I know that the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) had proposed limiting to 34 different amendments before we left. Now that we have a unanimous consent agreement for just one evening, I would point out that they are all Republican amendments, and two of the amendments, the Stearns and the Fossella amendment, are nearly identical or are at least pretty similar.

So it does not seem to make any sense to agree to a unanimous consent agreement for one day when, in fact, what we need here is some kind of a commitment and some kind of an agreement in writing that we can have a vote on the substitutes that have been offered here and have that vote before the August recess. I do not think I have to tell my colleagues how long this process has been ongoing over a period of the last several years.

Mr. DELAY. Regular order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Regular order would be the reading of the amendments.

Does the gentleman from Massachusetts object to the reading of the amendments?

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the reading of the amendments. I object to the original request.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I objected.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts object to the original unanimous consent request also?

Mr. MEEHAN. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I do.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

DESIGNATION OF HON. GEORGE R. NETHERCUTT, JR., TO ACT AS SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS ON THIS DAY

The Speaker pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
July 14, 1998.

I hereby designate the Honorable GEORGE R. NETHERCUTT, Jr. to act as Speaker pro tempore to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions on this day.

NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the designation is agreed to.

There was no objection.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4104, TREASURY, POSTAL SERVICE, AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1999

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 105–622) on the resolution (H. Res. 498) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4104) making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the United States Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain Independent Agencies, 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. 3682, CHILD CUSTODY PROTECTION ACT

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 105–623) on the resolution (H. Res. 499) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3682) to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit taking minors across State lines to avoid laws requiring the involvement of parents in abortion decisions, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3267, SONNY BONO MEMORIAL SALTON SEA RECLAMATION ACT

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 105–624) on the resolution (H. Res. 500) providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3267) to direct the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Bureau of Reclamation, to conduct a feasibility study and construct a project to reclaim the Salton Sea, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

BIPARTISAN CAMPAIGN INTEGRITY ACT OF 1997

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WICKER). 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.

□ 1836

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. 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, with Mr. SHIMKUS (Chairman pro tempore) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, pending was Amendment No. 82 by the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLITTLE) to Amendment No. 13 by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS).

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I asked to rise into the House so that I could propound a unanimous consent request. However, a point of order was reserved and a speech was then made and then objection was heard. Unfortunately, I was not able during that monologue to explain why I offered the unanimous consent, so I am doing so now.

The majority leader has committed that the campaign finance debate will end prior to the August recess. That coincides with the gentleman from Massachusetts' specified dates of somewhere between August 3 and August 7. His complaint was that we do not have a complete agreement in which they have structured it and they have signed off on it.

What I am trying to do as the manager of a bill, if I cannot meet the entire structural agreement, I thought that it would be appropriate to move us along, to at least begin to structure it day by day. What I offered was a structure for today.

Contained within that unanimous consent was a desire to continue to debate this particular amendment by the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLITTLE) to the substitute by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) for 30 minutes. We have consumed far more than 30 minutes prior to my unanimous consent being propounded. I am quite sure we are going to consume far more than an additional 30 minutes.

So I have some difficulty in understanding the argument from the other side in which they continue to make a point without listening.

The majority leader has said, we will finish this debate prior to the August recess. It would seem to me that it would behoove all of us who want to have an orderly process, give a fair opportunity for as many people who wish to enter into the debate as possible, to structure it. What we got was an objection from the other side because we could not structure from today until August. What I was offering was a structure for today. But, clearly, that was objected to.

So if we cannot do it day by day, we must propound something that is going to extend over a long period of time. It just baffles me that the debate that goes on is that we want to move through this in an orderly fashion, but then they object to an orderly fashion being offered for today. If the complaint is it is not everything, why would they object to today? If we can get order for today, maybe we can get order for tomorrow. If we can get order for tomorrow, maybe, working together, we can get order for the entire period.

But they seem to want to make the argument that they want to move forward; and when we try to propose an opportunity to agree to move forward,