

today and the structure of that rule and see when and if that bill can come back to the floor.

Mr. BONIOR. So is the gentleman telling us that it may not come back to the floor of the House?

Mr. BLUNT. I am not saying that. I have not had time to calculate this. We really thought we were going to win this rule and vote on this tonight. We thought it was a fair rule, an equitable rule that clearly gave all options. Apparently, the majority did not think that, and I have no further information.

Mr. BONIOR. Let me ask the gentleman when he expects to bring the Patient's Bill of Rights to the floor; at what point next week?

Mr. BLUNT. We do not know yet, but we are hopeful that that bill could be on the floor next week. We think it would be mid to late in the week, if we get it to the floor, but we are hoping that that is one of the things that will come to the floor next week. It is an important issue; needs to be debated and moved forward. We hope we can start and maybe complete that process next week.

Mr. BONIOR. And do we know under what procedure the Patient's Bill of Rights may be brought to the floor next week?

Mr. BLUNT. I am unaware of any procedural decisions that have been made on that.

Mr. BONIOR. On the question of the faith-based initiatives, is that a probable, a maybe, or a most likely next week?

Mr. BLUNT. I think it is most likely that that bill will come out of the Committee on Ways and Means to the floor next week.

Mr. BONIOR. And if I might ask one other question of my friend from Missouri, what other appropriation bills did the gentleman mention that may see the floor action?

Mr. BLUNT. I mentioned we would go to Commerce-Justice, move to finish that and then move to Foreign Operations appropriations next week, if we meet our schedule.

Mr. BONIOR. I thank my friend, and I encourage him to encourage the rest of the leadership on his side of the aisle to bring back a rule that reflects the vote we just had. The American people I think desperately want us to address this campaign finance issue, they want to do it in a fair way, and I think the gentleman from Massachusetts and the gentleman from Connecticut deserve to have a fair shot at the bill that they want on the House floor.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONIOR. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. I just wanted to announce, for members of the Subcommittee on Energy and Air Quality of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, that we are going to finish our markup this evening. Food will be provided on a bipartisan basis, so I would

encourage all members of that subcommittee to come back to the markup, and I thank the gentleman for yielding.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, JULY 16, 2001

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 2 p.m. on Monday, July 16, 2001.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURRETTE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO HAVE UNTIL MIDNIGHT FRIDAY, JULY 13, 2001, TO FILE PRIVILEGED REPORT ON DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2002

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations have until midnight, July 13, 2001, to file a privileged report on a bill making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All points of order are reserved on the bill.

CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it is confusing as to what just occurred. I just hope that we will have an opportunity to fully address what a good portion of this House wanted to do today, and that is to debate in front of the American people the whole question of ridding this system of special interests.

I, for one, want to discuss the empowerment of those who are least empowered, the involvement of the grass

roots, the inclusion of every voter. And I had hoped that we would have written a rule that would have allowed the kind of formidable debate that would have addressed the question of making sure that democracy prevails in this Nation. I am equally disappointed that we have not given ourselves the opportunity to debate, as the Senate debated, for a period of time for the American voter to understand that we too believe that the best democracy is that of their vote, and that anything that we do in this House is based upon our representation of all of our citizens.

So I hope, as we end this week, that we will act upon the comments of the distinguished minority leader and that we will be able to review this and assess this for further consideration. We do need campaign finance reform.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KELLER). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SIMMONS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. SIMMONS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Ms. NORTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. SMITH of Michigan addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. PALLONE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

CONSERVATIVE AND LIBERAL GROUPS OPPOSED TO SHAYS-MEEHAN CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLITTLE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, I just have some comments on the Shays-Meehan bill. This thing just died of the weight of opposition against it. I just want to read from a list of both conservative and liberal groups who oppose this legislation.

In fact, you could get a positive rating from both the NARL, the National Abortion Rights League, and from the National Right to Life Committee by voting against this terrible bill. And then you can also get the same positive rating from the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and from the AFL-CIO.

I would just like to read into the record all these groups, 81 groups, from information obtained from the Committee on House Administration, all the groups who are opposed to the big government's campaign regulation bill, known as Shays-Meehan.

We have the American Civil Rights Union; the American Conservative Union; the Business-Industry PAC; the Center for Reclaiming America; the Christian Coalition; the Free Congress Foundation; Gun Owners Of America; the National Rifle Association; the National Right to Life Committee; the AFL-CIO; the Alliance for Justice; the American Civil Liberties Union; the Cato Institute; the Freedom Forum; the Libertarian Party; the National Association of Broadcasters; the National Association of Manufacturers; Associated Builders and Contractors; the U.S. Chamber of Commerce; Americans For Tax Reform; the United Auto Workers; the American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals; the Asian American Legal Defense and Education Fund; the Bazelon Center for Mental Health Law; the Business and Professional People for the Public Interest.

Again, just to remind you, Mr. Speaker, these are all the organizations opposed to the big government campaign regulation known as Shays-Meehan.

The Center for Digital Democracy; the Center for Law and Social Policy; the Center for Law in the Public Interest; the Center for Reproductive Law and Policy; the Center for Science in the Public Interest; the Children's Defense Fund; the Community Law Center; the Consumers Union; the Disability Rights Education and Defense Fund; the Drug Policy Foundation; Earthjustice Legal Defense Fund; Education Law Center; Employment Law Center; and Equal Rights Advocates.

Let me see, the James Madison Center for Free Speech; Gun Owners of America; Free Congress Foundation. Okay, we are at 41. Here are the other 40.

The Food Research and Action Center; the Harmon, Curran, Spielberg &

Eisenberg firm; the Human Rights Campaign Foundation; Institute for Public Representation at Georgetown University Law Center; the Juvenile Law Center; the League of Conservation Voters Education Fund; the Legal Aid Society of New York; the Mexican American Legal Defense and Educational Fund; the National Abortion and Reproductive Rights Action League Foundation; the National Association of Criminal Defense Lawyers; the National Center for Lesbian Rights; the National Center for Youth Law; the National Center on Poverty Law; the National Education Association; the National Employment Lawyers Association; the National Immigration Forum; the National Immigration Law Center; the National Law Center on Homelessness & Poverty; and for number 60, the National Legal Aid and Defender Association; all against the big government, heavy-handed, campaign finance regulation known as Shays-Meehan.

Number 61, and, again, all these groups are opposed, the National Mental Health Association; National Organization for Women Legal Defense; National Partnership for Women and Families; National Veterans Legal Services Program; National Women's Law Center; National Youth Advocacy Coalition; Native American Rights Fund; Natural Resources Defense Council; New York Lawyers for the Public Interest; Physicians for Human Rights; Physicians for Social Responsibility; Planned Parenthood Federation of America; Public Advocates, Inc.; Public Justice Center; the Tides Center; University of Pennsylvania, Public Service Program; Violence Policy Center; Welfare Law Center; the Wilderness Society; Women's Law Project; and the Youth Law Center.

Eighty-one organizations opposed to the big government, heavy-handed campaign finance bill that went down today known as Shays-Meehan or McCain-Feingold in the Senate. No wonder this proposal is not moving forward. All these groups, from liberal to conservative, are opposed to it. And the Democrats voted to kill the rule that would have brought it up.

□ 1800

FUNDING FOR FAITH-BASED INITIATIVES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KELLER). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I stand here in support of faith-based entities who have long worked to address social ills. In fact, we just recently, earlier this week, paid a tribute to the efforts of these entities and encouraged private corporations to contribute to their worthwhile efforts.

This Congress will also likely consider proposals aimed at providing gov-

ernment funding to faith-based entities, Charitable Choice. However, I have grave concerns with those proposals and believe that before adopting them, they merit serious examination to ensure that they do not work to dilute our Nation's constitutional principles and civil rights law.

First, are we prepared to modify our constitutional principle of separation of church and state to one promoting a church state?

The First Amendment says Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof. This clause was intended to erect a wall of separation between church and state. In essence, our Nation has been successful in preventing the church from controlling the state and the state from controlling the religion.

The current faith-based proposals threaten this very important principle. Which religious entities will qualify for the government funding? Will the more dominant or better financed faiths be awarded the grants? The government will be forced to choose one religion or denomination over the other.

Once the entities accept government funding, they then must be held accountable for the use of these funds. As such, faith-based entities will open themselves up to government regulation. So we must ask ourselves, will groups forego the full expression of their religious beliefs, their independence and autonomy in exchange for money? Are we comfortable with our houses of worship becoming houses of investigation?

Further, while the proposals state that government funds should not be used for worship or proselytization, meaningful safeguards to prevent such action are not included in the provisions. The consequence is the possibility of use of government funds to promote certain religious beliefs or a beneficiary of social programs being subject to religious influence that is not welcome.

In addition to ensuring that faith-based initiatives do not threaten our Nation's constitutional principles, we must also guarantee that our citizens will remain protected under our civil rights laws. Religious institutions are currently exempted from the ban on religious discrimination and employment provided under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. As such, if faith-based proposals do not include a repeal of this exemption, these institutions will be able to engage in government-funded employment discrimination.

Allowing the exemption to be applied to hiring and staffing decisions by religious entities as they deliver critical services flies in the face of our Nation's long-standing principle that Federal funds may not be used in a discriminatory fashion.

As I reflect on those who fought hard to secure civil rights for us all, and as one who has been a strong advocate myself, I cannot sit idly by and watch