

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

of the Committee on House Administration and as a member of the Committee on Rules. I have witnessed firsthand the process that has brought us to this day, and I stand here before my colleagues proud of both the process and the rule.

Mr. Speaker, when we peel back the layers of debate on the issue before us today, when we remove the emotion and the hyperbole, when we separate the rhetoric from the reality, there is a fundamental question before this Congress today: how far will this Congress go in restricting the rights of the American people, whether individually or collectively, to participate in their political process? It is ironic that as this Congress and this country have achieved so much economically and socially by breaking down government regulation and intrusion, there are those who would have us impose excessive restrictions and undue burdens on the most basic of all human rights: the right of free speech. That we can improve our current campaign finance system is something upon which we can all agree, but to do so by destroying the very fabric of this Nation's political system is not an improvement, nor is it reform.

There are a number of important issues that we face in our shared desire to improve and reform campaign finance in these United States. Most important, we must ensure that we encourage rather than stifle citizen involvement in their political process.

The freedom to express one's views in the form of political speech is one of the inherent rights that this Nation was founded upon. Government restrictions which would limit that speech strike at the very core of our rights and liberties as Americans.

We should recognize, too, the freedom of political parties to encourage voter enrollment and participation. A vibrant party system has been and must continue to promote the free flow of ideas and debate that have shaped this Nation over the past 225 years.

By definition, Webster's dictionary says that "reform" means "to make or become better." What we do today must ensure that our campaign finance system does become better, and it can only become better if we recognize that curbing expensive campaigns should not come at the expense of political liberties. That is why I urge support of this rule and the support of the Ney-Wynn bill.

While neither the Shays-Meehan nor the Ney-Wynn bill bans so-called "soft money," Ney-Wynn at least ensures that such expenditures are used for party activities such as voter registration, getting out the vote, overhead, and fund-raising expenses. Such a provision will ensure that candidates cannot circumvent set limits, while ensuring a continued vibrant party system. Ney-Wynn also contains broader reporting requirements. People have a right to know who is supporting candidates for political office, and under

the Ney-Wynn bill they will have that information quickly and completely. Further, Ney-Wynn does more to restrict the influences of special interest groups.

□ 1400

Political parties will be restricted from fund-raising and spending soft money while special interests would still be allowed to spend funds in virtually unlimited amounts, increasing, rather than curtailing, their influence over the electoral process.

Mr. Speaker, there is a solid reason why the Ney-Wynn bill has enjoyed a growing bipartisan support over these past few weeks. That is because it is better, more responsible legislation that, as Webster defines, reforms our campaign finance system by making it better.

Mr. Speaker, let me once again remind my colleagues that our business here today is being conducted under regular order. This fair, standard rule is before this body because of the tireless efforts of both the gentleman from Illinois (Speaker HASTERT) and the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman NEY).

Let us proceed with open debate on both the bill and its amendment. I urge my colleagues to support this rule.

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

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the Republican leadership has brought us a rule that is the height of cynical political maneuvering, and the rule itself is, quite frankly, one of the most stupid proposals I have seen in my 23 years in this institution.

I want to look at the cynical maneuvering, first. We all know that the Republican leadership wants to defeat Shays-Meehan. There are, of course, Democrats who have some reservations about Shays-Meehan also, but these Democrats also believe in fundamental fairness, and that Shays-Meehan should have a clean, legitimate shot on the floor.

The Republican leadership has written a rule that everyone knows may well lose. If we assume that this rule is about cynicism, then what the Republican leadership has done is to present a rule to the House that they know will fail, and then they will refuse to reconvene the Committee on Rules to draft another rule.

They will refuse to schedule campaign finance reform for debate and simply explain it away by saying campaign finance reform is dead because the House refused to pass a rule to bring it up. This is, of course, the equivalent of killing your parents and then throwing yourself on the mercy of the court because you are an orphan.

Why do I say that this rule is likely to lose? Experience. It is a repeat of a rule that the then Democratic leadership fashioned in 1981 during the debate on the first Reagan budget. In 1981, the Democratic leadership refused to give

the Republican alternative, the now infamous Gramm-Latta substitute, a straight up-or-down vote. Rather, the Democratic leadership broke Gramm-Latta into pieces, requiring a series of votes on its provisions, thinking that that was the way to kill it.

Well, surprise, that rule was rejected by the House. Let me repeat, the House rejected that rule as fundamentally unfair to the minority. Now, 20 years later, the Republican leadership has constructed a rule that divides Shays-Meehan into 13 separate amendments.

Sound familiar? Maybe not, because no one in the current Republican leadership was in Congress in 1981. But I find it hard to believe they and their staff can be totally ignorant of history, and that they all have to know that there is a very good chance this rule will be defeated.

Mr. Speaker, one might have to conclude that this is a cynical way to go about achieving their real objective, which is, of course, to kill Shays-Meehan.

Let us look at how incredibly dumb this rule is. It seems to have been written in such a way as to help the strategic objective of killing Shays-Meehan. I would suggest the way this rule is written that it might have the exact opposite effect.

There are a number of Members on both sides of the aisle who have legitimate and sincere concerns about Shays-Meehan. In the event this rule actually passes, the heavy-handed and cynical maneuvering on the part of the Republican leadership may well drive some of the opponents of Shays-Meehan right into the Shays-Meehan camp.

If that is the case, then the Republican leadership will have orchestrated their own defeat, the proverbial snatching of defeat from the jaws of victory.

There are legitimate issues involved in a discussion of the merits of the two main alternatives, Shays-Meehan and Ney-Wynn. I, for one, am concerned that the absolute prohibition in Shays-Meehan on the right of Members of Congress to raise non-Federal funds for State and local political parties to conduct voter registration and get-out-the-vote activities will weaken the political process and neuter Members of Congress. Members will not be able to play a meaningful role in voter turnout efforts in their home districts, and will become largely irrelevant to their own political parties.

The Ney-Wynn bill does not contain this provision, and it is important for Members to think very carefully about this issue if we get to the point where we might actually vote on the legislation.

However, because of this incredibly dumb rule and the cynical maneuvering on the part of the Republican leadership, we may never get to that point. On the other hand, if this rule is, by some chance, passed, the debate on this issue will be in such a highly charged atmosphere that it may well

be impossible to have a rational discussion on the fundamental issues involved. This will be a sad day for the democratic process in this institution and in this country.

Mr. Speaker, this rule should be defeated. The Republican leadership needs to be shamed into bringing back a new rule that is fair to the House, fair to the proponents of both bills, and fair to the American people.

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

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS).

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I have not been in Congress for 22 years, like the gentleman from Texas, but I do know the difference between right and wrong. I think the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST) knows the difference between right and wrong.

What we recognize about this rule is that this is an honest up-or-down vote. Yesterday in the Committee on Rules the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) asked for his bill, and got what he asked for. He received it. That was his bill. We did not gut the bill. We are not putting any amendments against the bill. He gets his bill exactly the way that he said in the Committee on Rules he wanted it. He gets all 12 or 13 amendments.

Where I come from in Texas, you vote for what you are for and you vote against what you do not like. The fact of the matter is that this is an honest attempt to give our colleague, who is a Republican, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS), exactly what he asked for in the Committee on Rules.

We are not hiding anything. We are not making it more difficult. We are simply giving him exactly what he wanted. I have lots of legislation on which I would love to have the same opportunity that we are extending to our colleague.

The fact of the matter is that in the Committee on Rules, it was the Democrats who sit on the Committee on Rules that did the beating up of the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS), that did the beating up of Shays-Meehan. They said that it had virtually no reason to be on the floor of the House of Representatives. It has no reason to take the time that we are spending on it.

The Republican leadership, not only the gentleman from Illinois (Speaker HASTERT) and the gentlemen from Texas, Mr. ARMEY and Mr. DELAY, but also our committee chairman, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), have taken the time to schedule this vote to give the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) exactly what he asked for yesterday, and to make sure we have a full debate. I think it is not only fair and honest, but it is the right thing to do for our colleagues.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding time to me.

I am the ranking member of the Committee on House Administration. As such, I participated in the markup of these two pieces of legislation, the Shays-Meehan legislation, which has in the past had 252 votes each time it was offered for passage on the floor of this House, and the Ney-Wynn bill, which is a new bill.

Mr. Speaker, I beg to differ with my friend, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS). At the markup, which was held on June 28, it was my understanding, and I believe the understanding of the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN), that the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY), the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS), and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN) would have the opportunity, between June 28 and yesterday, to perfect their legislation, to present that perfected legislation to the Committee on Rules, and to have those pieces of legislation presented to the floor for consideration with such further amendments as others might have.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that was our understanding. I tell my friend, the gentleman from Texas, as a result, I did not offer any amendment. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY) nor any other Member offered any amendments. Why? Because it was the understanding of all 10 of us, in my opinion, that the bills would be perfected in the 10 days between June 28 and July 8 or 9 or 10.

That was not done. What the gentleman suggests is a fair process is to divide up into 14 different sections the perfections of the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN) sought, and therefore try to fight each one of those 14 different times.

I frankly think that is not fair. Why is it not fair? Because, as the gentleman from Texas, the ranking member of the Committee on Rules, has put forward, it is a rule which does not comport with what the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN) want to offer as their base bill.

Mr. Speaker, on the substance of this, the American public in my opinion is very concerned about the amount of money in politics. Rightly or wrongly, and I cast aspersions on no one in this House, rightly or wrongly, the American public believes that the gargantuan amounts of money that flow into Washington, into State Capitals, into local county seats as political contributions, hard or soft money, and that is a somewhat esoteric distinction that the public does not make, but it is an important one, because one is limited and one is not, they believe this is an important issue. They want to see it considered on its merits, not by procedural dissection, which is essentially what has occurred here.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, there seems to be a little bit of blurry history or rewriting history. I certainly was not here in 1981, as my colleague, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) was not, either. But as I recall, there was a minority substitute to a majority bill that the rule affected that the leadership lost, and the minority had a victorious day. In those days, the Republicans were the minority.

But when we look at today, I have been here today in both the Committee on House Administration and on the Committee on Rules. It was my understanding that on Wednesday evening, at the insistence of the sponsor of Shays-Meehan that we hold a markup before the July district work period, that was scheduled for Thursday before we left.

On Wednesday at 8 p.m. it was agreed upon by both the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY), who had to produce his bill, and the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) that he would produce his bill, and at 8 o'clock we would have the bill so the House, the entire House, 435 Members, would have the opportunity to learn what was in both bills.

That was because the Shays-Meehan bill that I knew as a State legislator watching the debate of this great body is now so much different than it was back then.

I am a fan of the 1957 T-Bird. It changed so much in the sixties, when I owned a sixties T-Bird, and in the seventies, in the eighties, and in the nineties, so the T-Bird today that is made reference to no longer looks like the 1957 Thunderbird. So you would have to be clarifying exactly what year of Thunderbirds you were referring to if you were an admirer.

In Shays-Meehan, this bill before us today is nothing like the Shays-Meehan bill that was constructed years ago and has been debated in this House in previous years. It is substantially different.

On the Committee on Rules, I have the opportunity to see managers' technical amendments on a frequent occasion. This bill, when we look at what happened with the Committee on Rules, we granted every single request, 12, of the Shays-Meehan bill. Whether they were technical or they were absolute critical changes that were made in the bill that would not be classified a manager's amendment, we gave it to the Shays-Meehan request.

Just as the Speaker said today, this week, we will have the debate on Shays-Meehan and any other amendments on campaign finance reform. It is here today. So the bill introduced by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN) reported by the Committee on House Administration will be debated in its entirety. As a matter of fact, they filed after the deadline, 4½ hours late, these 12 amendments, which were actually put

in the rule so they could be debated today in its entirety.

However, when we begin to look at special privileges for any Members, that becomes a political concept of what the Committee on Rules is, in fairness. The gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) is not the manager of the campaign finance bill, it is the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY), the Chair of the Committee on House Administration.

The en bloc amendment has been inaccurately referred to as the manager's amendment. The fact is that the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman NEY) is the manager of this legislation, so the amendment requested by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN) is not a manager's amendment.

Anyway, whether one is a freshman, a sophomore, as I, or a junior member of the Committee on Rules on the majority side, as its most senior Members know, an en bloc amendment has been inaccurately referred to as a manager's amendment in this legislation, and that an amendment en bloc is a clustering of individual amendments.

Mr. Speaker, each and every amendment requested by Shays-Meehan is in this rule, to be debated openly and fairly in this House.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE), from the Committee on Rules.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, the work of the Committee on Rules is never done. We work hard and we work late into the evening trying to fine-tune some of the most controversial issues that this House ever faces.

□ 1415

And, indeed, that is exactly what we did last night.

My friend, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS), came to our committee and he made his presentation; and he was passionate, as he always is, because he believes in this. And to a large extent, I do as well. This has been his cause, and he has fought it very well.

So I am very surprised today by all the fanfare over this manager's amendment, because the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) did not even mention this manager's amendment in his presentation to the Committee on Rules until I brought it up. At that time he said, oh yes, and he explained it briefly, and left us on the committee with the distinct impression that as long as his provisions were included in some way, it was okay to divide it up. Indeed, his words were: "There are about 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 11, 12, 12 changes, one or two are technical, some are substantive, but this is an amendment that gets our bill in a form that we are most comfortable defending. And so, obviously, we like it. Some people have

said you might like to divide them up into pieces; however, you decide."

He told the Committee on Rules, you decide. And so we did. We felt that to divide this up and allow examination of these substantive changes was the right and fair thing to do. So for all of us who have worked so hard to get this bill here today, for everyone who has done so much, no matter where you stand on it, do not kill this rule. Today is the day. Have we not waited long enough?

There is nothing unfair about this rule. And if it is defeated, I hope that this country understands who defeated it.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), a member of the committee.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. It will be very clear that it will be the Republican majority that defeats the rule, if it does go down.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to oppose this silly rule. This rule provides the American people with a limited opportunity to debate this important issue. It is a rule that was written by the Republican leadership that fears the will of the American people to have an open and honest debate on campaign finance reform.

If we are to maintain this institution's reputation as a representative body, then it is imperative that the American people have an opportunity to freely debate this issue here on the floor of the House. It appears the gentleman from New York (Mr. REYNOLDS) does not understand that when this bill is chopped up like it is, it will not have an up or a down vote, which I assure my colleagues, he is not in favor of.

Mr. Speaker, I have another problem with today's debate. I want to know why we are even talking about campaign finance reform before we are talking about election reform. I would think that after last year's travesty of an election, in which it was discovered that thousands of Americans nationwide had their right to vote stripped from them, Congress would have acted by now.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. KELLER).

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I rise today in support of the rule as well as in strong support of the need for a paycheck protection provision to the campaign finance reform bill, and I will tell my colleagues why.

Banning soft money to the parties does not take the money out of politics, it only takes the money out of the parties. For example, currently a union such as the AFL-CIO can give \$1 million to the Democratic party. The Democratic party will then turn around and run attack ads against Republicans like me that say, "Call Rick Keller and ask him why he is a bad

guy." Well, if we ban the soft money to the party, we will still see the exact same TV attack ad on the air. The only difference will be the little disclaimer at the bottom of the screen which will now say, "Paid for by AFL-CIO," as opposed to, "Paid for by the Democratic party."

Any attempts to ban these ads 60 days before an election is blatantly unconstitutional. That is why to be fair and balanced we must also couple the ban on soft money with a paycheck protection requirement that requires unions to get the written consent of their workers if they intend to use part of their union dues for political activities. This is critical because fully 40 percent of the union members nationwide are Republicans, yet nearly all of their \$100 million per election year is spent by unions on behalf of liberal Democrats. This is blatantly unfair and one-sided.

But I ask my colleagues not to take my word for it. Listen to what Thomas Jefferson, our third President and the author of the Declaration of Independence, had to say about this matter. In 1779, Thomas Jefferson wrote: "To compel a man to furnish contributions of money for the propagation of opinions which he disbelieves and abhors is sinful and tyrannical." Yet the American worker is forced to do just that.

Finally, President Bush has repeatedly said that paycheck protection is an important component to any campaign finance reform bill. We should give the President a fair and balanced campaign finance reform bill that he can sign into law.

I support the rule.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURUO).

Ms. DELAURUO. Mr. Speaker, today we have a historic opportunity to enact meaningful campaign finance reform. The Senate completed its work and passed a bill. The bipartisan Shays-Meehan measure has been twice passed by this House in previous Congresses.

We are on the threshold of bringing real reform to a system that is out of control and overrun by big-monied interest. Yet here we are debating the merits of a procedural rule that can only be characterized as guaranteed to fail. It does not allow the Shays-Meehan bill to be considered as a coherent whole. It is disingenuous and unfair.

This rule allows for 22 amendments designed to eviscerate the Shays-Meehan legislation; designed to kill the bill. Until we can get a clean up or down vote, we might as well tack up a "for sale" sign on all of our office doors.

We need to question the overall strategy behind this rule. If Shays-Meehan does not get defeated on the floor, then the opponents have paved the way for it to die in conference with the Senate.

I urge my colleagues to support genuine reform; that they not be afraid of real action. Restore integrity to our

political process, restore America's faith in its political process. Defeat this rule. Support a clean vote on campaign finance reform.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I have the unofficial comments made by my colleague, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS), last night in the Committee on Rules, which I would like to just share with the House as we look at the rule, the debate of the rule, with the balance of the time we have left.

The gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) said: "I just want people to have a fair and open debate on this process. Even if it disadvantage us if we have 200 amendments to go after our bill, I have always believed that the debate is healthy. I have always taken the position that we could be the substitute or the base bill, as long as ultimately you amend whatever is the base bill.

"Obviously, if you take up the Ney bill and he takes us down, we lost. And then you amend the Ney bill. If we survive, then we amend our bill. I have always taken that basic view.

"A vote for the Ney bill is a vote against our bill. And if he is the base bill and we replace him, then we amend our bill. I have always made that assumption.

"This manager's amendment, as I referred to it, I reluctantly call it the manager's amendment, it sounds ostentatious. I am not sure I feel like a manager. But this is an amendment that gets our bill in a form that we are most comfortable defending. And so obviously we like it. Some people have said you might like to divide them up into pieces; however, you decide."

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

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN).

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, what we are talking about is not really about technicalities, though there is a manager's amendment that we should have been able to offer and, in fact, we will be able to offer, because this rule is going down if we do not get an up or down vote on campaign finance reform.

But what this really is about are technicalities designed to kill a bill to end this soft money abuse. The United States Senate, in a historic vote, voted for a bill we have been working to preconference with Members of the other body. We have negotiated over a period of time and had a final product at 12 o'clock midnight on Tuesday. The Committee on Rules did not meet until Wednesday, sometime around 3 o'clock. We should have had the opportunity to present to the committee and have an up or down vote on the bill that we agreed to. But technicalities were being used to try to defeat campaign finance reform.

There is a strong feel across America these unlimited amounts of money have to be curtailed. We cannot get a

patient's bill of rights passed in this body because of the influence of soft money. We cannot get Medicare prescription drug coverage for seniors because \$15.7 million in soft money are gumming up the works. It becomes difficult to get legislation passed to protect our environment when continually soft money has played a role in killing that legislation.

So my colleagues can talk all the technicalities that they want. The fact of the matter is, my colleagues will either give us an en bloc amendment or we will defeat the rule. Because the American people want a vote on Shays-Meehan, and they want that bill to be similar enough to the bill passed in the other body so that we can avoid a conference committee, where legislation to reform our campaign finance laws have historically died, where the Patient's Bill of Rights died, where reasonable gun safety measures to protect America's children have died.

We want to avoid that conference committee. So we have preconferenced this bill in an effort to build on the progress that was made in the other body, in an effort to work with Members in a bipartisan way in this body, Republican Members who are willing to take on this issue in a leadership role and a bulk of the Democrat party, to see to it we end this abuse of the soft money system. It is inexcusable to continue to fund political campaigns through unlimited amounts of money.

I believe tonight, as soon as my colleagues acquiesce on this rule, we will be ready to begin that historic debate.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to comment that I am glad my colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN), addressed the group in the House today, because he was not at the Committee on Rules to present his case before us as we deliberated over the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY), the majority leader.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, this has been a very difficult couple of days. I have been working with the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) on this matter for some time. Some time ago the gentleman from Connecticut, speaking on behalf of himself and his cosponsors, came to me and requested that they be given a fair shake on this, that they get a chance to have their bill heard and have it heard in a timely fashion. We have worked on that. Today is the time that the gentleman from Connecticut and others have agreed to.

The gentleman from Connecticut came to me and said, I do not want anybody stacking the rule against me, I want to make sure it is a fair competition between my bill, which over 2 weeks ago he informed me was written. In fact, the gentleman came to me and

exercised his frustration and impatience that the bill that the committee would put up was not yet written when his was already written and ready to go, and would I protect his bill so that he could have a straight up and down bill, as his bill was, and was written and was ready to go at least 2 weeks ago. We assured him that that would happen.

He subsequently came back and said I want my bill as a base bill, not the committee mark. I do not want the conventional thing here, which is to put the committee's mark on as the base bill and have mine as a substitute. I want mine as the base bill, and let the committee's be a substitute. We agreed. We wanted to be fair. We gave him that special consideration. So his bill is the base bill.

And, now, in the last few days, he has come before us and he said I want to amend my bill, and I have a demand that I have my amendment in the way I would like it. And he said, I have 14 different things I would like to do with this bill; 14 different amendments to this bill. Six of the 14 are provisions to strike all together provisions in his bill that was ready to go 2 weeks ago. Six provisions to strike.

Now, what does he want to strike? What are those provisions? I think we ought to talk about it. Three of those were to clarify provisions that he had in his bill, that was ready to go 2 weeks ago. Let us go with it. But now we need time, in this 11th hour, to clarify. What are those three clarifications? What do they mean?

□ 1430

I think we ought to know about that. Here is one, for example. What does this mean? It says he has one amendment that would increase the aggregate limit on individual contributions to \$95,000 per cycle, including not more than \$37,500 per cycle to candidates, and reserving \$20,000 per cycle for the national party committees.

Is that soft money, or is that hard money? What individuals are we talking about? I think we ought to talk about that amendment.

Our complaint is that I do not get these 14 amendments. Incidentally, I might mention, Mr. Speaker, 145 amendments were submitted to the Committee on Rules. The Committee on Rules accepted 20 amendments. Fourteen of the 20 amendments that were accepted were amendments of the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS). Here is a fellow who has gotten his bill that just 2 weeks ago was ready to go as the base bill, and now he needs 14 amendments to his own bill.

When was the last time we saw anybody in this House come to the House with their bill and need 14 amendments to their own bill, 14 separate amendments to their bill? Also, if I do not get them, I am not being treated fair.

I am a little concerned about that concept of fairness. Fourteen of the 20 were given to the author of the bill

himself, to amend his own bill, that just 2 weeks ago was ready to go, 14 substantive amendments.

What we have is a person who got the bill on the floor when he wanted it on the floor, got the bill that he wrote that was ready to go as the base bill ahead of consideration of the committee's bill, who has been given the opportunity to have 14 out of the 20 amendments made available to amend his own bill on the floor, who is now complaining that we are not being fair with this Committee on Rules.

What more could the Rules Committee have done? Who else got that much consideration on any bill at any time? It is not fair.

Then further, not being satisfied to just complain that the Committee on Rules is an unfair committee of our colleagues, we have an attack on the Speaker himself from the New York Times, not a disinterested party.

The New York Times that knows very well their institutional influence over elections will be enhanced by the Shays-Meehan version of the bill more so than the committee mark. The New York Times says the Speaker balkanizes a bill he opposes against the sponsors' wishes, and he calls it an arrogant abuse of power.

The Speaker has put the bill that was ready to go 2 weeks ago through the Rules Committee on the floor as a base bill. The Speaker has said we are going to allow 20 people to offer 20 amendments to that bill in a timely, orderly fashion. Fourteen of the 20 amendments are given to the author of the bill himself, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, let me spare myself this embarrassment. I pledge to you right now, should at any time ever in the future of my service in the Congress of the United States I have the honor and the privilege of having the Committee on Rules make my bill in order as the base bill, ahead of the committee's bill, I will not embarrass myself by asking for 16 amendments to rewrite my bill, and further insist that the 16 amendments be made together as one lump-sum amendment not to be examined, not to be dissected, not to be understood, not to be debated, but just an ad hoc rewrite at the moment on the floor.

I will try to the very best of my ability, when I say my bill is ready to go, to be satisfied, to have my bill ready to go and not need to amend it with 16 amendments.

To further save myself the embarrassment, Mr. Speaker, let me pledge right now that should at any time ever in the future of my life as a legislator I have a Committee on Rules that is generous enough to give me, out of 145 requests, 14 of the 20 requests that are honored as amendments to my own bill, I will save myself the indignity of protesting the unfairness of it all.

Let me say to the New York Times, give me a break. What more do they want in the name of fairness?

Here is the deal. We have those people who had a bill passed in the Senate,

who have decided that their bill does not need to be subjected to a normal legislative process, which is to be conferred with a similar bill from the House, that which happens with virtually every piece of legislation ever legislated in the history of this body, a normal conference process, that believes that they will be cheated if they do not get their exact Senate bill passed in the House.

That is unreasonable, uninformed and arrogant. To say that I am being subjected to unfairness when I am asked to go through a normal legislative process is arrogant.

Mr. Speaker, this Committee on Rules is a decent, honorable committee. They have been fair and just. They have been considerate. The Speaker is a decent, honorable man, who has bent over backwards to be generous to the advocates of the Shays-Meehan bill. He does not deserve this kind of diatribe. I regret there are people in our body who are so small.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARMEY. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, am I correct that the gentleman from Texas, speaking on behalf of the Speaker, is in support of Shays-Meehan; or is the gentleman against Shays-Meehan?

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I am in support of responsible campaign finance reform that does respect the first amendment rights of the American people and does not trespass against freedom of speech; and I am not confident that Shays-Meehan is done as well as the committee mark. But on the debate of the rule, do not tell me that I am being treated unfairly when I have been given 14 separate opportunities to amend my own bill. That is unreasonable. That is arrogant.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER).

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

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, today we have an extremely important vote for this body, a vote that counts instead of a vote that can be passed off and characterized as it does not make a difference.

Today papers all across the country screamed that the Republican Party raises record amounts of money, and the Democratic Party raises record amounts of money. All this big money hurts the little person. It hurts the little person's voice to be able to participate in this election process.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope that we would defeat this rule as written because this rule not only dissects and bisects the Shays-Meehan language that should have been a manager's amendment to perfect this bill, but it is an unfair rule. Republicans and Democrats should bring this rule down so we can get legitimate debate on the other matters.

Mr. Speaker, the House centrist coalition of five Democrats and five Republicans strongly supports Shays-Meehan; I hope we vote for that bill at the end of the day.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN).

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, if we are serious about campaign finance reform, this is our one chance. Some of the party leaders in both parties do not want reform, and I think we have seen examples of it during this debate. They do not want reform. They would be delighted for us to turn down the rule. That is exactly what they are waiting for.

Mr. Speaker, I have been a longtime helper with Shays-Meehan, and the money providers who work for each party is what some of these party people are simply working on.

Vote for the rule. It is the one chance we have to make real reform happen. Those who do not vote for this rule will play right into the hands of those who want no reform. I urge my colleagues to vote for this rule.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

(Ms. WOOLSEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I stand in strong opposition to this rule. In fact, it amazes me that we would even consider such a convoluted attempt to sabotage true campaign finance reform.

Mr. Speaker, I represent a district that has an 83 to 85 percent voter turnout. So my colleagues know that the people I work for care very much about our Nation. They care about our Constitution, and they care about the campaign process.

Mr. Speaker, my constituents and people all over this Nation want campaign finance reform like the Shays-Meehan bill that will take big money out of the process. And like all people, they want young people in particular to feel that they belong to the process, that they want to be involved, that they are proud to be voters, that they are proud to be part of the democratic process.

The people I represent in Marin and Sonoma Counties know that our democracy depends on getting everybody involved in our electoral system. We must defeat this bill so we can start over.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS).

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, when I first came to this House in a special election 3 years ago, my first official act after being sworn in was to sign on to the Shays-Meehan bill. It was one of the proudest moments of my career. Today is one of the darkest days I have ever experienced in this Chamber.

Mr. Speaker, this rule, passed in the dead of night, is unfair. It is undemocratic. It is a cynical parliamentary ploy aimed at stopping a straight up-or-down vote on the Shays-Meehan bill as a whole.

The American people will not stand for this. They want to see democracy restored. They want us to reform a campaign finance system that is awash in unregulated soft money and dominated by special interests.

Mr. Speaker, let us defeat this rule and have a fair and honest debate on the merits of the Shays-Meehan bill. By defeating the rule we can reassure all Americans that our cherished democracy is not for sale.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO).

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, rarely are there times that one vote can fundamentally turn the tide of political history. I think today is such a moment. Our generation of political leadership can shape a new future, a future which will be free from the influence of unregulated and unlimited contributions.

Mr. Speaker, I think that we must make it a relic of the past where every issue we consider and every issue we ignore, from health care reform to energy policy, is determined by the clout of one special interest or another, and where the Congress has become more a marionette than a Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, is it any wonder that less than half of the people of our Nation turn out on election days? Weak substitutes allowing soft money and third-party advertising to continue will only foster a disconnect between the people and those who represent them.

I do not like the push to raise the limits for hard dollars because I think this debate is about limiting the influence of money and politics and not increasing it. But this issue is larger than what my concerns are. We should go back to what our Founders both dreamed about and built when they founded the greatest democracy in the history of the world. We should reform the system. We should defeat this rule, and we should adopt real, meaningful campaign finance reform.

□ 1445

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. FORD).

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, when I was growing up there was a kid on my street that was not very good at any games we played. He was so bad that he would oftentimes not get a chance to play after his team would lose. But because he owned the football and the basketball that we had, or we played with, he oftentimes got a chance to play. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE) is laughing. He may know what I am talking about a little bit. It seems to me we have reached a point here in the Congress where there

are some players on the other side of the aisle who simply are not as good as some of the players on this side of the aisle.

In this instance, we have a bill called Shays-Meehan, which is superior to theirs. So my friend, the distinguished majority leader, has come to the floor and suggested to us all that the way in which we are proceeding with this legislation, the way in which my friends, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN) and the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS), went before the committee somehow or another surprised him.

This is the same United States Congress that kept us here until 4 in the morning to vote on a \$1.3 trillion budget, in the wee hours of the morning; the same United States Congress that kept us here until 7 in the morning to vote on a budget. Shame on you, Mr. Leader. Thank you, New York Times.

We ought to be thankful that Shays-Meehan will eventually get an up or down vote and will eventually ban soft money. Mr. Leader, bring the ball back. Let the rest of us play. You have a bad bill, but America wants meaningful campaign finance reform.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI).

Ms. PELOSI. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, every person in this body takes an oath of office to protect and defend the Constitution of the United States from all enemies, foreign and domestic. There is no greater enemy to our Constitution, indeed to our democracy, than the role of money in the political process today. Those of us who take this oath of office to serve in Congress serve in Washington, D.C., a city that was built on a swamp. Two centuries later, it is back to being a swamp, a political swamp.

Today, we have the opportunity to drain the swamp and change the political landscape of political fund-raising in our country. We have an opportunity to empower the people. How many people have been turned off by the political process because of the role of big money? How many people fear that the Speaker's gavel is an auctioneer's gavel, not the gavel of the people? How many people decide not to run for office because of the role money plays?

Today, we have an opportunity to send a message to the American people that their role in the political process is important, in supporting candidates or in being candidates. We have an opportunity to clean up our act. And indeed we have a responsibility to do so. I have great confidence that if we pass the Shays-Meehan bill and when we pass the Shays-Meehan bill, we will clear the way for a new way in America in terms of political involvement. We have the creativity, we have the experience, we have the issues, we have the interest on the part of the American people which will be reawakened to involve them more fully in a government

of the people, by the people, and for the people.

I urge my colleagues to take advantage of this historic opportunity and support Shays-Meehan.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much for yielding me this time. My applause is to Shays-Meehan and to Ney and Wynn for engaging us in a debate that should be worthy of what the Founding Fathers thought that America was all about, democracy. But I will say to my dear and distinguished colleague, I am embarrassed. I am embarrassed that we would take the Shays-Meehan legislative initiative as we would take any other and totally implode it so that a reasonable debate could not be had up or down on this legislative initiative.

I am reminded of the telling of such an act some years ago when we were in the majority and we decided to play politics with a budget bill. It was wrong and we lost on the rule. So I stand here today saying, I am disappointed that the amendments that I had that dealt with the empowerment, ensuring that ethnic and racial minorities would be empowered to do voter registration and outreach were denied. But I am more embarrassed and I am outraged that we would not give the Shays-Meehan legislation an up or down vote and we would decide to give us this long list of fingers, so confusion will abound and the Founding Fathers' belief in democracy will be extinguished.

We need to defeat this rule so that we can have a fair and democratic process to debate this like our Founding Fathers and I know our Mothers would have wanted us to do.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule.

The purpose of campaign finance reform is to make federal election financing fair and balanced for all candidates. This is something we all agree with, regardless of party. I find it extremely troubling that the Rules Committee would report out a structured rule designed to limit and confuse meaningful debate on H.R. 2356, the "Bipartisan Campaign Finance Act of 2001."

Mr. Speaker, this rule is simply not in the spirit of bipartisan cooperation. Campaign Finance reform is an important issue for the future health of our country. Every person in America will be affected by the debate we hold today. It is a travesty of good government to prohibit an up or down vote on this piece of legislation. By limiting debate on H.R. 2356 to a technical discussion of individual portions of the bill, the Rules Committee has made it virtually impossible for this body to do justice to the magnitude of the decision we make here today.

Mr. Speaker, I am also disappointed in the committee's decision to offer a narrow slate of poison pill amendments for debate. I offered three debates in the spirit of inclusion and good government. The first might have helped this legislation to avoid a constitutional challenge by allowing constituent groups the right

to speak with their elected leaders. The second might have allowed for more detailed information on campaign finance reform by tracking its effect on all communities in the United States. The third would have committed this body toward fair and equal participation for all in elections. Rather than consider these proposals, the leadership has stifled considerable debate by reporting a rule designed to push their agenda through without regard to the will of the American people once again.

Mr. Speaker, the United States has reached a crucial point in its history. We could have discussed meaningful amendments that would protect the voices of all Americans. The Rules Committee should have paid attention to both the ancient and recent history of this Nation. Equal access to the right to vote has been a constant struggle within the United States, and until we take seriously the right of every citizen to participate in the political process by developing a campaign finance structure that promotes election reform for all Americans, this country will suffer.

I am disappointed. The American people will be, too. I oppose this rule.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY).

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, today we are talking about an issue that over 250 Members of this House have voted for twice and passed in the past. A similar bill has already passed the Senate in April. The leadership of this House promised supporters of campaign finance reform a straight up or down vote on Shays-Meehan, a bill so similar to the Senate version that a conference committee was not required, and we know that the conference committee has been the graveyard for campaign finance reform. I guess the leadership felt they could not win on the merits, so they had to manipulate the process to shortchange the American people once again.

Let us show the American people that our government is not for sale. Let us show the American people that we support elections, not auctions to the highest spender. Let us vote against this undemocratic rule. Let us bring it down so that we can bring Shays-Meehan to the floor for an up or down vote and send it to the Senate so a conference committee is not required, the President can sign it, and we can finally pass meaningful reform.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. RIVERS).

Ms. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise against this rule, and I raise my voice in support of a straight up or down vote on Shays-Meehan.

The Supreme Court of the United States has laid out very clearly for all of us the role that Congress can play in regulating elections in this country. They have told us that Congress can prohibit the use of corporate treasury funds and union dues money in Federal elections. They have told us that we may limit contributions to candidates, parties and political committees; that we may pass laws to combat actual

corruption and the appearance of corruption in the operation of the Federal Government; that we can require disclosure of the source and size of certain kinds of spending and most contributions; and that we can regulate coordinated expenditures to thwart attempts to circumvent existing election law. That is what the Supreme Court has already said.

Shays-Meehan does no more than what the Supreme Court has already endorsed, and it does no more than what is right. I urge Members to vote against this rule and support Shays-Meehan.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF).

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I rise in opposition to the rule, a rule that in effect takes Shays-Meehan and cuts it into 14 little pieces, a rule that says to the supporters of Shays-Meehan, If you are willing to vote for it once, we are going to put you to the test of voting for it 14 times.

Why is this being offered over the opposition of both Shays and Meehan? Very simply for this reason, the opposition believes they cannot defeat Shays-Meehan in an up or down vote. The only way they can defeat this legislation is if they can obfuscate; if they can make it ambiguous, unclear; if they can conceal to the American people whether they are really for it or against it.

The American people not only have the right to an up or down vote to end soft money and its corrupting influence on the political process, they have the right to the accountability that comes with a clear and unequivocal vote up or down on campaign finance reform. That is what is being denied with this rule. That is why we must reject this rule, so that the American people can have a clear and unequivocal vote for or against campaign finance reform.

I urge a “no” vote.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES).

(Mrs. JONES of Ohio asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, to my colleagues, I stand in opposition to this rule. As a second-term Member of Congress, legislation was quite new to me in my first term. What I am seeing happening today is the inability of a legislator with good intention to offer a campaign finance reform bill who, after having had a chance to speak with his or her colleagues, saying, Well, maybe that's a good idea. Maybe I should suggest an amendment or a change. Yes, there are 14. There probably could be 25 amendments that would be offered by colleagues to try and make this a better bill.

I must say very truthfully, I am still torn about how we do campaign finance reform. I support campaign finance reform because I know it is good for all

the people of our country. How we get to it seems to be a difficult question. And I say to Mr. Leader and to others here on the floor, let us take some time. The Senate dedicated 2 weeks. Why do we only get 1 day?

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

This is kind of an extraordinary situation we now find ourselves in on the floor. I would like to reiterate something I said at the beginning of this debate. This is a very peculiar result. The Republican leadership has crafted such an unfair and unusual rule that it may have the exact opposite effect of what the Republican leadership intended. They are trying to defeat Shays-Meehan, but they have written such a terrible rule that they may in fact drive some of the opponents of Shays-Meehan into the Shays-Meehan camp. It is a very interesting result.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), the Democratic leader.

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

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I hope that we can still have a rule today that is fair and seen as fair by Members on both sides of the aisle. This issue is a bipartisan issue. It is an issue on which we have always had bipartisan support. What we are saying today is that a vote for the rule as it presently reads is a vote against real campaign reform. I know there is disagreement on that, but all we are really saying is that we would like and appreciate what we believe is a fair procedure. And to us that means allowing us to have a manager's amendment putting all of the changes that we want to make in our bill in order with one vote. We then are happy to face any amendments that anyone wants to, in an orderly way, make against this bill and then vote on the Ney bill and then vote, if that does not succeed, on the Shays-Meehan bill.

This is an important moment in our democracy. There are many of us who feel deeply that this system is flawed, that there is too much money involved in campaigns, that the American people have become cynical about politics and about our democracy, and we have to be able to at least have an effort to pass real, meaningful campaign reform now, today, or at the latest tomorrow or next week.

I ask the leadership in all sincerity to give us what we believed was a fair procedure, for us to be able to get our bill perfected and in front of the Congress, take any shots with any amendments that are desired and then give us a vote on Ney and a vote on Shays-Meehan.

I will just finally say again, this is a big moment for our country. A lot of people out there are watching. There are a lot of people out there, just ordinary citizens, who want there to be less special interests involved in the political process. They want the Government and the democracy returned to

them. They want to know that their small contributions of participation and checks into this system count as much as the \$50,000 and the \$100,000 and the \$500,000 checks.

□ 1500

I pray that we can come out of this House of Representatives today with real reform.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE).

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. REYNOLDS) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the rule. What could be more fair, Mr. Speaker, than to allow all the changes that Members have requested to be debated and voted in the daylight of public scrutiny on this floor. We are all here because we believe that righteousness exalts a nation, but let us craft a system today that exalts the righteous, brings down the corrupt but does not sacrifice the blood-bought liberties, the freedom of speech of all Americans.

I strongly support the rule and I urge its passage.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the debate on the rule be extended for 20 minutes, equal time between the majority and the minority.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would ask if the gentleman could please restate his unanimous consent request.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield under his reservation, I ask unanimous consent that the debate on the rule be extended 20 minutes, and for equal time between the majority and the minority.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, reserving my right to object, I would ask the gentleman why he is making this request. This is a very unusual request. I have been in the House for 23 years. I do not recall the time being extended on a rule at any time during the 23 years that I have served in the House of Representatives.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield under his reservation, I am a new guy in the House. I think that some of my colleagues have expressed that they would spend some time expressing their view on the rule. I think some of my colleagues are seeing some different dimensions on the rule in discussions with some of the colleagues after hearing some of the debate on the rule, and I am one of those that believes that before we conclude our business tonight we are going to have a full and open debate on campaign finance reform.

I think my colleagues are expressing in the debate of the rule the opportunity of how we will continue having an open, fair debate on campaign finance reform.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, continuing to reserve my right to object, I would ask a question, if I may, and I see that the chairman of the Committee on Rules is on his feet. I would ask the chairman, is it the intention of the majority side to seek a change in the rule at this point to amend the rule at this point?

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield under his reservation?

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST) for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, let me say it is obvious that we very much, in a bipartisan way, want to move ahead with campaign finance reform. My friend and I discussed this late last night in the Committee on Rules, and we fashioned a rule and it is quite possible that we could, as we have discussed with the side of the gentleman, propose a modification to the rule. As we work on that unanimous consent request which has just been propounded by the gentleman from New York (Mr. REYNOLDS), it is so that we might continue an interesting discussion on the issue of campaign finance reform and, during that time, ensure that we have a package put into place that will allow us to proceed with a full and fair and vigorous debate throughout the rest of the afternoon and evening.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I would ask the gentleman, is this discussion about changes in the rule only occurring on his side of the aisle or are there any Members on our side of the aisle who are being consulted about potential changes in the rule?

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, at this juncture, I will say that I know that there are consultations that have gone on in a bipartisan way.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I think there are conversations going on everywhere.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time is controlled by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST) under his reservation of objection.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the ranking member of the Committee on House Administration.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST) for yielding me this time.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I move for a call of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a call of the House is ordered.

Mr. HOYER. I do not believe the gentleman had the floor. He did not have the floor.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I believe that I had the floor. I do not believe the other gentleman is recognized.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from New York (Mr. REYNOLDS) withdraw his unanimous consent request?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my unanimous consent request.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The call was taken by electronic device, and the following Members responded to their names:

[Roll No. 227]

Abercrombie	Davis, Jo Ann	Houghton
Ackerman	Davis, Tom	Hoyer
Aderholt	Deal	Hulshof
Akin	Defazio	Hyde
Allen	DeGette	Inslee
Andrews	Delahunt	Isakson
Armey	DeLauro	Israel
Baca	DeLay	Issa
Bachus	DeMint	Istook
Baird	Deutsch	Jackson (IL)
Baker	Diaz-Balart	Jackson-Lee
Baldacci	Dicks	(TX)
Baldwin	Dingell	Jefferson
Ballenger	Doggett	Jenkins
Barcia	Doolittle	John
Barr	Doyle	Johnson (CT)
Barrett	Dreier	Johnson (IL)
Bartlett	Duncan	Johnson, E. B.
Barton	Dunn	Johnson, Sam
Bass	Edwards	Jones (NC)
Becerra	Ehlers	Jones (OH)
Bentsen	Ehrlich	Kanjorski
Bereuter	Emerson	Kaptur
Berkley	Engel	Keller
Berman	English	Kelly
Berry	Eshoo	Kennedy (MN)
Biggert	Etheridge	Kennedy (RI)
Bilirakis	Evans	Kerns
Bishop	Everett	Kildee
Blagojevich	Farr	Kilpatrick
Blumenauer	Fattah	Kind (WI)
Blunt	Ferguson	King (NY)
Boehlert	Filner	Kingston
Boehner	Flake	Kirk
Bonilla	Fletcher	Kleckzka
Bonior	Foley	Knollenberg
Bono	Forbes	Kolbe
Borski	Ford	Kucinich
Boswell	Fossella	LaFalce
Boucher	Frelinghuysen	LaHood
Boyd	Frost	Lampson
Brady (PA)	Gallegly	Langevin
Brady (TX)	Ganske	Lantos
Brown (FL)	Gekas	Largent
Brown (OH)	Gephart	Larsen (WA)
Brown (SC)	Gibbons	Larson (CT)
Bryant	Gilchrest	Latham
Burr	Gillmor	LaTourette
Burton	Gilman	Leach
Buyer	Gonzalez	Lee
Callahan	Goode	Levin
Calvert	Goodlatte	Lewis (GA)
Camp	Gordon	Lewis (KY)
Cannon	Goss	Linder
Cantor	Graham	Lipinski
Capito	Granger	LoBiondo
Capps	Graves	Lofgren
Capuano	Green (TX)	Lowey
Cardin	Green (WI)	Lucas (KY)
Carson (IN)	Greenwood	Lucas (OK)
Carson (OK)	Grucci	Luther
Castle	Gutierrez	Maloney (CT)
Chabot	Gutknecht	Maloney (NY)
Chambliss	Hall (OH)	Markey
Clay	Hall (TX)	Mascara
Clayton	Hansen	Matheson
Clement	Harman	Matsui
Clyburn	Hart	McCarthy (MO)
Coble	Hastings (FL)	McCarthy (NY)
Collins	Hastings (WA)	McCullom
Combest	Hayes	McCrery
Condit	Hayworth	McDermott
Conyers	Hefley	McGovern
Cooksey	Herger	McHugh
Costello	Hill	McInnis
Cox	Hilleary	McIntyre
Coyne	Hilliard	McKeon
Cramer	Hinchey	McKinney
Crane	Hinojosa	McNulty
Crenshaw	Hobson	Meehan
Crowley	Hoefel	Meeks (NY)
Cubin	Hoekstra	Menendez
Culberson	Holden	Mica
Cummings	Holt	Millender-
Cunningham	Honda	McDonald
Davis (CA)	Hooley	Miller (FL)
Davis (FL)	Horn	Miller, Gary
Davis (IL)	Hostettler	Miller, George