

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	DeLauro
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)
Boehler	Filner	Kingston
Boehner	Flake	Kirk
Bonilla	Fletcher	Klecicka
Bonior	Foley	Knollenberg
Bono	Forbes	Kolbe
Borski	Ford	Kucinich
Boswell	Fossella	LaFalce
Boucher	Frelinghuysen	LaHood
Boyd	Frost	Lampson
Brady (PA)	Galleghy	Langevin
Brady (TX)	Ganske	Lantos
Brown (FL)	Gekas	Largent
Brown (OH)	Gephardt	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)	McCollum
Combest	Hayes	McCrery
Condit	Hayworth	McDermott
Conyers	Hefley	McGovern
Cooksey	Herger	McHugh
Costello	Hill	McInnis
Cox	Hilleary	McIntyre
Coyne	Hilliard	McKeon
Cramer	Hinches	McKinney
Crane	Hinojosa	McNulty
Crenshaw	Hobson	Meehan
Crowley	Hoeffel	Meeks (NY)
Cubin	Hoekstra	Menendez
Culberson	Holden	Mica
Cummings	Holt	Millender-
Cunningham	Honda	McDonald
Davis (CA)	Hoolley	Miller (FL)
Davis (FL)	Horn	Miller, Gary
Davis (IL)	Hostettler	Miller, George

Mink	Rodriguez	Stupak
Mollohan	Roemer	Sununu
Moore	Rogers (KY)	Sweeney
Moran (KS)	Rogers (MI)	Tancredó
Moran (VA)	Rohrabacher	Tanner
Morella	Ros-Lehtinen	Tauscher
Murtha	Ross	Tauzin
Myrick	Rothman	Taylor (MS)
Nadler	Roukema	Taylor (NC)
Napolitano	Roybal-Allard	Terry
Neal	Royce	Thomas
Nethercutt	Rush	Thompson (CA)
Ney	Ryan (WI)	Thompson (MS)
Northup	Ryun (KS)	Thornberry
Norwood	Sabo	Thune
Nussle	Sanchez	Thurman
Oberstar	Sanders	Tiahrt
Obey	Sandlin	Tiberi
Olver	Sawyer	Tierney
Ortiz	Saxton	Toomey
Osborne	Scarborough	Towns
Ose	Schaffer	Trafigant
Otter	Schakowsky	Turner
Oxley	Schiff	Udall (CO)
Pallone	Schrock	Udall (NM)
Pascrell	Scott	Upton
Pastor	Sensenbrenner	Velazquez
Payne	Serrano	Visclosky
Pelosi	Sessions	Vitter
Pence	Shadegg	Walden
Peterson (MN)	Shaw	Walsh
Peterson (PA)	Shays	Wamp
Petri	Sherman	Waters
Phelps	Sherwood	Watkins (OK)
Pickering	Shimkus	Watson (CA)
Pitts	Shows	Watt (NC)
Platts	Shuster	Watts (OK)
Pombo	Simmons	Waxman
Pomeroy	Simpson	Weiner
Portman	Skeen	Weldon (FL)
Price (NC)	Skelton	Weldon (PA)
Pryce (OH)	Slaughter	Weller
Putnam	Smith (MI)	Wexler
Quinn	Smith (NJ)	Whitfield
Radanovich	Smith (TX)	Wicker
Rahall	Smith (WA)	Wilson
Ramstad	Snyder	Wolf
Rangel	Solis	Woolsey
Regula	Souder	Wu
Rehberg	Spratt	Wynn
Reyes	Stearns	Young (AK)
Reynolds	Stenholm	Young (FL)
Riley	Strickland	
Rivers	Stump	

□ 1713

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). On this rollcall, 422 Members have recorded their presence by electronic device, a quorum.

Under the rule, further proceedings under the call are dispensed with.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York (Mr. REYNOLDS) has 1 minute remaining on debate on the rule.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, the time is here. We are going to have a vote on this rule. This is a fair rule. It allows for full debate on Shays-Meehan, along with the 14 changes the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN) want to make to their own bill. It provides an opportunity for an amendment of the Ney-Wynn bill, the Doolittle bill and the Linder bill, along with numerous other amendments of Members who appeared before the Committee on Rules.

It is a fair rule, one that allows for a full, balanced debate on this very important legislation. This will bring

about, once and for all, a great debate, a debate that the entire House can participate in. The rule that is provided before us, if it is voted up, we have the debate; if it is voted down, it is for those who opposed it to live for another day to demagogue it, rather than vote on it.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, the 2000 presidential election may well be remembered for "hanging chads" and other evidence of the imperfections in our electoral system. The right to vote is our most precious freedom. We cannot afford to have a repeat of last fall's problems.

The 2000 presidential election, therefore, should direct our attention once again to the need for campaign and electoral reform. Both political parties are motivated to address the issue in this 107th session of the Congress. I have already cosponsored legislation to provide states with the tools they need to ensure uniformity and improve voter accuracy and access. We must be careful, however, not to let our efforts to achieve voting reform mask the critical problem with our electoral process—the uncontrolled and pernicious influence of big money on the outcome of our elections. So, today, I rise in strong support of the Shays-Meehan legislation, which will help fix many of our system's problems.

It is time for Congress to enact campaign finance reform because quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, our federal campaign finance system is broken. Last year, both parties spent unprecedented amounts in soft money for a new record in the campaigns for control of the White House and Congress.

New Mexicans—like all Americans—are justifiably appalled by the fact that the amount of money spent in elections has increased exponentially with no end in sight. The Democratic and Republican national party committees raised a record \$463 million in soft money from January 1, 1999 through December 31, 2000, according to a Common Cause analysis released in February. The amount raised during this past election cycle was nearly double the \$235.9 million raised during the 1995–1996 election cycle. We must take action now.

In the 106th Congress, and again in the 107th, I was elected by my colleagues to take a leadership role on the issue of campaign finance reform in the House of Representatives. In September 1999, I helped floor manage the House's passage of the Shays-Meehan legislation which would have closed some of the worst loopholes in the campaign finance laws. However, this bill never became law because of the opposition of a single Senator.

In spite of this setback, a bipartisan group, led by JOHN MCCAIN and RUSSELL FEINGOLD, have passed their legislation in the other body. It is my hope that, this year, the House will follow suit, and pass meaningful campaign finance reform legislation and that the President will sign it into law.

Current law authorizes contributions by individuals of up to \$1,000 per candidate per election and up to \$5,000 per Political Action Committee (PAC) per election. Corporations and unions are prohibited from making any contributions to candidates or their campaigns.

Nevertheless, individuals, unions, and corporations give contributions of hundreds of thousands of dollars, indeed, millions to campaigns as so-called "soft" money to the political parties themselves. The soft money loop-

hole is based on the fiction that a contribution to the Democratic party or the Republican party is different in reality from a contribution to the party's candidates. It is fiction because parties spend most of the contributions on television campaigns and those campaigns have one goal—electing candidates. Banning unregulated, unlimited contributions to parties is the core of campaign finance reform.

Campaign finance reform is vital to every other piece of legislation that Congress considers. From the very real need for a patients bill of rights to the acute need for a comprehensive national energy policy, to the need for a Medicare prescription drug benefit to education reform, the people's voices should be heard and not drowned out by big money. Vested interests have too often been able to exert influence in Congress and White House through the soft money loophole.

Mr. Speaker, campaign finance reform is the most important step Congress can take to restore citizens' belief in our democratic process. What better motivation for reform than the egregious excesses of the 2000 election—both in voter access and in campaign contributions? We must act before the 2002 election, before the abuses of the electoral process have so distorted the democratic ideal that we are no longer truly a "government of the people, by the people and for the people."

I urge my colleagues to vote for this bill. The time is now for real campaign finance reform. Passage of the Shays-Meehan legislation is the only true way to achieve that goal.

Mr. BALDACCI. Mr. Speaker, I am outraged by the unprecedented rule that has been developed for consideration of the Shays-Meehan campaign finance reform legislation. I have never before seen a rule that divides a Manager's Amendment into 14 separate provisions and requires each of them to be passed individually. The Republican Leadership has really outdone themselves this time in finding new and creative ways to thwart the will of the American people.

Since first being elected to office, I have strongly supported meaningful campaign finance reform. I was so hopeful last year when the House passed Shays-Meehan by an overwhelming vote—only to see it die in the Senate.

This year, we were hopeful again. The Senate has passed McCain-Feingold. The House Leadership committed to allowing a vote on Shays-Meehan.

But the Republican Leadership is still trying to pull the rug from under reform again. The Republican Leadership's rule is designed to make it as difficult as possible for Shays-Meehan to pass in the form its sponsors recommend.

If the Rule is defeated, as I believe it should be, the Leadership should rest assured that supporters of campaign finance reform will not go quietly. The American people have said time and again that they want to see our campaign finance system cleaned up in a meaningful way. Defeating this rule will not defeat this issue. We will be back, and Shays-Meehan will ultimately pass this body.

Americans have lost all confidence in the campaign finance system. Rules like this may cause them to lose all confidence in the U.S. Congress. I urge my colleagues to defeat this rule and to demand that Shays-Meehan be brought back under a fair rule so that we can do the will of the American people and start