

pointing out how, if we do not move to do some campaign finance reform, the people who ran against Washington have become the Washington they ran against. And we all know how rapidly that happens to people. Voters have moved from being disillusioned with that to now being flat-out cynical about it, and they have every right to be.

When I first ran for office, my average campaign contribution was \$7.50. Now, as an incumbent who has been around for 23 years, my average campaign contribution, PAC's and individuals, is \$50. There are not many people that could say that, but that is exactly what Jefferson had in mind.

Tonight, as we know, there is a huge Republican dinner, one more time, where people are paying a gazillion dollars for whatever. You know, I hate to tell those people, but in my district you can get a chicken dinner, a really good chicken dinner, for \$5 to \$10. So obviously they are not going there for the chicken. They are going there for some other reason.

This is one of the very few countries in the world that pretends someone would give you \$10,000 because they believe in good government and did not want anything for it. Having finished today the Armed Services Committee bill and looking at all of the stuff that got jammed in that bill that the President did not want, the Joint Chiefs did not want, the Pentagon did not want, but some special interests wanted that had given people a lot of campaign money, and guess what? They got it. They got it. They got their B-2's, they got their whole laundry list of whatever it was they wanted, although generals did not want it and the President did not want it, and what does that say?

□ 1600

I think that it is so important for this bipartisan group who has introduced the bipartisan Clean Congress Act to get this moving. I hope every American holds Members' feet to the fire to discharge this bill and get it on the floor.

What are some of the things in this bill? Doing away with political action committees, so you go back to individual contributions. That is what it is supposed to be about, not big, huge groups.

It also asks that we collect 60 percent of what we get from the State that we run in. If you are getting 100 percent of your money from a State that you are not representing, you have got to wonder who is calling the tune and whose tune the Member is dancing to.

There are other things in here that ban tax-funded taxpayer mailings during election years and many other of these areas that we really need to clean up, too.

This is what is wrong here. This place looks like a coin-operated legislative machine. The average American feels they do not have the coins to put

in, and they do not. So they feel they will never be heard here, and many are not. That is why when you look at your priorities you scratch your head and say, Wait a minute, how did these priorities get here?

Well, they got here because of this ridiculous funding process. I think it is so important we clean this House of that special interest money. It is more important than probably anything else we do, because that is the only way we get to real priorities, the people's priorities, and not the fat cat priorities.

So I encourage every American to take some time and think about this, and say we want our Government back as we start to close this century out and this decade out, and ask every Member to move on this bipartisan bill that will clean this House and correct this great injustice, I think. Finally we will be able to have real priorities and not big money priorities.

TRIBUTE TO DR. AND MRS. BILLY GRAHAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HUTCHINSON). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. BROWNBACK] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. Speaker, yesterday in this House we voted to give and grant to two people, well deserving, the Congressional gold medal, and that was to Dr. Billy and Ruth Graham, and that motion passed overwhelmingly in this House. It is going to the Senate and hopefully will be passed by a similar margin there and signed by the President of the United States.

I just wanted to recognize these two extraordinary Americans and what they have done, for their extraordinary service they have committed to this country and the people of this planet. Dr. Graham has evangelized to more people on this globe, on this effort, than any human in history that he has witnessed to during the time period of his service, and it continues.

Many writers, both political and religious, in this country are saying we as a Nation are entering a period of a fourth awakening, a time period of moral and spiritual renewal in America, where we look at ourselves and say, Are we doing the rights things? Are we doing the things that will last, not just for this lifetime, but for a further period of time on into eternity?

They are saying we are entering into a period of moral and spiritual renewal, a reassessment of our values as a country. That is going to do a great deal to solve our true problems in America.

Mr. Speaker, as I travel my district in eastern Kansas and talk to people back home, I ask them, do they think the biggest problems we face as a Nation, are they moral or are they economic? Are they the problems associated with the economy or problems associated with values? And I will get in almost every crowd 8 or 9 to 1 that will

say the problems are moral rather than they are economic we are facing. They are problems with family and a disintegration of the family. They are problems with drugs. They are problems with crime. They are problems with people not willing to work. They are problems with people willing to do things that if they would think about it or if their own moral compass was a little better set, they would not do at all.

The problems we are facing are moral, and the decline is taking place there. Yet I am optimistic in looking to the future, because I think we are finally starting to address the fundamental problems we have as a society, the value problems we have, and one does not address them in Congress. One addresses them in the individual community, in the individual family, in the individual person and what he does.

That is how we change the culture, the society of this America. That is how we make ourselves better. That is how we solve our problems of family, that is how we solve our problems of crime. That is how we solve our problems dealing with drugs, problems dealing with welfare. We change ourselves and our own values and moral and spiritual outlook.

Mr. Speaker, I think we need to get back to the basics and get back to the basic values, values of family, values of work, and recognition of a higher moral authority. When we as a society do that, we will solve many, many of our problems. That is what Dr. Graham and his wife Ruth have been about for a lifetime, is dealing with that, looking at the internal person and what they are doing and their personal relationship with a higher moral authority.

So that is why I voted in favor of that. I was very strongly in support of it. And I hope that when Dr. and Mrs. Graham get this, if it passes the Senate and is signed into law by the President, I hope that he and Mrs. Graham will be invited to this Chamber to address a joint session of Congress and address the Nation, calling for moral and spiritual renewal in America.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN OUTSIDE THE CONSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, with the talk now about whether we shall have clean or, shall we say, dirty CR's or debt limit bills, I would like to offer some views that go to the intent of the Framers. We need to think through this process, for we are engaged in something that has never happened in 200 years, or more than 200 years of the Constitution, and it looks like we are headed toward some recidivism in trying to attach things to the debt limit

or to the CR, when it would appear that the tolerance of the American people for this gridlock is way down.

What is wrong with the strategy of dirty CR's and dirty debt-limit bills? Besides the fact that you do not want to stop the Government or put the full faith and credit of the United States in any doubt, one might begin with the fact that it is not working or it has long since stopped working. You got the President to the table with a 7-year balanced budget. If victory had been declared then we might be somewhere.

But more seriously, this strategy is outside of the constitutional framework, and that is why it is stopping up this place. I teach a course at Georgetown, where I was a law professor, called Lawmaking and Statutory Interpretation. This gridlock has made me think about the course and about what we are doing in a deeper fashion.

What we are doing is outside of the constitutional framework. It is not that it is unconstitutional; it is indeed an abuse of the Constitution, because it thwarts the intent of the Framers.

Now, conservatives pride themselves on being what we in academic law call originalists. They insist upon going back to the Framers for everything, and it gets very awkward because very often the Framers did not even think about certain things. But here I think it is legitimate task, what did Thomas Jefferson and what did James Madison intend, what did they have in mind?

We have heard the argument on the floor here that the Government is shut down or the debt limit will not rise because the President did something, the President vetoed it.

My friends, the veto was not meant by the Framers to produce any counter weapon here in this House. Once there is a veto, three things are possible: A negotiated solution, let the matter stand, or overrule the veto with a supermajority.

The Framers did not build a system that did not have cloture. What we are doing in this body now, 200 years after the Constitution was passed, is creating a system without cloture, where there is point-counterpoint, shutdown of the Government following a veto. The Framers were more brilliant than that. They knew that if you could not bring cloture at some point, the Government could not operate.

We have, in fact, done that. What we have done is to give new meaning to the word "gridlock." First, we have created the word the Framers never intended. The Framers never intended that the Government would be paralyzed.

Now, the gridlock that was the slogan of the last Congress have come back in ways that no one ever dreamed of, and if you think, particularly you on the other side of the aisle, that people sent you here to make gridlock worse, I think you got a big surprise coming for you when you go home to your primaries and when you go home in November.

We must not introduce gridlock into a brilliant system that has its own built-in cloture. Do not blame the President for using the veto. The Framers intended that. Show me where the Framers intended to allow you to shut down the Government? Show me where the Framers intended for you to allow a game of chicken to be played with the debt limit of the United States? The were much too brilliant, much too thoughtful to leave the system in that state.

We must not try to undo their brilliant work. What we must do is what the originalists, the conservatives, have always insisted upon doing. We have lost our compass. We have lost our way.

Let us open the Constitution, try to find the original meaning in the structure of checks and balances, and understand that the veto was meant to produce civilized responses, and not to take the Government out. It is too late in the game, and it is too late in the day, for us to try to upset and wreck a brilliant system of Government. History will not forget us or forgive us if we allow this to happen.

TRIBUTE TO HON. MIKE SYNAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WISE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, as Sandy and I joined in that overflow crowd today in the St. John's Episcopal Church to celebrate the life of Mike Synar, I looked around and I realized what an incredibly vital person Mike was, as every person in that church felt a personal tie to Mike; someone who was so full of energy, so full of life, so full of commitment, so full of passion for what he did; and how someone in such a short life span, a life of only 45 years, could mean so much to so many people, not only in that church, but people across this country, who felt a personal kinship to Mike.

One of my early memories of Mike is I invited him, when I was a new Member, to come to our district to our annual senior citizen convention. I remember Mike grabbing the microphone, he would not be contained by lecterns and podiums and stages and things like that, grabbing that microphone and charging into this crowd of several hundred people. He did not know them; it did not matter. They were people, and he was incredibly empathetic, and his infectious enthusiasm revved them up as well.

That enthusiasm characterized Mike's whole life, and certainly his service in this Chamber, because in many ways his service in this Chamber was his life, 16 years of service, being elected at a very, very early age.

Courage is another word that describes Mike. The previous speaker spoke eloquently about the Framers of the Constitution. Mike was the most ardent defender of those Framers. If

the Congress violated the will of the Framers, Mike knew how to take care of that.

He went to the U.S. Supreme Court. That is what the Constitution said to do. I remember particularly one piece of legislation, I believe it was the Gramm-Rudman bill, he went and won. Do you know how popular it was to take on a so-called balanced budget provision and get it struck down on legal grounds? Mike did, and won, and forced this Congress, of course, to do it properly.

Mike could be a policy wonk, but he was one of the few people I know that combined policy and commitment. He knew the ins and outs of legislation. He could get very excited about how the words were phrased and what this word was and how it fit in the context of the overall passage.

But he was not just a policy wonk. At the same time he was out there organizing people. He was a grassroots organizer, one of the best I have ever seen; not only organizing people in the grass roots at his district or across the country, but organizing people in this Chamber. He always was asking "What can I do to help," and he meant it.

Mike was never bitter. He certainly had some setbacks. I remember one time one of his many causes, one he believed passionately in, as he believed passionately in so many things, was campaign reform.

□ 1615

In order to get a bill passed, a decision was made by those whom he had been working with to go with a lesser version, and so in the last moments before the vote was taken, the message went out, "Vote for the lesser version to try and get something through." In many ways, I guess, that undercut what Mike was doing. I asked him whether he was bitter, and he just smiled and said, "That is the way the process is and we will try and go get the rest later."

I have mentioned reform several times. I guess change or reform would have to be what characterized Mike Synar. He was always fighting for reform and change. Regardless of the issue, you could disagree with Mike on an issue. He would work with you, and he would argue with you and he would realize that he would have to go some place else, but he would come back and work with you on the next issue.

He brought a lot of change and much reform to this country. One of his greatest issues, and he would want me to mention it as he dedicated much of his time even after his leaving the Congress, was campaign reform. Mike believed that the strength of this body is how we get people here, and that is a battle that still must be fought. My hope is that when it is, we recognize the role that Mike Synar had in bringing us to this day.

Mr. Speaker, Mike was one of the few people I know that took no PAC contributions and had a very strict limitation on individual contributions, and