THOMAS) and deal with that, and then come to some of the allegations that have floated through this Chamber again about how we are impinging on free speech.

The chairman was right when he referred back to Buckley v. Valeo and how it was handled by the United States Supreme Court. Because in Buckley v. Valeo, the court made a distinction between contributions and expenditures, and we wound up with half of what the Congress had passed.

So there is always a risk when an amendment is brought before this body when we seek to pass legislation, there is always a risk that a portion of that legislation may be held unconstitutional. But in trying to avoid the problem created by Buckley v. Valeo, we are really undermining our chances of campaign finance reform.

What we are trying to do here is to pass a soft money ban. I disagree with the gentlewoman from Kentucky (Mrs. NORTHUP). We can read all the reports we want. We know who gives money to the national parties. If we can just look at the reports of the Republican Party, we will see $6 million or $7 million in money from the tobacco companies coming to the Republican Party, and that is soft money because it comes from corporations.

Corporations have not been able to give to Federal candidates for decades, and yet, they can give money to the national parties, and that money can be used for issue ads that will go out and will affect Federal elections. That is wrong. That is why we need to ban soft money.

Both the freshman bill and the Shays-Meehan bill do that. They have effective soft money bans. It is disingenuous for people to stand up and say they believe in a balanced bill. They believe it is constitutional. Therefore, we should simply go ahead and adopt a nonseverability clause.

Nonseverability clauses are the exception rather than the rule. What is going on here? There have been innumerable efforts to kill campaign finance reform, real reform in this hall, in this session. What is going on now is an attempt to adopt an amendment that would have a chance of killing in the courts any campaign reform, either Shays-Meehan or Hutchinson-Allen, that passes this particular body. We do not want that to happen.

Amendment 132 should be voted down. We do not want a nonseverability clause. If you simply look at the people who are advocating for this particular reform on the Republican side, they are not sponsors of Shays-Meehan; they are not sponsors of Hutchinson-Allen.

□ 1945

Now, let me go back for a moment to the claims that are made periodically here that we are infringing on free speech. Let us go back to Buckley v. Valeo. That court held clearly that in order to prevent corruption, or the appearance of corruption, the Congress could act to impose restrictions on campaign contributions. It is absolutely clear from that decision and from other decisions that it is constitutional to ban soft money.

In a recent case, the court said if it appears that soft money is being used as a way to avoid hard money limits, then the Congress could reconsider what it has done so far on soft money.

Let us talk about what that means in the real world. In the real world, an individual can only give $1,000 to a candidate, but they can give $100,000 or $500,000 to a political party, and that money can be used for issue ads to affect a Federal election.

That is wrong. It needs to be stopped. We have got to contain the influence of big money in politics, and we cannot be diverted by arguments that we are jeopardizing free speech.

I believe Shays-Meehan is constitutional. I believe the freshman bill is constitutional. But in any bill that we pass, there is always some risk. There is always some risk. And so what we ought to do is stop all the posturing and simply say what we want is a bill to come out of this Congress that will not only pass the House and pass the Senate and be signed by the President, but will withstand constitutional scrutiny, and when it is done, will not be ruled in its entirety unconstitutional because of some minor provision.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania) having assumed the chair, Mr. DICKEY, Chairman pro tempore of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2183) to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to reform the financing of campaigns for elections for Federal office, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4059, MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1999

Mr. SOLOMON, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 105–585) on the resolution (H. Res. 477) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4059), making appropriations for military construction, family housing, and base realignment and closure for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4060, ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1999

Mr. SOLOMON, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 105–586) on the resolution (H. Res. 478), providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4060) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO HAVE UNTIL MIDNIGHT, FRIDAY, JUNE 19, 1998, TO FILE PRIVILEGED REPORT ON DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1999

Mrs. NORTHUP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight Friday, June 19, 1998, to file a privileged report on a bill making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Kentucky?

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, just to ask how many nongermane amendments were made in order by the rules that we just filed?

Mrs. NORTHUP. It is an open rule, sir.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. No nongermane amendments, though?

Mrs. NORTHUP. But I was happy to yield to the gentleman's question.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. The gentlewoman did not yield, I reserved the right to object.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XXI, all points of order are reserved.

BIPARTISAN CAMPAIGN INTEGRITY ACT OF 1997

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 442 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2183.

□ 1950

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R.