			
FARA Database			
501(c)(4)			\$1,595,000
36 . Hunting, John			\$1,575,000
37 . GILL, TIM MR			\$1,550,000
38 . Field, Joseph M			\$1,510,000
501(c)(4) Orgs			\$1,492,500
39 . McNair, Robert C			\$1,462,300
40 . Ware, Marilyn			\$1,390,000
41 . Assn of Trial Lawyers of America			\$1,347,084
42 . Labors Int'l Union of North America			\$1,326,000
43 . SILVERMAN, ROBERT F X MR			\$1,255,000
44 . FORRESTER, DOUGLAS R			\$1,232,500
45 . Abraham, S Daniel & Ewa			\$1,210,000
46 . INT'L BRTHD OF TEAMSTERS			\$1,155,000
47 . ROWLING, ROBERT B			\$1,125,000
48 . NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSN			\$1,089,257
49 . MILBERG WEISS BERSHAD HYNES LERACH			\$1,075,000
50 . GUND, LOUISE L			\$1,067,250
51 . MCCORMACK, WINTHROP L			\$1,057,083
52 . Bing, Peter S			\$1,050,000
53 . Chambers, Anne Cox			\$1,038,000
54 . Marcus, Bernard and (Bill) Wilma			\$1,025,000
55 . BEVERLY ENTERPRISES INC			\$1,022,140
56 . Communications Workers of America			\$1,017,000
57 . Earhart, Anne Getty			\$1,010,000
58 . JENSEN, S J			\$1,007,000
59 . PFIZER INC			\$1,005,000
60 . Bruckhorst, Frank			\$1,000,000
61 . Altris Group Inc (Philip Morris Companies)			\$1,000,000
62 . Ortenberg, Arthur and Elizabeth Claborne			\$1,000,000
63 . BUELL, SUSIE TOMPKINS			\$1,000,000
64 . Rosenthal, Richard H			\$995,000
65 . TRT HOLDINGS INC			\$955,000
66 . Adams, Stephen			
67 . LEWIS, DAN			
68 . Carsey, Marcia L			
69 . CLARK, JAMES H			
70 . Aronson, Theodore			
71 . Sheet Metal Workers Int'l Assn			
72 . Templeton, John M Dr. and Dr. Josephine M			
73 . BRAINERD, PAUL			
2008 Cycle			
2004 Cycle			
Lobby Directory			
Lobbyists, Firms & Organizations			
Lobby Databases			
NEW			
Year End 2004 and Prior Filings			
Lobby \$\$\$			

Political Money Line

Summary (88-04)		
Lobby	74 . United Food & Commercial Workers Intl Union	\$852,500
→ Registrations	75 . BACON, LOUIS M MR	\$950,000
Updated Regularly	76 . Woodland_Group Indiana LLC	\$940,000
Text Search	77 . CITIGROUP	\$929,500
PAC \$ to	78 . BELLSOUTH CORP	\$920,272
→ Congressional	79 . Ward, Tom	\$875,000
Commit	80 . Crow, Harlan	\$875,000
108th Congress	81 . Lee, Thomas H & Barbara Fish	\$860,000
107th Congress	82 . DYSON, ROBERT R AND ANNE E	\$850,000
106th Congress	83 . LEWIS, JONATHAN D	\$845,800
84 . McKay, Robert	\$820,000	
→ Leadership PACs	85 . Pharmaceutical Research & Mfg of America-PHARMA	\$817,000
Top \$ Rankings	86 . US Public Affairs, Inc. (US Tobacco)	\$778,958
Top Donors	87 . AT & T	\$765,075
To These PACs	88 . Int'l Birth of Painters & Allied Trades Union	\$760,000
Soft Money	89 . LEEDS, GERARD G & LILLO J	\$755,000
→ & Levin Funds	90 . STEPHENS, JACKSON T	\$750,000
2005-2006	91 . Morongo Band of Cahuilla Mission Indians	\$745,000
2003-2004	92 . Doctors for Justice	\$745,000
2001-2002	93 . Sussman, S Donald	\$740,000
1999-2000	94 . GlaxoSmithKline Plc/United Kingdom	\$732,500
1997-98	95 . MICROSOFT CORP	\$700,000
1985-96	96 . Lerach Coustalin Stora & Robbins	\$692,500
1983-84	97 . UBS AG (Switzerland)	\$684,162
→ User's Login	98 . AFFILIATED Computer Services (ACS)	\$662,500
Change my	99 . Massachusetts Mutual Life Insurance	\$655,000
Password	100 . O'CONNOR, MACONDA B	\$650,000
Logout	101 . Reynolds American Inc	\$642,000
→ Online Services	102 . CONTRAN CORP	\$620,000
PACTracker	103 . GILDER, RICHARD	\$620,000
SEER 2004	104 . Blue Cross & Blue Shield Assn	\$614,500
SEER 2002	105 . SRC COMMUNICATIONS INC	\$595,000
Thomas Tracker	106 . Childs, John W & Marlene	\$590,000
Learn about	107 . Bentler, William	\$577,500
FECInfoPro	108 . ARKLEY, ROBIN P II & CHERIE	\$569,000
PACTracker	109 . American Tort Reform Assn	\$565,000
	110 . Snyder, Harold and Beatrice (deceased)	\$550,000
	111 . STEPHENSON, JAMES E AND MRS DONNAY	\$550,000
	112 . INT'L GAME TECHNOLOGY	\$545,000
	113 . National Rifle Assn	\$542,772
	114 . FOOS, SHARI & RICHARD	\$537,500

Political Money Line

eAlert	115 - Int'l Birthd of Electrical Workers	\$530,000
SEER	116 - Seardle, Dan	\$525,000
ThomasTracker	117 - RECAMATI, MICHAEL ALBERT	\$525,000
Electronic Filing	118 - Mutual Benefits Corporation	\$524,500
Data Download	119 - FINTWISTLE & CAPPUCCI LLP	\$522,500
Disclosure Data	120 - Verizon Communications	\$510,000
Download	121 - Human Rights Campaign	\$510,000
PECINO Enterprise	122 - Lindner, Robert D	\$506,000
TRMC Services	123 - Stephens, Warren A	\$505,000
	124 - ANHEUSER-BUSCH COMPANIES	\$500,000
	125 - DEVON ENERGY CORP	\$500,000
	126 - LYON, WILLIAM J MR AND MRS	\$500,000
	127 - HUGHES, B WAYNE	\$500,000
	128 - MRRM P.A.	\$500,000
Reporters' Tips	129 - Soros-Colombel, Andrea	\$500,000
Next Reports Due	130 - Nicholas, Peter M	\$500,000
CRS Report	131 - Byrne, Jack	\$500,000
Political Ad \$	132 - American Postal Workers Union	\$500,000
State Campaign	133 - TROUT, KENNY A AND LISA C	\$490,000
Directs	134 - KIESCHNICK, MICHAEL HALL	\$480,000
Sort Money Lite	135 - BASS, ANNE T	\$479,000
	136 - Schwartz, Bernard L and Irene	\$465,000
	137 - INTUIT CORP	\$461,200
	138 - Int'l Assn of Machinists & Aerospace Wrkrs	\$459,500
	139 - Harrah's Entertainment Inc	\$459,500
	140 - Bass, Robert M	\$450,000
	141 - Wyeth	\$440,000
	142 - Corzine, Jon S and Joanne	\$440,000
	143 - Matthews, George Jr	\$438,000
	144 - Archer-Daniels-Midland Co	\$435,000
	145 - SOROS, JONATHAN T	\$428,700
	146 - Fio-Sun Inc	\$424,500
	147 - POLIS, JARED SCHUTZ	\$420,000
	148 - Novartis AG/SWITZERLAND	\$415,000
	149 - ANSIN, RONALD M	\$414,000
	150 - REPUBLICAN PARTY OF IOWA	\$408,355
	151 - WASTE MANAGEMENT INC	\$400,000
	152 - Fat Wreck Chords	\$400,000
	153 - ORR, FRANKLIN & SUSAN P	\$400,000
	154 - Burnett, Nancy	\$400,000
	155 - Jones, Robert	\$400,000

Political Money Line

156 . American Gas Assn	\$399,604
157 . AMGEN INC	\$399,000
158 . Prison Realty Corp	\$398,935
159 . Rockefeller, Larry	\$385,000
160 . UNITEMIZED	\$383,638
161 . Hazel, Bruce	\$377,262
162 . Bonderman, David	\$370,000
163 . BRISTOL-MYERS SQUIBB CO	\$366,500
164 . Int'lle Nederlanden Groepe NV/NETHERLANDS	\$360,000
165 . BRIDGES, SAMUEL RUITT	\$360,000
166 . Sanofi-Aventis SA/FRANCE	\$357,500
167 . Burdon Senate Fund	\$355,000
168 . Maltz, David	\$353,400
169 . AMERICAN INT'L GROUP	\$350,000
170 . MERRILL LYNCH PIERCE FENNER & SMITH	\$350,000
171 . Waters & Kraus	\$350,000
172 . COCA-COLA CO	\$349,000
173 . ELI LILLY & CO	\$342,628
174 . United Automobile Aerospace & Agricultural Implement Workers of Amer	\$330,000
175 . Day, Robert A	\$325,000
176 . SAUNDERS, THOMAS	\$323,000
177 . PAULSON, HENRY W JR & WENDY	\$322,500
178 . UNITE HERE (Formerly Union of Needletrades,Industrial & Textile Employees, and Hotel and Restaurant Employees)	\$322,000
179 . Renault SA/FRANCE	\$317,000
180 . UNITED HEALTH CARE CORP	\$315,000
181 . Mississippi Band of Choctaw Indians	\$315,000
182 . Manheimer, Virginia	\$314,251
183 .	\$312,096
184 . JEFFERIES & CO	\$310,000
185 . Coffin, Gladys C	\$305,000
186 . Int'l Paper Co	\$305,000
187 . AELAC, INC (Am Family Life Assurance)	\$305,000
188 . Stryker, Patricia	\$301,000
189 . American Insurance Assn	\$300,000
190 . ELLISON, LAWRENCE J	\$300,000
191 . Schiffrin, Richard S.	\$300,000
192 . Entenza, Matthew	\$300,000
193 . Buying Time, LLC	\$295,701
194 . DANIELS, GEORGE G MR & MRS	\$291,003
195 . GRUENER, GARRETT MR	\$282,665

Political Money Line

196 . JP Morgan Chase & Co	\$280,000
197 . G TECH CORP	\$275,000
198 . Aetha, Inc	\$275,000
199 . BASTIAN, BRUCE W JR	\$275,000
200 . Resnick, Stewart A	\$275,000
201 . HOGAN, WAYNE & PATRICIA	\$274,000
202 . Americas PAC	\$270,000
203 . FRIESS, FOSTER S & LYNETTE	\$267,000
204 . MCI INC (formerly MCI-Worldcom)	\$265,000
205 . Bergman, Matthew P	\$265,000
206 . PACIFICARE HEALTH SYSTEMS INC	\$265,000
207 . Rice, Joseph F	\$263,000
208 . Lieberman, Leonard	\$262,500
209 . Cumming, Ian M and Annette P	\$260,500
210 . PERRY, LISA R AND RICHARD C	\$260,000
211 . BARON & BUDD P C	\$260,000
212 . GILMORE, ELIZABETH B	\$260,000
213 . JRL Enterprises	\$260,000
214 . Doerr, L John and Ann Howland III	\$260,000
215 . Alliance for Protecting Seniors	\$259,000
216 . AMERICAN SPECIALTY HEALTH PLANS	\$259,000
217 . Prince, Richard	\$255,000
218 . Choctaw Nation of Oklahoma	\$255,000
219 . Int'l Assn of Fire Fighters	\$255,000
220 . ORACLE CORP	\$254,999
221 . Wallace, Henry Scott	\$254,000
222 . CHICKASAW NATION	\$252,600
223 . SPRINT NEXTEL	\$250,000
224 . KENDRICK, EARL G	\$250,000
225 . NEXTEL FINANCE CO	\$250,000
226 . Raichle, Marcus Jr	\$250,000
227 . Schmidt, Wendy B	\$250,000
228 . WEITZ & LUXENBERG PC	\$250,000
229 . CALIFORNIA MANAGEMENT ASSOCIATES LLC	\$250,000
230 . Ware, Marian S	\$250,000
231 . KAZAN MCCLAIN EDISES SIMON & ABRAM	\$250,000
232 . Powers, Williams	\$250,000
233 . AXA-IAP GROUP/FRANCE	\$250,000
234 . RRD Holding Corp	\$248,500
235 . General Electric	\$248,500
236 . DAIMLER CHRYSLER/GERMANY	\$248,375

The CHAIRMAN. Gentledady from Michigan.

Mrs. MILLER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have just a brief statement here. I certainly want to thank you for having this markup today, and I will be supporting the Chairman's mark. I think it is certainly a step in the right direction toward bringing more accountability and disclosure into our election process.

The 2004 election was the first one that we had conducted under the provisions of BCRA, and we all learned a lot of important lessons. We found that it is nearly impossible, despite the most onerous of regulatory burdens, to take big money out of the political process. When the parties were taken out of the soft money business by BCRA, the soft money did not go away, as some of the reformers had hoped. It just found a new home.

The big contributions that used to go to the national political parties instead went to these very loosely affiliated groups, as we all call them, the 527 organizations. These organizations, as has been articulated here already, numerically have spent over \$500 million with less disclosure than before and with less accountability to the American people. These groups did not have to file with the Federal Election Commission, and are not directly associated with political parties. Because of this, there was significant voter confusion, I think, as to who was actually trying to influence the voters of America.

While the BCRA cosponsors had commendable intentions, their legislation resulted in nearly unintelligible regulations which caused confusion even amongst veteran campaign finance attorneys.

As mentioned here, I have also had a personal experience where I had three different campaign finance attorneys give me three different opinions about an endorsement I wished to give to a county prosecutor candidate.

The reality of the situation created by BCRA also forced at least one of the political parties to outsource its entire voter mobilization and turn over efforts to 527 organizations. In fact, this has prompted one of these 527 groups to contend—in a fund-raising appeal that they sent, “It is our party, we bought it, we own it and we are taking it back.” I don't think that those types of words make it seem like the big money has been taken out of politics.

From the hearings that this committee has held and the evidence from the last election, it has been plain for all of us to see that BCRA was a very poor piece of legislation that resulted in tremendous unforeseen consequences; and that is certainly one of the reasons I am going to be supporting the chairman's mark. This legislation, I think, will bring a deregulatory approach to the campaign finance arena for the first time in actually 30 years.

And as I have stated in other hearings that we have had on this topic, no matter how many laws Congress passes or how many regulations the FEC hands down to limit the influence of money and politics, money will always find its way back into the process. In fact, I have often said that I think money is sort of like the tide. It seeks its own level in politics. Or perhaps it is sort of like holding a handful of jelly. Just about the time you think you have it, it is leaking out of this finger, and this finger or the next finger.

I think if money is going to come into the process, it should certainly do so under the greatest amount of sunshine and greatest amount of accountability.

Again, I think this bill is a very good first step in that direction. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, thank you.

Gentlelady from California.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Yes, I would really like to make some comments on some of the statements that have been made.

Certainly, with the Supreme Court upholding BCRA, Mr. Reynolds, that seems to suggest to me that there were no limits on first amendment rights if they upheld this, which they did.

And secondarily, when Mr. Mica suggests that 527s control the activities of the day, what do you think huge amounts of hard dollars will do in controlling a message?

And that is exactly what will happen with this bill, the Pence-Wynn bill, because it will have just a huge amount of funds coming in, hard dollars from wealthy donors. And you cannot say, as in the past, that it does not control the message.

Lastly, this bill does take away the reforms that were created in 1974; thus was the reason why we have the Federal Election Campaign Act, so that it will limit the amount of dollars that go into campaigns. The American people are sick and tired of the money that is put into campaigns for—to move and to try to influence elections, and this is exactly what will happen.

This bill is not, will not level the playing field. In fact, it will make it lopsided, if you will. So this bill that we have before us does not do anything to help us as we try to grapple with taking a lot of money out of the hands of policyholders, and it certainly does muffle the voices of those who have had no voice.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank the gentlelady. The Chair lays before the committee the bill, H.R. 1316, open to amendment, and the Chair offers an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Is there any discussion on the amendments that we have discussed previously? The Clerk will report the amendment.

The CLERK. Chairman's mark amendment to H.R. 1316 offered by Mr. Ney, "Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following—

[The information follows:]

CHAIRMAN'S MARK
(AMENDMENT TO H.R. 1316)
OFFERED BY MR. NEY

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

1 SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

2 This Act may be cited as the "527 Fairness Act of
3 2005".

4 SEC. 2. REPEAL OF AGGREGATE LIMIT ON CONTRIBUTIONS
5 BY INDIVIDUALS.

6 (a) REPEAL OF LIMIT.—Section 315(a) of the Fed-
7 eral Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 441a(a))
8 is amended by striking paragraph (3).

9 (b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

10 (1) INDEXING.—Section 315(e) of such Act (2
11 U.S.C. 441a(e)) is amended by striking "(a)(3),"
12 each place it appears in paragraphs (1)(B)(i),
13 (1)(C), and (2)(B)(ii).

14 (2) INCREASE IN LIMITS FOR SENATE CAN-
15 DIDATES FACING WEALTHY OPPONENTS.—Section
16 315(i)(1)(C) of such Act (2 U.S.C. 441a(i)(1)(C)) is
17 amended—



1 (A) by amending clause (i) to read as fol-
2 lows:

3 “(i) 2 times the threshold amount, but
4 not over 4 times that amount, the in-
5 creased limit shall be 3 times the applica-
6 ble limit;”;

7 (B) by amending clause (ii) to read as fol-
8 lows:

9 “(ii) 4 times the threshold amount,
10 but not over 10 times that amount, the in-
11 creased limit shall be 6 times the applica-
12 ble limit; and”;

13 (C) in clause (iii)—

14 (i) by adding “and” at the end of sub-
15 clause (I),

16 (ii) by striking subclause (II), and

17 (iii) by redesignating subclause (III)
18 as subclause (II).

19 (3) INCREASE IN LIMITS FOR HOUSE CAN-
20 DIDATES FACING WEALTHY OPPONENTS.—Section
21 315A(a)(1) of such Act (2 U.S.C. 441a—1(a)(1)) is
22 amended—

23 (A) by adding “and” at the end of sub-
24 paragraph (A);

25 (B) by striking subparagraph (B); and



1 (C) by redesignating subparagraph (C) as
2 subparagraph (B).

3 **SEC. 3. REPEAL OF LIMIT ON AMOUNT OF PARTY EXPENDI**
4 **TURES ON BEHALF OF CANDIDATES IN GEN**
5 **ERAL ELECTIONS.**

6 (a) REPEAL OF LIMIT.—Section 315(d) of the Fed
7 eral Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 441a(d))
8 is amended—

9 (1) in paragraph (1)—

10 (A) by striking “(1) Notwithstanding” and
11 inserting “Notwithstanding”,

12 (B) by striking “expenditures or limita
13 tions on” and inserting “amounts of expendi
14 tures or contributions”, and

15 (C) by striking “Federal office, subject to
16 the limitations contained in paragraphs (2), (3)
17 and (4) of this subsection” and inserting “Fed
18 eral office in any amount”; and

19 (2) by striking paragraphs (2), (3), and (4).

20 (b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

21 (1) INDEXING.—Section 315(e) of such Act (2
22 U.S.C. 441a(e)) is amended—

23 (A) in paragraph (1)(B)(i), by striking
24 “(d),”; and



1 (B) in paragraph (2)(B)(i), by striking
2 “subsections (b) and (d)” and inserting “sub-
3 section (b)”.

4 (2) INCREASE IN LIMITS FOR SENATE CAN-
5 DIDATES FACING WEALTHY OPPONENTS.—Section
6 315(i) of such Act (2 U.S.C. 441a(i)(1)) is
7 amended—

8 (A) in paragraph (1)(C), as amended by
9 section 2(b)(2)(C), by amending clause (iii) to
10 read as follows:

11 “(iii) 10 times the threshold amount,
12 the increased limit shall be 6 times the ap-
13 plicable limit.”;

14 (B) in paragraph (2)(A) in the matter pre-
15 ceding clause (i), by striking “, and a party
16 committee shall not make any expenditure,”;

17 (C) in paragraph (2)(A)(ii), by striking
18 “and party expenditures previously made”; and

19 (D) in paragraph (2)(B), by striking “and
20 a party shall not make any expenditure”.

21 (3) INCREASE IN LIMITS FOR HOUSE CAN-
22 DIDATES FACING WEALTHY OPPONENTS.—Section
23 315A(a) of such Act (2 U.S.C. 441a—1(a)) is
24 amended—



5

1 (A) in paragraph (1), as amended by sec-
 2 tion 2(b)(3), by striking “exceeds \$350,000—”
 3 and all that follows and inserting the following:
 4 “exceeds \$350,000, the limit under subsection
 5 (a)(1)(A) with respect to the candidate shall be
 6 tripled.”;

7 (B) in paragraph (3)(A) in the matter pre-
 8 ceding clause (i), “, and a party committee
 9 shall not make any expenditure,”;

10 (C) in paragraph (3)(A)(ii), by striking
 11 “and party expenditures previously made”; and

12 (D) in paragraph (3)(B), by striking “and
 13 a party shall not make any expenditure”.

14 **SEC. 4. INCREASE IN CONTRIBUTION LIMITS FOR POLIT-**
 15 **ICAL COMMITTEES.**

16 (a) CONTRIBUTIONS TO POLITICAL COMMITTEES.—
 17 Section 315(a)(1)(C) of the Federal Election Campaign
 18 Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 441a(e)(1)(C)) is amended by strik-
 19 ing “\$5,000” and inserting “\$7,500”.

20 (b) CONTRIBUTIONS MADE BY MULTICANDIDATE
 21 COMMITTEES.—Section 315(a)(2) of such Act (2 U.S.C.
 22 441a(a)(2)) is amended—

23 (1) in subparagraph (A), by striking “\$5,000”
 24 and inserting “\$7,500”;



1 (2) in subparagraph (B), by striking “\$15,000’
 2 and inserting “\$25,000”; and
 3 (3) in subparagraph (C), by striking “\$5,000’
 4 and inserting “\$7,500”.

5 **SEC. 5. INDEXING OF ALL CONTRIBUTION LIMITS.**

6 (a) IN GENERAL.—Section 315(e)(1)(B) of the Fed
 7 eral Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C
 8 441a(e)(1)(B)) is amended to read as follows:

9 “(B) Except as provided in subparagraph (C)—

10 “(i) in any calendar year after 2002—

11 “(I) a limitation established by subsection
 12 (a)(1)(A), (a)(1)(B), (b), or (h) shall be in
 13 creased by the percent difference under sub
 14 paragraph (A),

15 “(II) each amount so increased shall re
 16 main in effect for the calendar year, and

17 “(III) if any amount after the adjustmen
 18 made under subclause (I) is not a multiple o
 19 \$100, such amount shall be rounded to the
 20 nearest multiple of \$100; and

21 “(ii) in any calendar year after 2006—

22 “(I) a limitation established by subsection
 23 (a)(1)(C), (a)(1)(D), or (a)(2) shall be in
 24 creased by the percent difference under sub
 25 paragraph (A),



1 “(II) each amount so increased shall re-
2 main in effect for the calendar year, and

3 “(III) if any amount after the adjustment
4 made under subclause (I) is not a multiple of
5 \$100, such amount shall be rounded to the
6 nearest multiple of \$100.”.

7 (b) PERIOD OF INCREASE.—Section 315(e)(1)(C) of
8 such Act (2 U.S.C. 441a(e)(1)(C)), as amended by section
9 2(b)(1), is amended by striking “subsections (a)(1)(A),
10 (a)(1)(B), and (h)” and inserting “subsections (a) and
11 (h)”.

12 (c) DETERMINATION OF BASE YEAR.—Section
13 315(e)(2)(B) of such Act (2 U.S.C. 441a(e)(2)(B)) is
14 amended—

15 (1) by striking “and” at the end of clause (i);

16 (2) by striking the period at the end of clause
17 (ii) and inserting “; and”; and

18 (3) by adding at the end the following new
19 clause:

20 “(iii) for purposes of subsections (a)(1)(C),
21 (a)(1)(D), and (a)(2), calendar year 2005.”.



1 **SEC. 6. PERMITTING TRANSFERS BETWEEN LEADERSHIP**
 2 **COMMITTEES AND NATIONAL PARTY COM-**
 3 **MITTEES.**

4 Section 315(a)(4) of the Federal Election Campaign
 5 Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 441a(a)(4)) is amended—

6 (1) by striking “(4)” and inserting “(4)(A)”;
 7 and

8 (2) by adding at the end the following new sub-
 9 paragraph:

10 “(B) The limitations on contributions contained in
 11 paragraphs (1) and (2) do not apply to transfers between
 12 a leadership committee of an individual holding Federal
 13 office and political committees established and maintained
 14 by a national political party. For purposes of the previous
 15 sentence, the term ‘leadership committee’ means, with re-
 16 spect to an individual holding Federal office, an unauthor-
 17 ized political committee which is associated with such indi-
 18 vidual but which is not affiliated with any authorized com-
 19 mittee of such individual.”.

20 **SEC. 7. INCREASE IN THRESHOLD OF CONTRIBUTIONS AND**
 21 **EXPENDITURES REQUIRED FOR DETER-**
 22 **MINING TREATMENT AS POLITICAL COM-**
 23 **MITTEE.**

24 (a) IN GENERAL.—Section 301(4)(A) of the Federal
 25 Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 431(4)(A) is



1 amended by striking “\$1,000” each place it appears and
 2 inserting “\$10,000”.

3 (b) LOCAL POLITICAL PARTY COMMITTEES.—

4 (1) CONTRIBUTIONS RECEIVED.—Section
 5 301(4)(C) of such Act (2 U.S.C. 431(4)(C)) is
 6 amended by striking “\$5,000” each place it appears
 7 and inserting “\$10,000”.

8 (2) CONTRIBUTIONS OR EXPENDITURES
 9 MADE.—Section 301(4)(C) of such Act (2 U.S.C.
 10 431(4)(C) is amended by striking “\$1,000” and in-
 11 sserting “\$10,000”.

12 **SEC. 8. PROHIBITING CONTRIBUTIONS AND DONATIONS TO**
 13 **SECTION 527 ORGANIZATIONS BY FOREIGN**
 14 **NATIONALS.**

15 (a) IN GENERAL.—Section 319(a)(1) of the Federal
 16 Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 441e(a)(1)) is
 17 amended—

18 (1) by striking “or” at the end of subparagraph
 19 (B);

20 (2) by redesignating subparagraph (C) as sub-
 21 paragraph (D); and

22 (3) by inserting after subparagraph (B) the fol-
 23 lowing new subparagraph:



1 “(C) a contribution or donation to an orga-
 2 nization described in section 527 of the Internal
 3 Revenue Code of 1986; or”.

4 (b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT REGARDING SOLICI-
 5 TATION OF FUNDS.—Section 319(a)(2) of such Act (2
 6 U.S.C. 441e(a)(2)) is amended by striking “(A) or (B)”
 7 and inserting “(A), (B), or (C)”.

8 **SEC. 9. REQUIRING SECTION 527 ORGANIZATIONS TO SUB-**
 9 **MIT REPORTS UNDER FEDERAL ELECTION**
 10 **CAMPAIGN ACT OF 1971.**

11 Section 304(a) of the Federal Election Campaign Act
 12 of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 434(a)) is amended by adding at the
 13 end the following new paragraph:

14 “(13)(A) Except as provided in subparagraph (B),
 15 each organization described in section 527 of the Internal
 16 Revenue Code of 1986 shall submit a report under this
 17 section in the same manner, under the same terms and
 18 conditions, and at the same times applicable to a political
 19 committee which is not an authorized committee of a can-
 20 didate or a national committee of a political party.

21 “(B) Subparagraph (A) does not apply to an organi-
 22 zation described in section 527(j)(5)(B) of the Internal
 23 Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to a State or local com-
 24 mittee of a political party or political committee of a State
 25 or local candidate).”.



1 **SEC. 10. PERMITTING EXPENDITURES FOR ELECTION-**
2 **EERING COMMUNICATIONS BY CERTAIN OR-**
3 **GANIZATIONS.**

4 (a) PERMITTING ORGANIZATIONS TO MAKE EXPEND-
5 ITURES FOR CERTAIN TARGETED ELECTIONEERING COM-
6 MUNICATIONS.—Section 316(e) of the Federal Election
7 Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 441b(e)) is amended by
8 striking paragraph (6).

9 (b) EXPANDING TYPES OF ORGANIZATIONS ELIGI-
10 BLE TO MAKE EXPENDITURES.—

11 (1) IN GENERAL.—Section 316(e) of such Act
12 (2 U.S.C. 441b(e)) is amended by striking “section
13 501(c)(4) organization” each place it appears in
14 paragraphs (2), (3)(A), and (4)(B) and inserting
15 “section 501(c)(4), (5), or (6) organization”.

16 (2) DEFINITION.—Section 316(c)(4)(A)(i) of
17 such Act (2 U.S.C. 441b(c)(4)(A)(i)) is amended by
18 striking “section 501(c)(4) of the Internal Revenue
19 Code of 1986” and inserting “paragraph (4), (5), or
20 (6) of section 501(c) of the Internal Revenue Code
21 of 1986”.

22 (c) CLARIFICATION OF EFFECT ON TAX TREATMENT
23 OF EXPENDITURES.—Section 316(c)(5) of such Act (2
24 U.S.C. 441b(c)(5)) is amended by striking the period at
25 the end and inserting the following: “, or to affect the
26 treatment under such Code of any expenditures described



12

1 in section 527(e) of such Code which are made by a sec-
 2 tion 501(c)(4), (5), or (6) organization.”.

3 **SEC. 11. EXPANDING ABILITY OF CORPORATIONS AND**
 4 **LABOR ORGANIZATIONS TO COMMUNICATE**
 5 **WITH MEMBERS.**

6 (a) **TYPES OF COMMUNICATIONS PERMITTED.**—Sec-
 7 tion 316(b)(4)(B) of the Federal Election Campaign Act
 8 of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 441b(b)(4)(B)) is amended by striking
 9 “only by mail addressed” and inserting “only by commu-
 10 nications addressed or otherwise delivered”.

11 (b) **SOLICITATIONS BY TRADE ASSOCIATIONS.**—Sec-
 12 tion 316(b)(4)(D) of such Act (2 U.S.C. 441b(b)(4)(D))
 13 is amended by striking “to the extent that” and all that
 14 follows and inserting a period.

15 **SEC. 12. PERMITTING STATE AND LOCAL POLITICAL PAR-**
 16 **TIES TO USE NONFEDERAL FUNDS FOR**
 17 **VOTER REGISTRATION AND SAMPLE BAL-**
 18 **LOTS.**

19 (a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 301(20) of the Federal
 20 Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 431(20)) is
 21 amended—

22 (1) in subparagraph (A), by striking clause (i)
 23 and redesignating clauses (ii) through (iv) as clauses
 24 (i) through (iii); and

25 (2) in subparagraph (B)—



1 (A) in clause (i), by striking “subpara-
2 graph (A)(i) or (ii)” and inserting “subpara-
3 graph (A)(i)”;

4 (B) by striking “and” at the end of clause
5 (iii);

6 (C) by striking the period at the end of
7 clause (iv); and

8 (D) by adding at the end the following new
9 clauses:

- 10 (v) voter registration activities; and
- 11 (vi) the costs incurred with the prep-
12 aration of a sample ballot for an election
13 in which a candidate for Federal office and
14 a candidate for State or local office ap-
15 pears on the ballot.”.

16 (b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—(1) Section
17 304(f)(3)(B)(iv) of such Act (2 U.S.C. 434(f)(3)(B)(iv))
18 is amended by striking “section 301(20)(A)(iii)” and in-
19 serting “section 301(20)(A)(ii)”.

20 (2) Section 323 of such Act (2 U.S.C. 441i) is
21 amended—

22 (A) in subsection (b)(2)(A), by striking “clause
23 (i) or (ii)” and inserting “clause (i)”;



1 (B) in subsection (e)(4), by striking “clauses (i)
2 and (ii)” each place it appears in subparagraphs (A)
3 and (B) and inserting “clause (i)”; and

4 (C) in subsection (f), by striking “section
5 301(20)(A)(iii)” and inserting “section
6 301(20)(A)(ii)”.

7 **SEC. 13. CLARIFICATION OF AUTHORIZATION OF FEDERAL**
8 **CANDIDATES AND OFFICEHOLDERS TO AT-**
9 **TEND FUNDRAISING EVENTS FOR STATE OR**
10 **LOCAL POLITICAL PARTIES.**

11 Section 323(e)(3) of the Federal Election Campaign
12 Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 441i(e)(3)) is amended by striking
13 “speak,” and inserting “speak without restriction or regu-
14 lation,”.

15 **SEC. 14. MODIFICATION OF DEFINITION OF PUBLIC COM-**
16 **MUNICATION.**

17 (a) IN GENERAL.—Section 301(22) of the Federal
18 Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 431(22)) is
19 amended by adding at the end the following new sentence:
20 “Such term shall not include communications over the
21 Internet.”.

22 (b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by
23 subsection (a) shall take effect on the date of the enact-
24 ment of this Act.



1 **SEC. 15. TREATMENT OF CANDIDATE COMMUNICATIONS**
 2 **CONTAINING ENDORSEMENT BY FEDERAL**
 3 **CANDIDATE OR OFFICEHOLDER.**

4 (a) IN GENERAL.—Section 315(a) of the Federal
 5 Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 441a(a)) is
 6 amended by adding at the end the following new para-
 7 graph:

8 “(9)(A) For purposes of paragraph (7)(C), a dis-
 9 bursement for an electioneering communication which re-
 10 fers to a candidate for Federal office shall not be treated
 11 as a disbursement which is coordinated with such can-
 12 didate solely on the ground that the communication con-
 13 tains a State or local endorsement or (in the case of a
 14 communication containing a State or local endorsement)
 15 that the candidate reviewed, approved, or otherwise par-
 16 ticipated in the preparation and dissemination of the com-
 17 munication.

18 “(B) In subparagraph (A), the term ‘State or local
 19 endorsement’ means, with respect to a candidate for Fed-
 20 eral office—

21 “(i) an endorsement by such candidate of a
 22 candidate for State or local office or of another can-
 23 didate for Federal office; or

24 “(ii) a statement of the position of such can-
 25 didate on a State or local ballot initiative or ref-
 26 erendum.”.



1 (b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section
2 315(a)(7)(C)(ii) of such Act (2 U.S.C. 441a(a)(7)(C)) is
3 amended by striking “such disbursement” and inserting
4 “subject to paragraph (9), such disbursement”.

5 (c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by
6 this section shall apply with respect to elections occurring
7 on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

8 **SEC. 16. SEVERABILITY.**

9 If any provision of this Act or any amendment made
10 by this Act, or the application of a provision or amend-
11 ment to any person or circumstance, is held to be uncon-
12 stitutional, the remainder of this Act and the amendments
13 made by this Act, and the application of the provisions
14 and amendments to any person or circumstance, shall not
15 be affected by the holding.

16 **SEC. 17. EFFECTIVE DATE.**

17 Except as otherwise provided, the amendments made
18 by this Act shall take effect January 1, 2006.



The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment is read. Is there any discussion on the amendment?

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlelady from California.

Ms. LOFGREN. First, I would like to ask unanimous consent to put in the record an article from the National Journal: The Weekly on Politics and Government from May 7 entitled "Here's a New Campaign Finance Report Reform Plan: Just Stop."

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection.

Ms. LOFGREN. Secondly, I made my primary comment at the outset, but I just think that it is worth reiterating that the direction that the chairman and apparently the majority are going in is wrong in both directions.

The whole premise of campaign finance reform, when it comes to candidates, is that if you go out and solicit large amounts of money, there is the possibility of corruption, that the people who give you money will get bills and favors in return. And this is why the court has upheld the regulation of the solicitation of funds by candidates to avoid the corruption of the political system.

And it is not a hypothetical. We have seen corruption in our political system. There is a reason to prevent that. So the bill actually loosens up the control of corruption that was the cause of the regulation of the solicitation of funds by candidates and parties on their behalf.

At the same time you, 527s or other groups that are not candidates for office, that have no ability to provide a benefit to donors by way of law or political favor would be regulated under the bill—unconstitutionally, I believe—and I just think that this is wrong. Not just once, this bill is wrong twice, taking us in the wrong direction in both cases. It is a terrible mistake.

And I thank the gentleman for recognizing me.

The CHAIRMAN. I would disagree respectfully with the gentlewoman on the point that this is more hard dollars, exposed hard dollars to the public that would come from Democrats and Republicans. Again, the 527 organizations have a lot of unaccountable money.

But I would agree with one thing while welcoming what the gentlelady is saying when she speaks about the direction of the chairman and the majority party, if by that fact you mean Mr. Wynn has joined the Republican Party.

We would love to have him. He is, I think, a wonderful member of Congress. He happens to be on the bill also.

Ms. LOFGREN. Would the gentleman yield because obviously we have great affection for Mr. Wynn. We just think he erred in this particular case.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, to err is human. And with that, any other—

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Well, Mr. Chairman, I just respectfully disagree with my colleague from California.

It is correct the Supreme Court, in its absurd ruling in 1976 upholding the limits on contributions, used the pretense of preventing corruption, or appearance of corruption, as a justification for abridging the first amendment rights through governmental regulation.

But there was never any evidence in the record of corruption or appearance of corruption. They just assumed that to be true. And this is constantly asserted by proponents of campaign finance regulation, but they never offer any evidence.

But it is just—it is so believable to say “corruption” and “politicians are corrupt.” but there is never any cause and effect that is ever demonstrated. And I just want to get that into the record, because I am not going to sit here and accept as the gospel that, you know, because of a demonstrated record of corruption we got that absurd set of amendments in 1974 that made the situation even worse after Theodore Roosevelt & Company got involved, and now we have made it even worse than that after McCain-Feingold, Shays-Meehan got involved.

The CHAIRMAN. Any other comments?

The question is on the amendment. Those in favor of the amendment will say aye.

Those opposed will say nay.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Chairman, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The CHAIRMAN. The ayes have it and the gentlelady asks for the yeas and nays. The clerk will call the roll.

The CLERK. Mr. Ehlers.

Mr. EHLERS. Aye.

The CLERK. Mr. Mica.

Mr. MICA. Aye.

The CLERK. Mr. Doolittle.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Aye.

The CLERK. Mr. Reynolds.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Aye.

The CLERK. Mrs. Miller.

Mrs. MILLER. Aye.

The CLERK. Ms. Millender-McDonald.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. No.

The CLERK. Mr. Brady.

Mr. BRADY. No.

The CLERK. Ms. Lofgren.

Ms. LOFGREN. No.

The CLERK. Chairman Ney.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Six to three. The amendment is agreed to.

The question is now on the substitute as amended. Those in favor will say aye.

Those opposed will say nay.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Chairman I would ask for a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. And with that the ayes have it.

And the gentlelady asks for a recorded vote. The clerk will call the roll.

The CLERK. Mr. Ehlers.

Mr. EHLERS. Aye.

The CLERK. Mr. Mica.

Mr. MICA. Aye.

The CLERK. Mr. Doolittle.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Aye.

The CLERK. Mr. Reynolds.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Aye.

The CLERK. Mrs. Miller.

Mrs. MILLER. Aye.

The CLERK. Ms. Millender-McDonald.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. No.

The CLERK. Mr. Brady.

Mr. BRADY. No.

The CLERK. Ms. Lofgren.

Ms. LOFGREN. No.

The CLERK. Chairman Ney.

The CHAIRMAN. Aye.

The CHAIRMAN. Six to three. The bill is adopted as amended.

And the Chair recognizes Mr. Ehlers for the purpose of offering a motion.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Chairman, I move that H.R. 1316, as amended, be reported favorably to the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion. Those in favor will say aye.

Those opposed will say nay.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. I ask for a recorded vote on that, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The ayes have it.

And the gentlelady, the minority ranking member, has asked for a vote. The clerk will call the roll.

The CLERK. Mr. Ehlers.

Mr. EHLERS. Aye.

The CLERK. Mr. Mica.

Mr. MICA. Aye.

The CLERK. Mr. Doolittle.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Aye.

The CLERK. Mr. Reynolds.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Aye.

The CLERK. Mrs. Miller.

Mrs. MILLER. Aye.

The CLERK. Ms. Millender-McDonald.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. No.

The CLERK. Mr. Brady.

Mr. BRADY. No.

The CLERK. Ms. Lofgren.

Ms. LOFGREN. No.

The CLERK. Chairman Ney.

The CHAIRMAN. Aye.

The CHAIRMAN. Six to three. The motion is agreed to and H.R. 1316, as amended, is reported favorably to the House.

I would also like to add a note. I have had a personal conversation with Mr. Meehan and also with Mr. Shays. I can only speak for myself, but I would also welcome a vote on their 527 bill at some point in time. I have indicated that to both of the gentlemen.

I ask unanimous consent that members have seven legislative days for statements and materials to be entered into the record. Without objection, the material will be so entered.

I ask—

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Chairman, pursuant to clause (2)(l) of rule 11, I am requesting not less than 2 additional calendar days, as provided by the rules, to submit additional views to accompany the committee's report on this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentlelady's request is honored.

I ask unanimous consent that the staff be authorized to make technical conforming changes on all matters considered by the Committee at today's meeting. Without objection, so ordered.

I want to thank all the members for the debate and thank the members for their attendance. With that, the Committee is adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 4:59 p.m., the Committee was adjourned.]