

Committee on Resources, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, the Committee on Ways and Means, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to transmit the 2002 National Drug Control Strategy, consistent with the Office of National Drug Control Policy Reauthorization Act of 1998 (21 U.S.C. 1705).

Illegal drug use threatens everything that is good about our country. It can break the bonds between parents and children. It can turn productive citizens into addicts, and it can transform schools into places of violence and chaos. Internationally, it finances the work of terrorists who use drug profits to fund their murderous work. Our fight against illegal drug use is a fight for our children's future, for struggling democracies, and against terrorism.

We have made progress in the past. From 1985 to 1992, drug use among high school seniors dropped each year. Progress was steady and, over time, dramatic. However, in recent years we have lost ground. This Strategy represents the first step in the return of the fight against drugs to the center of our national agenda. We must do this for one great moral reason: over time, drugs rob men, women, and children of their dignity and of their character.

We acknowledge that drug use among our young people is at unacceptably high levels. As a Nation, we know how to teach character, and how to dissuade children from ever using illegal drugs. We need to act on that knowledge.

This Strategy also seeks to expand the drug treatment system, while recognizing that even the best treatment program cannot help a drug user who does not seek its assistance. The Strategy also recognizes the vital role of law enforcement and interdiction programs, while focusing on the importance of attacking the drug trade's key vulnerabilities.

Previous Strategies have enjoyed bipartisan political and funding support in the Congress. I ask for your continued support in this critical endeavor.

GEORGE W. BUSH.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 12, 2002.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 5:30 p.m.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 49 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 5:30 p.m.

□ 1735

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON) at 5 o'clock and 35 minutes p.m.

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 344 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 344

Resolved, That on the next legislative day after the adoption of this resolution, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, the House shall resolve 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, or to the bill as perfected by an amendment in the nature of a substitute finally adopted, shall be in order except those printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII and as specified in this resolution.

SEC. 2. (a) Before consideration of any other amendment, it shall be in order to consider the amendments in the nature of a substitute specified in subsection (b). Each such amendment may be offered only in the order specified, may be offered only by the Member designated or a designee of such Member, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for 40 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to amendment except as specified in section 3. All points of order against such amendments are waived (except those arising under clause 7 of rule XVI or clause 5(a) of rule XXI). If more than one amendment in the nature of a substitute specified in subsection (b) is adopted, then only the one receiving the greater number of affirmative votes shall be considered as finally adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. In the case of a tie for the greater number of affirmative votes, then only the last amendment to receive that number of affirmative votes shall be considered as finally adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole.

(b) The amendments in the nature of a substitute referred to in subsection (a) are as follows:

- (1) By The Majority Leader.
- (2) By Representative Ney of Ohio.
- (3) By Representative Shays of Connecticut.

SEC. 3. (a) After disposition of the amendments in the nature of a substitute specified in section 2(b), the provisions of the bill, or the provisions of the bill as perfected by an amendment in the nature of a substitute finally adopted, shall be considered as an original bill for the purpose of further amendment under the five-minute rule and shall be considered as read. No further amendment shall be in order except those specified in subsection (b) of this section. Each such amendment may be offered only by the Member designated in subsection (b) or a designee of such Member, but not before the legislative day after the day on which such Member announces in accordance with subsection (c) in the House or in the Com-

mittee of the Whole the intention of the Member to offer the amendment. Each such amendment shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for 20 minutes 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 such amendments are waived (except those arising under clause 7 of rule XVI or clause 5(a) of rule XXI).

(b) The amendments referred to in subsection (a) are as follows:

(1) Ten amendments by the Majority Leader.

(2) Five amendments by the Minority Leader.

(3) Five amendments by Representative Shays of Connecticut or Representative Meehan of Massachusetts.

(c) The announcement referred to in subsection (a) shall describe the amendment by the number assigned to it under clause 8 of rule XVIII and may not be made later than the end of the legislative day on which this resolution is adopted. A Member may make only one such announcement, which must include any amendment the Member intends to offer but must be limited to the number of amendments specified in subsection (b) of this section for the bill or for each substitute specified in section 2(b).

SEC. 4. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, the House shall resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 5. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill, or the bill as perfected by an amendment in the nature of a substitute finally adopted, to the House with such further amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any further amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill, or to the bill as perfected by an amendment in the nature of a substitute finally 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. 6. House Resolution 203 is laid on the table.

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

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

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York (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 344 is a structured rule providing for consideration of H.R. 2356, the Bipartisan Campaign Finance Reform Act of 2001, with 1 hour of debate in the House, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on House Administration.

I would like to stress that this rule before us was not written by nor is a product of the Committee on Rules. The rule reflects the terms for consideration set forth in the motion to discharge, with the exception of allowing immediate debate this week, versus a later date, as determined by the House rules. The petition calls for amendments to be introduced and printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by the close of business today.

Equally important, I would like to stress that, essentially, we do not know what amendments we are about to make in order, because the Shays-Meehan, Ney-Wynn and Arney substitutes will not be filed until after this rule is debated and approved.

Unfortunately, it is a shame to see this issue come to the floor in such a convoluted manner. The signers of the discharge petition have set in motion a clumsy and awkward debate that could hardly be called a fair and open process. There were no hearings on the language we will see on the floor tomorrow.

All this comes as a result of the discharge petition. But since circumstances have afforded this opportunity for debate, let us look at the issue before us and what it means to America.

The recent events have forged a true sense of patriotism among all Americans. But we must ask ourselves if we are willing to trample on this newfound nationalism by jeopardizing the most basic of American rights and freedoms, the right to free speech, because in this fourth version of Shays-Meehan, we have gagged Americans, whether in the middle, the right or the left, and will allow only special interests to have access to soft money.

It is reasonable to debate strengthening our campaign finance laws, but taking away first amendment rights and limiting free speech is not the way to do it. Real reform means recognizing that curbing the expense of campaigns should not come at the expense of political liberties. Limiting issue advocacy and curtailing who can say what is both unconstitutional and un-American.

We would be fooling ourselves if we believed the notion that the Shays-Meehan legislation represents a complete ban on soft money. Let us be honest: In this bill there is no such thing as a ban on soft money. At least the Ney-Wynn proposal ensures that such expenditures are used for political party activities, such as voter registration, get out the vote, overhead and fund-raising expenses.

□ 1745

Now, neither this issue nor the bill is new. In fact, the Shays-Meehan bill was in existence even before I came to Congress. But today, Shays-Meehan is in its fourth draft; I repeat, its fourth draft, and is vastly different than what was first proposed.

This new bill creates even bigger loopholes than before, creating \$30 mil-

lion per year soft-money loophole, restricting broadcast ads for only 60 days prior to an election that even some of the sponsors admit could be unconstitutional, rather than year-round, and loosening even further the loopholes that allow party committees to shift their current soft money over to non-profits who, in turn, could use 100 percent soft money for issue advocacy.

Mr. Speaker, Shays-Meehan creates a \$60 million soft-money loophole for State and local parties. It creates a new loophole to permit a \$40 million soft-money building fund for the Democratic National Committee if both amendments are approved by some of the Shays-Meehan supporters. In short, Shays-Meehan establishes a pathway to new and more underground money.

Creating loopholes and granting special exemptions hardly seems like reform.

Even more preposterous is the fact that some sponsors of the Shays-Meehan bill do not want to curtail soft money right away. That is right. Those supporters say, let us wait until after Election Day, the next cycle, before any of this takes effect rather than the current legislation of 30 days. Why? One simple reason: the rhetoric fails to match up to the reality. The bill's sponsors are now in the newspapers and on the talk shows saying how critical this reform package is. But now they say it can wait.

Mr. Speaker, I suspect at some point during this debate my colleagues will attempt to make a correlation between campaign finance reform and the recent Enron scandal. They will demagogue and demagogue again that the corporate downfall of Enron could have in some way been averted had tougher campaign finance laws been on the books. Is there anyone who truly believes this to be the case? Is there anyone who can look those pension holders in the eye and honestly say that campaign finance reform would have prevented Enron's collapse? The only connection between Enron's downfall and campaign finance reform is political convenience.

On a side note, I would like to extend my respect to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY), the chairman of the Committee on House Administration. As a member of his committee, I have come to respect his realistic and pragmatic approach to real campaign finance reform.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make sure that my colleagues know that today this House will deal once and for all with a major decision on campaign finance reform. It is very important that all Members look very closely and know full well what it is that we may be passing.

The Committee on Rules reported out this rule without recommendation, and, in doing so, I hesitate to ask my colleagues to support the rule. However, by signing the discharge petition, a majority of this House has signaled their desire to have this debate. And

so, in mirroring the conciliatory actions of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT), the Speaker of the House, I ask my colleagues to vote "aye" on the rule.

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

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. REYNOLDS) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the rule for considering campaign finance reform is a fair rule, and I intend to support it. This rule was spelled out in the discharge petition that the majority of House Members, including myself, signed. The rule gives both sides a chance to offer substitutes and amendments to the legislation, while also bringing debate on this highly charged issue to a timely conclusion.

The rule designates H.R. 2356, the reported version of the Shays-Meehan campaign finance reform bill, as the base bill. Beginning tomorrow morning, we will have 1 hour of general debate on the bill, equally divided between the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER). Following the general debate, the bill will be considered for amendment.

Members should be aware that the rule requires that all amendments be entered into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by the conclusion of this legislative day. It is anticipated that there will be an announcement at some point later this evening by both the majority leader and the Democratic leader about the specific amendments to be considered.

Before consideration of any other amendment, the rule provides that three amendments in the nature of a substitute will be considered. Each substitute will be debated for 40 minutes, equally divided between proponents and opponents. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY), the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY), and the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) are allowed to each offer one substitute. Under the Queen of the Hill procedure, the substitute with the most votes will then be considered the base text.

Following consideration and voting on the substitutes, it will then be in order to consider individual perfecting amendments. These individual amendments are debatable for 20 minutes, equally divided between proponents and opponents. The amendments are allocated as follows: 10 from the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY), five from the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT) if he chooses to use them, and five from either the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) or the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN.)

Finally, at the conclusion of the amendment process, the rule provides for a motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, the various provisions of the bills before us are technical and somewhat confusing, but there is one thing that is abundantly clear: campaign reform legislation will require both parties to look for alternative means to turn out their base supporters. As many Members know, hard-money contributions are currently regulated by Federal law, while soft-money contributions are not. Hard money is made up of contributions to Federal candidates, Federal multi-candidate PACs, and to the Federal accounts of national and State parties. Soft money is everything else.

Under current law, individuals can give a total of \$25,000 a year in hard-money contributions. Unions, corporations, and other associations can set up multi-candidate PACs which can give a limited amount of hard money directly to candidates and to party committees. Thus, multi-candidate PACs can give \$5,000 in hard money per election to any Federal candidate, \$15,000 per year in hard money to any national party committee, and \$5,000 in hard money per year to any State party committee. Employees of corporations, members of unions, and members of associations contribute to these multi-candidate, hard-money PACs, but no corporate or union money can go into these PACs.

Soft money is made up of contributions by individuals to party committees that exceed the individual's \$25,000 annual hard-dollar limit, contributions by corporations to party committees, and contributions by labor unions to party committees. Additionally, individuals, corporations, and labor unions can give any amount of soft money to independent organizations not connected to political parties.

The various proposals before the House seek to significantly change all of this. For example, under the Shays-Meehan bill, hard-dollar limits for individuals would be raised from \$50,000 per 2-year cycle to \$95,000. Soft-money contributions to national party committees by individuals, corporations, and labor unions would be totally banned, and soft-money contributions to State parties would be limited to \$10,000 per year, and then could be used only for certain limited purposes. Various restrictions would be placed on the use of soft money by independent organizations not directly connected with a political party.

Mr. Speaker, what does all this mean? Well, the answer depends on the type of political race involved.

Traditionally, the national Democratic Party has relied on soft money to mobilize its minority supporters through grass-roots efforts such as phone banks and door-to-door canvassing. The party has funded statewide-coordinated campaigns designed to turn out minority voters for Presidential voters in key swing States such as Michigan, Pennsylvania, and Illinois, and for its nominees for U.S. Senate and Governor in a number of States.

Republicans have also used soft money to fund coordinated campaigns designed to mobilize their base voters for Presidential and statewide candidates. On balance, however, the mobilization efforts directed at turning out minority voters statewide are more important to Democratic candidates than mobilization efforts funded by the Republican Party.

Some of the funds traditionally used to mobilize base voters could be replaced by the limited soft-money contributions permitted to State parties under Shays-Meehan; but clearly, this will be a challenge for both parties in future statewide campaigns.

The bill's total ban on soft money to national parties, accompanied by a major curtailment of soft money to State parties, will also have a significant effect in campaigns for the U.S. House of Representatives. This is particularly true if the ban on soft-money expenditures by independent groups is held constitutional by the courts.

In recent years, both parties have benefited from soft-money issue ads directed at campaigns for the U.S. House. In 1996, interest groups aligned with the Democratic Party spent millions of dollars on soft-money issue ads directed largely at Republican candidates who supported the Gingrich revolution, which was one of the factors in Democrats picking up nine seats that year.

In 2000, organizations connected with the pharmaceutical industry spent millions of dollars in soft money supporting Republicans and opposing Democrats, thus helping Republicans hold their narrow majority in the House. In both 1998 and 2000, Democratic Party committees and Republican Party committees spent millions of dollars in soft money on issue ads. On balance, Republican Party committees and independent organizations aligned with the Republican Party outspend the Democratic Party, and organizations aligned with the Democratic Party on soft-money issue ads directed at races for the U.S. House of Representatives.

Soft-money expenditures by both Democratic and Republican national parties also occurred on voter turnout efforts for House races during those years and, in some cases, made the difference and the outcome of particular elections. These turnout efforts have been particularly important to Democratic House candidates.

In summary, restrictions on soft money hurt both parties, but in somewhat different ways. Accordingly, Members of the House will have to weigh a variety of factors in deciding how to vote on the various proposals presented under this rule.

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

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER).

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I believe we have just heard a defense of soft

money, if it is used for purposes that the Democrats agree with: do not use it for issue ads, but use it for turning out minority voters, I think I heard him say.

As a member of the Committee on Rules, I must admit that I would not traditionally propose or support using the discharge process to bring this kind of bill to the House floor. However, I do support bringing this measure to the floor for debate, and if that means that we would have to agree to the major tenants of the rule proposed by the discharge petition for H.R. 2356, then so be it.

It is time that we considered this measure. It is time that we laid to rest allegations of unfairness and obstruction, and it is time that we address the fanciful claims that Shays-Meehan bans soft money. It does not.

As my colleagues well know, soft money is defined as money that is raised and spent outside the Federal regulatory framework. Because of this broad definition, there are numerous types of soft money and a significant number of avenues through which soft money can be used to influence Federal elections, thus making it all the more baffling that the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN) claim to have eliminated soft money with their sole elimination of national party soft money. Let me state clearly and unequivocally: Shays-Meehan does not ban soft money.

During the 2000 Presidential campaign, the Republican Party and the Democrat Party raised, in national party soft money, roughly \$250 million each. However, even totaled, this number pales to the amount of money that corporations and unions spend on electioneering activities.

If Congress wishes to ban the use of all soft money to influence political decisions, such a ban would affect or should affect everyone and every organization involved in political activity. It hardly seems appropriate to deny political parties a role in campaigns while allowing corporate conglomerates the opportunity to shape the political debate. In fact, by eliminating the role of parties, corporations and labor unions could become increasingly reliant on loopholes allowing them to spend funds from their general treasuries to influence elections, activities that would be undertaken without Federal regulation.

Truth be told, however, unions are the single biggest spenders of unregulated soft money, expenditures that will not be affected by Shays-Meehan. Dr. Leo Troy, professor of economics at Rutgers University, has been studying unions for more than 2 decades. He estimates that during the 1995-1996 election cycle alone, unions spent more than \$300 million just on voter education and get-out-the-vote efforts. This hardly seems like leveling the playing field, as unions can and will continue to influence the political

process. If we give individuals, corporations, and unions a legal avenue to funnel soft money into the political process into State and local parties, they will continue to do so.

□ 1800

They will continue to do so. This Shays-Meehan does not ban soft money, nor will it stop other people from engaging in it. This is only logical. This is not reform. This does not even begin to address the concept of reform. Shays-Meehan is merely diverting and channeling soft money into an ever-growing number of parties, while allowing corporations and unions to spend unlimited and unregulated dollars on electioneering. This does not and will not change the amount or type of money in the system, and it certainly does not alter the ability of outside groups to influence elections.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER), who is the principal author of the discharge petition that brought this matter to the House.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, we are at a historic moment in the House of Representatives. This rule which will allow us to debate historic campaign finance reform did not come to this floor without considerable work. This issue has been before the House of Representatives before, and the House passed similar reform legislation but it died in the Senate.

Last year when the Senate passed campaign finance reform, a rule was proposed that was destined to defeat true reform; and it was turned down by the House of Representatives. The Speaker announced that he would not bring it forward again, and we initiated over 7 months ago a discharge procedure led by the Blue Dog Democrats in the House to bring this issue to the floor.

I want to thank Speaker HASTERT for allowing us, once we did reach the 218, to allow the Committee on Rules to adopt the identical rule contained in the petition to allow us to have a fair and open debate on campaign finance reform.

Let there be no mistake about it, this is the opportunity of this House to end the influence, the undue influence of big money in the political process. This is our opportunity to end the 25, 50, 100, quarter of a million dollar contributions and more that are being made today to political parties in the form of what we call soft money. This legislation will restore the public's confidence and trust in the political process. And let there be no mistake, the Ney substitute is not true reform. It does not end soft-money contributions to the political process.

Yesterday, I was able to participate in a press conference with some of the leading business CEOs from around the country who have joined together under the umbrella of the Subcommittee on Economic Development, Public Buildings, and Emergency Man-

agement of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. Those business leaders said they are tired of being leaned on for these big checks. They are ready to see this system cleaned up. They are ready to know that when they come before this Congress there is a level playing field for all people, including them.

I am proud to support this legislation and this rule.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, everyone likes to say that they are for reform, and it is very unfortunate that there are some people who are supportive of the Shays-Meehan bill who argue that those of us who are not necessarily supporting their version of what they call reform are somehow opposed to the process of campaign finance reform.

Well, I am proud to stand here and, Mr. Speaker, say that I will take a back seat to no one when it comes to the very important issue of reform. I have been very proud to internally bring about some reforms of this institution. We were able to, in the last Congress, reduce the number of rules in this place from 52 down to 28 rules. We brought about sweeping reforms when we became the majority.

One of the things that I am very proud of, Mr. Speaker, is that when we became the majority we said that we were not going to put in place the kind of rule that we are considering right now for this legislation. It has all of these sort of inside baseball things, like a "king of the hill" procedure. I am not going to get into the details of it, but I will tell you it is unfair and it is wrong. But having said that, I am going to support the rule.

I am going to support the rule simply because 218 members of House of Representatives signed the discharge petition, and for that reason I think it is important that we move ahead. When it comes to the issue of campaign finance reform, I am for it. I am for it, Mr. Speaker. I am a proponent of reform, and I do not want anyone to say that I am not pro-reform. I happen to believe that what we need to do is we need to empower the American people with as much information as possible.

In fact, in the last couple of Congresses I have introduced legislation called the Voter Empowerment Act, and basically what we say, as President Bush has said, we need to instantly make available information on who is supporting whom so the voters can make a decision as to whether or not a Member of Congress is somehow beholden to their contributors.

I also believe that if we are going to ban soft money, we should ban it all the way across the board. And I think we should make this package effective

immediately, as my colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), said on television on Sunday. I think we should do it now. I believe we should also realize that the proposal before us, which is called reform, we have not actually seen it yet. We will see it somewhere around midnight tonight. So much for a fair and open process. But we will see it very, very late tonight, and then we will proceed.

Based on what I have heard about it, it does impose more regulations on the American people. And I came here to deregulate, and I did not come here to jeopardize the ability of Americans to exercise their first amendment rights.

I happen to believe that another issue needs to be addressed here, Mr. Speaker. I happen to be a strong proponent of the two-party system. I am proud to have worked around the world encouraging the development of political parties. Let us take that historic election which took place in 2000 in Mexico. For 71 year we saw one political party, the PRI Party, the Institution and Revolutionary Party, control Mexico. And with the encouragement of the National Election Party and support from around the world for a degree of political pluralism in Mexico, we saw a political party, when it came to getting support from all over, in a position where they were able to win the election.

Well, we also encouraged it in eastern and central Europe; in Nicaragua we encouraged it. What is it we brought about? We brought about a degree of fairness. We brought about a great contrast. And that is what exists here in the United States today, an interesting clash between the two political parties and then we allow the American people to make a decision.

Well, the measure we are going to be considering, the Shays-Meehan bill, basically undermines the two-party system. If you look at countries where the party systems are really in a state of disarray, they have had real difficulty. I do not want the United States of America to follow that route. I want both the Democratic Party and the Republican Party to remain strong. And I do not like the idea of us empowering the media when it comes to determining who is going to win these elections. I think that is wrong. I think the parties should be able to stand strongly for the ideals on which they were founded.

So I believe that we have a package of reforms that are the right thing to do. I think that we should say that union members should with their dues be able to decide which candidates they support without having a few people here in Washington, D.C. decide how those dollars are expended.

I think we should do everything we can to let the American people know that we want them to have choices and we do not want to jeopardize the great system that we have.

We live with reforms today. They were put into place following Watergate, 1974. I was privileged, I wrote my

senior thesis at Claremont-McKenna College on the campaign finance reform of 1974. We live with it today. And while some people talk about the fact that we have some horribly corrupt system here in our Nation's capital, well, I argue that we have a great degree of transparency and we can have even more. And, again, as my friend, the gentleman from New York (Mr. REYNOLDS), said, those who will try to draw this allusion between the bankruptcy of Enron and the political process, obviously, there is no correlation.

We need to encourage people to get involved in the political process, rather than making it unattractive to be involved in the political process. And you make it unattractive when you impose an onerous level of burdens on the American people; and that is exactly what this legislation will do.

I believe also, if we look at this question of a conference, and, again, I am getting back to inside baseball here, if we all want openness, we want to follow the legislative process, those who argue by going to a joint House-Senate conference we are killing the prospect for any kind of reform, I do not believe that for one second. Sure, if given the choice of imposing onerous regulations on the American people undermining their first amendment rights or seeing nothing done, I choose to have nothing done. But I believe the thoughtful reforms that we have in the Ney-Wynn proposal, the disclosure issue that I mentioned, the other kinds of proposals, those can be addressed in a joint House-Senate conference, and we can come back with improved legislation.

So those who say they do not want us to go to conference are in fact saying, let us not follow the constitutional guidelines, the process which was put into place by our framers for making laws. I do not believe that is an open process. I do not believe that is a fair process.

So let us do what we are paid to do here. Let us legislate. Let us work. Let us try to come to a package which will be beneficial for the American people. That should be our number one priority.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN), who has worked tirelessly on this project for a very long time.

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and thank the ranking member for yielding me time.

Thanks in large part to the efforts of the Blue Dogs, we will consider meaningful campaign finance reform legislation under a fair process. I want to thank every Member who signed that discharge petition, particularly the minority leader, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), who worked tirelessly to get us back to the floor under a fair rule.

Mr. Speaker, with the Enron scandal casting a cloud over the White House and the capital, this House has a his-

toric opportunity to reform our campaign finance laws by ending the soft-money system. Twice this House has passed bipartisan campaign finance reform with over 250 votes, but never with such a strong chance that the bill would become law. Tomorrow will be the moment of truth for reform. The role will be called and the votes will be counted. And over the course of this debate opponents of reform will attempt to perpetuate several myths about our bill in an attempt to stop us. But do not be fooled.

Myth number one, Shays-Meehan has been weakened to the point that it is meaningless. My friend, if that were true, do you think getting this bill passed into law would be so difficult? Would this floor fight be described as Armageddon?

Here are the facts: our bill bans soft-money contributions to the national parties, prevents Federal office holders from raising soft money for parties to spend in Federal elections, and prohibits State parties from spending soft money on TV attack ads attacking Federal candidates.

Myth number two, it is a partisan bill. This is a bipartisan bill. If this were a partisan bill, I have complete confidence that the President of the United States would be waving his veto pen for all of us to see. But he is not. McCain-Feingold, Shays-Meehan, Levin, Castle, Graham, Stenholm, Roukema, Lieberman, Thompson, Snowe, Wamp. The list goes on and on, Democrats and Republicans joining together to say enough is enough.

Myth number three, the Ney bill is a better choice. The truth is the Ney bill allows \$900,000 in soft money per donor to be given to national parties in just one election cycle, and unlimited money to the State parties for TV attack ads on Federal candidates. The Ney bill is not serious reform. It is, to put it bluntly, a political device proposed in an attempt to break apart our reform coalition.

Myth number four, Shays-Meehan is unconstitutional. The Supreme Court has upheld contribution limits time and time again. This Court has long upheld laws saying that spending on campaign ads has to be disclosed and has to come from hard money. The Shays-Meehan bill makes sure that campaign ads masquerading as issue discussion are subject to the same laws that uncloaked campaign ads should be.

Mr. Speaker, more than any other recent scandal, the unfolding Enron scandal has made it clear that under the present system money talks and public interest walks. Let us pass campaign finance reform.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE).

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

Mr. Speaker, as I voted in favor of bringing this bill and a rule to the floor for debate and deposition last year, I

urge my colleagues to support this rule tonight. It is time to yield to the processes of this institution and bring this measure to the floor.

But I also rise, Mr. Speaker, today in strong opposition to the underlying legislation for the single and exclusive reason that I believe in my heart that this legislation is, in fact, despite what the author of the bill just offered into the record, I believe it is, in fact, unconstitutional.

□ 1815

The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN) said on the floor of this Chamber moments ago that the Supreme Court has upheld spending limits, and in that measure he is right, but also in 1996 the Supreme Court ruled that "independent expression of a political party's views is core first amendment activity no less than is the independent expression of individuals, candidates or other political committees." It is precisely those individuals and other political committees that the Shays-Meehan bill bars, Mr. Speaker, from any political communication that mentions one of us incumbent Federal officeholders in the 2 months prior to an election.

One of the great ironies of the debate this week is that many of the supporters of the Shays-Meehan legislation are using the very issue ads that they would ban, financed by the very type of groups that they would ban, to sell this legislation to the American people.

Mr. Speaker, Members of Congress and I had the privilege a little over a year ago to take an oath of office where we promised to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States. My promise to uphold the Constitution and those blood-bought freedoms constrains me from supporting this legislation.

By barring any groups of Americans other than political action committees from criticizing Members of Congress by name in the 2 months before an election is unconstitutional. It is good for incumbents, bad for democracy; good for bureaucracy, bad for liberty.

Let us support the rule but oppose or amend this underlying legislation to discharge each of our oaths of office.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. WYNN), who is one of the principal authors of one of the alternative proposals that we will consider tomorrow.

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST) for yielding me the time and also for his hard work in the course of developing this issue.

Let me begin by saying I take strong exception to the statements by some of the media and some of my colleagues who say that our political system is corrupt in order to advance their own ends and to pass campaign finance reform. There may be Communist dictatorships that are corrupt, there may be

Third World despots that are corrupt, but I stand here today for the proposition that the Congress of the United States of America is not corrupt.

There have been no indictments, no convictions to justify the essentially self-serving accusations made by some Members of this body who support campaign finance reform. We differ on issues, we have different constituencies, we have different approaches to economic prosperity. That is all fair game for debate, but I believe to call this institution corrupt is totally unjustified. It paints with a very broad and a very misguided brush.

There are ways our system can be improved, but I do not hear the broadcast media or the print media calling for free air time or free ad space. The role of money in politics is not for personal gain, as would be the case if this were a corrupt government. Rather, money in American politics is a function of free speech, the ability to communicate views through the mass media. Thus the drive for campaign funds is not motivated by corruption, but rather by the necessity to pay for ad time and print space.

There is certainly room for reform to reduce the amount of money in politics and to reduce broadcast attack ads by national parties. That is what many of us want to accomplish with the Ney-Wynn bill. I did an analysis under Ney-Wynn. The top 10 contributors of soft money would have contributed \$21 million less than is currently allowable, but excessive bans on so-called soft money only weaken the political parties and strengthens the influence of wealthy individuals and candidates while reducing the role of our national parties.

Next, consider the right of free speech by issue advocates, whether liberal or conservative or even moderate. This is unconstitutionally restricted under the Shays-Meehan bill during the most critical time just before the election, 60 days before the election. This is not only unconstitutional, I submit that it defies common sense and our supposed goal of promoting an informed electorate.

National political parties have an important core function in terms of get out the vote, voter education and voter registration. These functions are critical to both party building and to ensure greater participation in our political process. This is particularly important for minority groups, African Americans, Hispanics, and others, and these functions should not be relegated to so-called other groups whose agenda we are not aware of, but who may, in fact, represent special interests. These are functions the parties should perform.

Moreover, the Shays-Meehan bill restricts State political parties. I submit the States can regulate political activity within their borders. We should not be federalizing elections.

Finally, let me conclude by saying that self-appointed reformers suggest

that Shays-Meehan would solve the Enron problem. That is patently absurd. Campaign finance reform would not have enabled Enron to avoid bankruptcy. Campaign finance reform would not have saved those employees and investors from losing their money. It is totally misleading to suggest that Shays-Meehan would have or could prospectively solve the Enron problem.

What we do know is Enron, Arthur Andersen and the accounting industry gave politicians, Senators and House Members lots of hard money. Shays-Meehan does not get rid of hard money; therefore, these direct contributions would continue. But we also know that our system works because disclosure exists. Disclosure allowed us to know who got what, who got how much, and ultimately it allows the voters to make the decisions, not the reformers. That is the way our system should work.

I urge adoption of the rule, rejection of Shays-Meehan and the adoption of a compromise approach that would protect national parties, restrict soft money and not interfere with the States. That is the Ney-Wynn substitute.

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

The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. WYNN) is correct, that is exactly why I am a cosponsor of his legislation, because his bill does a better job. It talks about meaningful reform and instantaneous reporting, and it takes a special kind of guy to look in front of a camera and make a statement that the Shays-Meehan bill ends all soft money. It just is not true.

The Shays-Meehan bill empowers special interests to use independent expenditures, underground expenditures to influence campaigns while silencing average Americans.

Most everyone wants to reform our campaign finance laws, but taking away first amendment rights and eliminating free speech is not the way to do it. Make no mistake about it, the Shays-Meehan bill does not ban soft money. Instead, it creates a new road for cash to travel to political parties, allowing up to \$60 million in soft money per donor nationwide via the States.

Funneling is not reforming, and if the supporters of Shays-Meehan were serious about campaign finance reform, the bill would completely ban soft money and take effect immediately. It does neither, raising questions about its intentions.

Matter of fact, the first Shays-Meehan bill in 1999 banned all soft money, did not allow State and local political parties to get at soft money. It banned labor, it banned corporations, and it banned the wealthy from being able to put money in. So we talk about a change of what a bill had to do to get 218 motion-to-discharge signers, take a look at the different bills in the fourth draft we are now having before us in Shays-Meehan.

If the Shays-Meehan does not raise hard-money limits for House can-

didates and combine with other restrictions on finances, it will make the House of Representatives a millionaires' club. Take a look at some of the candidates we have had to recruit through our political parties that had wealth in order to run for public office. Wealth, individual wealth, and then we try to find some gimmicks on how we can have a millionaires' amendment or some other solution. My colleagues should live in fear, all 435 of us, that a wealthy American decides to run, and we have no available solution to get our message out.

The Shays-Meehan campaign finance legislation is no reform at all, rather some mechanism to limit free speech while turning over power and decisions to parts of the media and the wealthy. Limiting issue advocacy and curtailing who could say what and what can be said is definitely unconstitutional, and I have sat in the Committee on Rules where some of the sponsors have admitted it is unconstitutional.

The time has come. We have used a motion to discharge to get this bill on the floor. By gosh, we are going to have the debate tomorrow, maybe into the next day, but there is no longer any place to hide that the Senate will take care of it or the White House will take care of it. It is going to be settled right here in the House of Representatives.

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

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), the assistant to the minority leader.

Ms. DeLAURO. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will consider one of the most important pieces of legislation before the Nation today, the urgent need to overhaul our failed campaign finance system. Last summer we attempted to close many of the loopholes that allowed unregulated and unlimited soft money to poison our electoral system. This is a system that allowed the wealthiest individuals and the biggest corporations to seek unchecked influence.

We proposed ending the phony negative advertising that masqueraded as voter education, but are actually campaign commercials in all but name. We were ready to take these substantial steps toward cleaning up the system.

I wish the Republican leadership had chosen not to become the enemies of reform and change. They have thrown up every procedural roadblock. They cannot imagine a world without such special interest money. They were successful in this intransigence before Enron. Now the winds of change blow strong, and now a majority of this body say, no more.

That is why a bipartisan coalition of Members has forced this bill to the floor with a discharge petition over the objections of the Republican leadership. That we were forced to resort to such a rare parliamentary maneuver speaks volumes about the new urgency in the country.

Make no mistake, those wedded to this corrupt funding system will do all in their power to defeat, alter or con-tort this bill. They have called consid-eration of this bill Armageddon. They will attempt to add poison pill amend-ments that purport to strengthen the bill, but, in fact, are only designed to destroy the delicate bipartisan com-prromise that the gentleman from Con-necticut (Mr. SHAYS) and the gen-tleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEE-HAN) have worked hard to put together.

I urge my colleagues to turn these amendments aside so that the Presi-dent can sign meaningful campaign fi-nance reform, this legislation, into law as soon as possible. The American peo-ple are demanding that we clean up this system. The time for reform is now, and in light of recent events, the need has never been greater.

We have in this Chamber tonight a strong and courageous woman, Granny Dee. We see her here and thank her for the long road she has traveled for cam-paign finance reform. She inspires all of us. I thank her for her hard work. Tomorrow is the day of reckoning.

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

Some say that what killed campaign finance in July was not the Republican leadership, it was the Presidential am-bition of some of the leadership in the minority.

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

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I would in-quire as to the time remaining on each side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY). The gentleman from New York (Mr. REYNOLDS) has 7½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST) has 11 minutes re-maining.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Cali-fornia (Mrs. DAVIS).

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speak-er, I rise today in support of this rule and the Shays-Meehan campaign fi-nance reform bill.

Unlimited contributions are pol-luting our democratic process. By pass-ing the Shays-Meehan bill, we will even the playing field. We will ensure that people of limited means can come together and send powerful policy mes-sages to their elected officials. The Shays-Meehan will also make our cam-paign system more transparent.

In my last election a group called Citizens for Better Medicare ran hun-dreds of TV ads on prescription drug coverage. The problem was that no one knew that these Citizens for Better Medicare were actually pharmaceutical companies. Once Shays-Meehan is signed into law, corporations and large donors will not be able to hide behind these misleading shell groups.

I urge all of my colleagues in this House to vote for real campaign fi-nance reform and pass Shays-Meehan into law.

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

(Ms. WOOLSEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend her re-marks.)

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this rule and in strong support of the Shays-Meehan bill.

I represent a district north of the Golden Gate bridge right across from San Francisco with an 85 percent voter turnout. My constituents, the people I serve, care about a fair campaign pro-cess where their involvement counts. They want to ensure that the men and the women who are elected to head our government are truly accountable to their constituents, not special inter-ests. They support the Shays-Meehan bill because they want big money influ-ence out of the election process.

My constituents want to give our children a democratic election system that they will believe they can be part of, and without real reform, Mr. Speak-er, we are telling our kids and young voters that only wealthy contributors have a voice in the political process.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote for the rule and for Shays-Meehan.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ari-zona (Mr. FLAKE).

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule. In case you wonder why the big media outlets, NBC, CBS, ABC and others, are such big sup-porters of the Shays-Meehan bill, it is not very tough to figure out they will be the only ones left standing, the only ones left able to speak within the 60 days before the election.

□ 1830

And if my colleagues think for a minute these media corporations or these corporations that own media out-lets are not biased or that they do not have an axe to grind here in Wash-ington, consider for a minute: Micro-soft Corporation, which owns MSNBC, \$2,311,926 in soft money last year, or in the last cycle, \$820,000 in hard money from their PAC. They spent nearly \$5 million lobbying the Congress in 1999. Go down the list: Walt Disney, which owns ABC, over \$1 million in soft money, \$283,000 in hard money, and spent nearly \$3.5 million lobbying the Congress in 1999.

Now, these corporations will be able to speak 60 days before the election. Unlike interest groups or unlike indi-viduals or others, they are allowed to speak. They are allowed to say what-ever they want, as they should be. But if we are going to curtail the speech of others, then why not at least require disclosure on the part of the large cor-porate media outlets?

Should Shays-Meehan be the base bill, I have an amendment that I will offer which would require such disclo-sure. We cannot stand and say that we want campaign finance reform that is so unbalanced. And I say those who want campaign finance reform should want to apply it equally across the board.

Of course, that is not what this is really about. This is about showing our constituents that we really care about campaign finance reform. I think it is a sham, and I would urge rejection of the rule and rejection of the bill.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL).

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding me this time.

I support the rule. Opponents of cam-paign finance reform are spreading er-roneous information about Shays-Meehan. The opponents say Shays-Meehan violates the first amendment because it prohibits free speech. In order to reach this conclusion, one must assume money equals speech. Therefore, the rich man's wallet overwhelms the poor man's soap box. Not so in America.

Shays-Meehan simply says that spe-cial interest television commercials must play by the same rules as Federal candidates. Corporate dollars, union dues, and unlimited dollars from wealthy individuals are prohibited, but groups are allowed to purchase and run television so long as they disclose the hard-dollar contributions.

I urge my colleagues to support Shays-Meehan. It protects our first amendment rights. It protects our de-mocracy.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I re-serve the balance of my time.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michi-gan (Mr. LEVIN).

(Mr. LEVIN asked and was given per-mission to revise and extend his re-marks.)

Mr. LEVIN. The basic issue before us is not free speech, but the cost to de-mocracy of opening the floodgates to big money. Soft money, unregulated, undisclosed, was originally intended to help parties register and get out the vote. Instead, it is turning political parties into exchangers of money for so-called issue ads. It is swamping the voice of the citizen. It is corroding the legislative process. It has been said that money is the mother's milk of po-litics. Instead, big money is becoming its poison.

Look, Shays-Meehan prohibits soft money except in a circumscribed in-stance. Only in this case, when it re-lates to registering and getting out the vote. Only in those cases, returning soft money to its original purpose.

I say vote for Shays-Meehan. It is originally what was intended by soft money. It is real reform of the political process.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I re-serve the balance of my time.

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

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule. Granny Dee did something very inno-vative, and she is here tonight in this Chamber. She walked across America for 14 months in support of her dream,

campaign finance reform. Tomorrow, we will have an opportunity to give her and other Americans her dream, by passing meaningful reform. The President says he will sign it. The Senate has passed it. All we need to do is keep the poison pill amendments off of it.

Now, Enron was known as a very innovative company. That was their claim to fame before we found out they were really a house of cards. Well, the Enron end game has got to be passing campaign finance reform. It is time for Congress to do something very innovative: to restore public faith in the political system by banning soft money and creating more competitive elections.

This is our Enron end game. Let us pass campaign finance reform and send it to the President for his signature.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS).

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time and belatedly apologize for the fact that I think this was a debate he introduced a few months ago, and we are finally debating it, I think under a very fair rule. It gives both sides the opportunity to present their case.

When Abraham Lincoln addressed this Chamber during the Civil War, when we were losing 10,000 Americans a month, he looked at Congress and said, "The dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate to the stormy present. The occasion is piled high with difficulty, and we must rise with the occasion. As our case is new, we must think anew and act anew, and then we will save our country."

I happen to believe what we are going to do tomorrow is about saving our country and our democracy. It is about enforcing the ban on corporate treasury money that took place in 1907; it is about enforcing the ban on union dues money that was passed in 1947; and about making sure that rich individuals cannot buy elections with the law that passed in 1974.

I do not know what the prediction outcome will be tomorrow, but I do know this: we came to this Chamber with a good bill, the Senate took this bill and changed it slightly; and we have taken the Senate changes and incorporated them in our bill with the hope and the prayer that this House will act and pass campaign finance reform and send it back to the Senate for the President's signature.

I do not know if that will happen. But in order for it to happen, we have to kill amendments that gut our proposal. We have to kill amendments that supposedly improve it but break apart the coalition that we have in the House. And we have to make sure that this bill ultimately can be passed by the Senate.

I urge my colleagues to pay attention to this debate, to vote their conscience, and we will all live with the consequences.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I would inquire about the time remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY). The gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST) has 6 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from New York (Mr. REYNOLDS) has 3½ minutes remaining.

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

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Granny Dee would not have walked so many miles if she did not believe in campaign finance reform. The American people believe in campaign finance reform. They want this process and the members of the elected process, the democratic process, to be an open book.

Tomorrow, we can show them that we are by voting for campaign finance reform and not delaying one more moment. This is a complex rule, but it is a fair rule. It will give us an opportunity to debate many issues. I know my local broadcast stations are concerned about one particular issue, impacting on the first amendment. We will be able to debate that. But what we must do and where we must not fail is fail the American people and this democratic process.

We have a lot to export to the world, that is, democracy in its purest sense. The only way we can do so is to support the Shays-Meehan bill tomorrow, have a vigorous debate, and be optimistic about what we need to do to show the American people we do believe their voices can be heard. I ask my colleagues to support Shays-Meehan as well as the rule.

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

Mr. FORD. I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I have listened with great delight to my friend from New York and others who have expressed their opposition to this bill. It is almost as if my friend from New York would have us do more than what we are doing. I will be interested in hearing some of the debate tomorrow.

Let me be clear. I support campaign finance reform, because I think when we have liberal Democrats and some conservative Republicans saying something is bad, it is probably a good thing. And we will hear a lot of that tomorrow, not just here in this Chamber but even outside this Chamber.

Any time we can limit the money that companies like IBM and AFL-CIO chiefs and union bosses and Enron chiefs give to this process, it is a good thing for the political process. What is it that we are afraid of, actually having to campaign? What is it that we are afraid of, actually having to go home and ask voters to examine and analyze our records? I submit I am one Congressman not afraid to go home and ask the voters to analyze my record without the help of some of these huge

corporate dollars, without the help of some of these union dollars. And I hope the majority of my colleagues will see fit to vote that way tomorrow.

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

I listened carefully to my friend from Tennessee, and he kind of wants it both ways. I am never afraid to go home. I go home every single week to my district in western New York to talk to my voters and listen to what they have to say, as they send me to Washington. But the gentleman cannot have it both ways, to where we ban a little bit but we do not really have a level playing field and we just kind of set up the rules.

That is why I am a cosponsor of Ney-Wynn, because it is pretty straightforward. It is pretty straightforward on reform. It is pretty straightforward on quick and accurate information on what is being raised and spent.

And I listened to Andy Card, the Chief of Staff to the President, when he talked about the credentials that he looked for in a bill: a level playing field, banning soft money on both labor and corporations, paycheck protection and instantaneous reporting.

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

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

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, under the Ney bill, how much money could Ken Lay have contributed, the former chairman of Enron, to the NRC, the DNC, and all the other parties?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, I would respond that I would have to get an expert on that; but I can say that under the Shays-Meehan bill, which the gentleman supports, it could be \$30 million to both parties with the State and locals.

Mr. FORD. How much could you give to the national parties, I would ask my friend from New York?

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time is controlled by the gentleman from New York. Requests must be made for Members to yield. Members may not get into a dialogue with one another absent such yielding.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I believe I have answered the question of the gentleman from Tennessee. The Shays-Meehan bill would provide \$30 million to both parties at the State and local level. I do not exactly know what the Ney-Wynn bill would provide in those dollars.

But I can say that the Shays-Meehan bill empowers special interests to use independent expenditures, which I really consider underground money, to influence campaigns while silencing average Americans. Most everyone wants to reform our campaign finance laws, but taking away first amendment rights and limiting free speech is not the way to do it.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3699,

which I introduced to correct a simple clerical error and will not cost any additional funding. Without the fix my legislation provides, numerous homeless outreach providers in Northeast Florida will be subjected to profound and unintended consequences.

In May 2001, The Emergency Services and Homeless Coalition of Jacksonville submitted a consolidated Continuum of Care Application to the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) requesting a maximum grant of \$3.5 million. The intent of this application, consistent with HUD's responsibilities under the SuperNOFA program, was to compete for and obtain funding for a total of 11 Jacksonville homeless outreach projects.

Due to a technical error in the way the grant was submitted, the full funding for all 11 projects in Jacksonville was inadvertently granted to one agency—Liberty Center. Unfortunately, due to an interpretation of the HUD Reform Act, HUD personnel cannot make the needed corrections to remedy the technical error—thus requiring this legislative proposal before us today.

As a result, many of the programs listed on the application will cease to exist due to a lack of funding. One of these projects, the "Quest" program, operated by the Jacksonville Mental Health Resource Center, requested \$293,979 and provides psychiatric medication case management to approximately 200 clients and case management services to several hundred others. There are 5 full-time and 2 part-time employees who will be cut. Without this program, these individuals will not have continuous case management basis and other public service facilities will have to deal with these individuals on a crisis basis. This type of problem will ripple through the region and disrupt years of quality service to these patients.

Mr. Speaker, without action today, another program, Goodwill Industries, will be forced to close its Job Options program, a \$431,707 renewal in the continuum. Goodwill run out of funding for this project on February 28, which will result in termination of 9 employees. This is a job training program which puts homeless or near homeless clients into paying jobs and off the dole. This past year there were 852 homeless participants enrolled in the program, of which 534 were placed in employment earning an average of \$7.95 per hour. It is a very effective program and saves substantial government dollars, which would otherwise have to be spent in support of these clients, were they unable to obtain jobs.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3699 simply corrects an administrative and clerical error in a grant application. My legislation corrects a horrible wrong that would inadvertently de-fund numerous projects. The legislation simply turns back the clock to the date the eleven members of the Coalition sat down together and submitted a consolidated Continuum of Care Application to help Jacksonville's homeless outreach projects. The bill does not authorize any additional funding; it only restores the original intent of the Homeless Coalitions Continuum of Care Application, allowing funding to be restored to all existing projects and to begin funding for the new projects. The Liberty Center would keep \$459,600 of the grant and the remaining funds of just over \$3 million would be dispersed to the other 10 projects in the priority order they were listed on the grant application.

This legislation will not cost the taxpayers any additional funds, and it will not change the original grant award amount of \$3,484,778.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague, Ms. Brown for joining me as an original cosponsor of this legislation and urge all my colleagues to support passage of H.R. 3699.

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, today the House will begin the debate and vote on proposals to reform the way we finance federal election campaigns in this country. Some believe this issue rates very low in public concern, but I believe strongly that the proposals we debate today go to the very heart of our democracy.

This is a debate about the way we will run our elections, which are the foundation and a major safeguard of our republic. It is a debate and a decision about whether every voter will have an equal voice in deciding our nation's future or whether some interests will always have special status because their voices are backed by large financial contributions.

Mr. Speaker, there is nothing wrong with a person providing a financial contribution to a political candidate or committee. It is proper that candidates are supported at the grassroots level through the involvement of friends and neighbors. Each of us is here in large measure because we enjoy and appreciate such support from a wide range of Americans who care about our government and are personally committed to supporting us.

But, there is something wrong with this system when the link between candidates and the grassroots voter—our neighbors and our friends—is broken or bent beyond recognition by an avalanche of big money that comes directly from corporations, labor unions and from a very few, very wealthy individuals. That is the problem we face today.

Direct political contributions from corporations to individual candidates were outlawed in 1907, but today corporations give hundreds of millions of dollars to both parties in the form of "soft money" because current federal law has a loophole allowing such contributions for so-called "party-building activities." This loophole now allows enormous contributions—some of \$1 million in a single check—that go directly to the political parties rather than individual candidates. Although giving to political parties may lessen the appearance of corruption, the average American understands that Enron, big tobacco companies and other corporations do not give millions of dollars to a political party just to assure good government.

Mr. Speaker, the choices before the House are clear cut. We can again pass a bill that provides genuine, effective reform of the current system—the bill offered by Mr. SHAYS and Mr. MEEHAN. Some of the alternatives before us have the appearance of reform by at least providing some limits on soft money but they lack real substance because the limits are so high and so wide that they change very little in the current situation.

I believe it is essential that the House stand fast on the cause of campaign finance reform, that we again—for the third time—pass the Shays-Meehan bill. In doing so, we will end the soft-money chase. We also will assure that those who engage in campaign advertising that attacks or promotes candidates must fully disclose the sources of their funding to the voters.

The decision we make today is perhaps the most important decision that this Congress will

render. The outcome will influence everything else we do on a vast array of issues and concerns. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to pass real reform so that we send a clear message to the American people that this Congress intends to restore common sense to our campaign laws.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will now put the question on motions to suspend the rules and on House Resolution 344, on which further proceedings were postponed earlier today.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Concur in the Senate amendment to H.R. 2998, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 3699, by the yeas and nays;

House Resolution 344, de novo;

And House Concurrent Resolution 326 de novo.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first such vote in this series.

□ 1845

RADIO FREE AFGHANISTAN ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY). The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and concurring in the Senate amendment to the bill, H.R. 2998.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment to the bill, H.R. 2998, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 421, nays 2, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 15]

YEAS—421

Abercrombie
Ackerman

Aderholt
Akin

Allen
Andrews