



Kelly	Nethercutt	Sherwood
Kennedy (MN)	Ney	Shimkus
Kennedy (RI)	Northup	Shows
Kerns	Northwood	Shuster
Kildee	Nussle	Simmons
Kind (WI)	Oberstar	Simpson
King (NY)	Obey	Skeen
Kingston	Olver	Skelton
Kirk	Ortiz	Slaughter
Kleczka	Osborne	Smith (MI)
Knollenberg	Ose	Smith (NJ)
Colbe	Otter	Smith (TX)
Kucinich	Owens	Smith (WA)
LaFalce	Oxley	Snyder
LaHood	Pallone	Solis
Lampson	Pascarella	Souder
Langevin	Pastor	Spence
Lantos	Payne	Spratt
Largent	Pelosi	Stark
Larsen (WA)	Pence	Stearns
Larson (CT)	Peterson (MN)	Stenholm
Latham	Peterson (PA)	Strickland
LaTourette	Petri	Stump
Leach	Phelps	Stupak
Lee	Pickering	Sununu
Levin	Pitts	Sweeney
Lewis (GA)	Platts	Tancredo
Lewis (KY)	Pombo	Tanner
Linder	Portman	Tauscher
Lipinski	Price (NC)	Tauzin
LoBiondo	Pryce (OH)	Taylor (MS)
Lofgren	Putnam	Taylor (NC)
Lowey	Quinn	Terry
Lucas (KY)	Radanovich	Thomas
Lucas (OK)	Rahall	Thompson (CA)
Luther	Ramstad	Thompson (MS)
Maloney (CT)	Rangel	Thornberry
Maloney (NY)	Regula	Thune
Manzullo	Rehberg	Thurman
Markey	Reyes	Tiahrt
Mascara	Reynolds	Tiberi
Matheson	Riley	Tierney
Matsui	Rivers	Toomey
McCarthy (MO)	Rodriguez	Towns
McCarthy (NY)	Roemer	Traficant
McCullum	Rogers (KY)	Turner
McCrary	Rogers (MI)	Udall (CO)
McDermott	Rohrabacher	Udall (NM)
McGovern	Ros-Lehtinen	Upton
McInnis	Ross	Velazquez
McIntyre	Rothman	Visclosky
McKeon	Roukema	Vitter
McKinney	Royal-Allard	Walden
Meehan	Royce	Walsh
Meek (FL)	Rush	Wamp
Meeks (NY)	Ryan (WI)	Waters
Menendez	Ryun (KS)	Watkins (OK)
Mica	Sabo	Watt (NC)
Millender-	Sanchez	Watts (OK)
McDonald	Sanders	Waxman
Miller (FL)	Sandlin	Weiner
Miller, Gary	Sawyer	Weldon (FL)
Miller, George	Saxton	Weldon (PA)
Mink	Scarborough	Weller
Mollohan	Schaffer	Wexler
Moore	Schakowsky	Whitfield
Moran (KS)	Schiff	Wicker
Moran (VA)	Schrock	Wilson
Morella	Scott	Wolf
Murtha	Sessions	Woolsey
Myrick	Shadegg	Wu
Nadler	Shaw	Wynn
Napolitano	Shays	Young (AK)
Neal	Sherman	Young (FL)

## NOT VOTING—9

Berman	Lewis (CA)	Pomeroy
Dooley	McHugh	Sensenbrenner
Kilpatrick	Paul	Watson (CA)

□ 1349

Mr. DINGELL and Mr. KIRK changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

---

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2356, BIPARTISAN CAMPAIGN REFORM ACT OF 2001

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 188 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

## H. RES. 188

*Resolved*, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2356) to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to provide bipartisan campaign reform. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on House Administration. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The bill shall be considered as read. No amendment to the bill shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against the amendments printed in the report are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. After passage of H.R. 2356, it shall be in order to consider in the House S. 27. All points of order against the Senate bill and against its consideration are waived. It shall be in order to move to strike all after the enacting clause of the Senate bill and to insert in lieu thereof the provisions of H.R. 2356 as passed by the House. All points of order against that motion are waived. If the motion is adopted and the Senate bill, as amended, is passed, then it shall be in order to move that the House insist on its amendment to S. 27 and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The gentleman from New York (Mr. REYNOLDS) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST), the ranking member of the Committee on Rules, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 188 is a fair, structured rule that provides for the consideration of H.R. 2356, the Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act of 2001. I would like to point out that this is not an unorthodox rule; rather, this rule is what is known as “regular order.”

The rule provides for 1 hour of general debate to be equally divided between the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on

House Administration. The rule makes in order 20 amendments that were printed in the report accompanying the resolution. In addition to the full consideration of these amendments, the rule makes in order two substitutes, one offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLITTLE), which is debatable for 30 minutes, and the other offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. WYNN), which is debatable for 60 minutes.

The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill, as well as all points of order against the amendments.

After passage of H.R. 2356, the rule provides that it shall be in order to consider in the House Senate 27. It waives all points of order against the Senate bill and against its consideration.

The rule makes in order a motion to strike all after the enacting clause of the Senate bill and insert in lieu thereof provisions of H.R. 2356 as passed by the House. Furthermore, the rule waives all points of order against the motion to strike and insert. Additionally, the rule provides that if the motion to strike and insert is adopted and the Senate bill, as amended, is passed, it shall be in order to move that the House insist on its amendment and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

Finally, the rule provides one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, before we begin what is certain to be a very passionate debate, I would first like to commend the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT), the Speaker of the House, on his efforts to bring this issue before us today. The Speaker pledged a fair, open, and timely debate on this measure and, as has been the hallmark of his leadership, today has made good on that commitment. I would also like to acknowledge the great strides that have been made to ensure that this rule be made as fair as possible and to ensure a healthy debate on this important issue. As this rule was developed, the committee honored numerous requests from the gentleman from Connecticut to ensure a proper and complete debate. In short, we are here today because the Speaker has facilitated a fair and open process.

Additionally, I would like to commend the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY), the chairman of the Committee on House Administration, for his fair bipartisan handling of this matter. The willingness of both the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT) to accommodate all parties involved by supporting alternative measures and open debate is a true testament to their leadership on this measure. I thank both the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I have had the unique opportunity to hear testimony on this issue from all sides, both as a member