Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on House Oversight and the Committee on Ways and Means be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H.R. 4354) to establish the United States Capitol Police Memorial Fund on behalf of the families of Detective John Michael Gibson and Private First Class Jacob Joseph Chestnut of the United States Capitol Police, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California?

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and of course I will not object, but under my reservation, I would yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS), the chairman of the Committee on House Oversight.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, this bill establishes the United States Capitol Police Memorial Fund on behalf of the families of Detective John Michael Gibson and Private First Class Jacob Joseph Chestnut.

I want to make sure people understand that this bill establishes by law an official fund in the United States Treasury. Because of that, it is not only permissible, but obviously appropriate, to use official House resources in support of and to solicit contributions to the memorial fund.

In addition to that, the reason the Committee on Ways and Means had jurisdiction over this measure is that those donations to this fund are considered charitable and are, therefore, tax deductible. In addition, there is a provision which says that Federal campaign committees may, in fact, donate funds to the memorial fund.

It is an appropriate gesture, structured in the appropriate way, that it is a tax deduction and no tax would be levied against it.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding under his reservation.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his explanation.

Mr. Speaker, continuing under my reservation, many of us attended the funeral of Detective Gibson today, and tomorrow morning we will be attending the funeral of Officer Chestnut. It has been a proud week for all of us; in some ways, however, a very proud week as well when we consider the actions of these two brave and courageous men, and indeed, the actions of their colleagues on the Capitol Police Force and other emergency response teams that came to the Capitol to assist our own Capitol Police.

Mr. Speaker, as we drove from the church, there were literally thousands upon thousands of Americans who stood by the curb and watched the procession go by, waved, saluted, placed their hands on their hearts, in recognition of the contribution to their own welfare and the welfare of their country, that these two brave and courageous Americans had performed and the sacrifices they had made.

This will allow all of us, all Americans and indeed others, in a very tangible way to participate in showing to the families of Officer Chestnut and Detective Gibson that our words are not the only thing that we are prepared to raise on their behalf.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for this action.

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

Mr. HOYER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman’s words are quite appropriate and timely in terms of the death of these two particular officers.

I do want to underscore that the establishment of this United States Capitol Police Memorial Fund is dedicated on an even basis to the families of these two gentlemen for a 6-month period. It means that this fund will live beyond these two families’ needs, and that it will become a perpetual memorial fund available to the Capitol Police; entirely appropriate for this occasion, but available in the future, unfortunately, if needed. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. Speaker, obviously I am in strong support, as I know every Member of this House is, of this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, continuing my reservation for just a minute, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Maryland for yielding to me.

I would just like to mention at this point, there is another organization that has fulfilled a complementary role. That organization’s name is Heroes, Incorporated. They responded immediately with cash assistance to the family and are also prepared to provide scholarship funds, as they have for every police officer killed in the District of Columbia, I think it is over 300 now, and dozens of children are receiving college scholarships as a result of this organization. This is a wonderful fund, and I mean nothing pejorative, and I wholly support it. But I think it might be appropriate to mention the fact that the Heroes also responded in a very generous fashion and deserve some credit for doing that as well.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman for his comments, and I would point out that the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), the majority whip, when he made his initial presentation, did, in fact, speak directly of Heroes and the wonderful work they had done, not only with respect to their immediate response for these two officers, but the
work that they had done for so many other officers, and indicated as well that the Hero scholarship is probably the most generous scholarship that is given in America and will ensure that the children of Detective Gibson and Officer Lewis will not need to worry about their educational expenses.

But I thank the gentleman for his very appropriate remarks.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to temporarily withdraw the bill.

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

There was no objection.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CONVENTION CENTER AND SPORTS ARENA AUTHORIZATION ACT AMENDMENTS

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H.R. 4237) to amend the District of Columbia Convention Center and Sports Arena Authorization Act of 1995 to revise the revenues and activities covered under such Act, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 4237

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. REVENUES AND ACTIVITIES COVERED UNDER WASHINGTON CONVENTION CENTER AND SPORTS ARENA AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1995.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 101 of the District of Columbia Convention Center and Sports Arena Authorization Act of 1995 (DC Code, sec. 47-303) shall be amended by striking subsections (a) and (b) and inserting the following:

"(b) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION REGARDING REVENUE BOND REQUIREMENTS UNDER HOME RULE ACT.—Nothing in the District of Columbia Convention Center and Sports Arena Authorization Act of 1995 may be construed to authorize or obligate any revenues of the Washington Convention Center Authority for any purpose authorized under the Washington Convention Center Authority Act of 1994 (D.C. Law 10-188)."

(b) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION REGARDING REVENUE BOND REQUIREMENTS UNDER HOME RULE ACT.—Nothing in the District of Columbia Convention Center and Sports Arena Authorization Act of 1995 may be construed to authorize or obligate any revenues of the Washington Convention Center Authority for any purpose authorized under the Washington Convention Center Authority Act of 1994 (D.C. Law 10-188)."

This bill authorizes the Washington Convention Center Authority, an independent agency, to issue bonds and waive the 30-day waiting period for the D.C. City Council enactment to go into effect. Its passage this evening is important so they can get immediate Senate consideration and be signed by the President, and we can be in the ground and starting construction the 1st of September.

Our subcommittee has followed the effort to build a new convention center in downtown Washington with great interest. We think this is critical for the city to reestablish a tax base in downtown Washington, working with the MCI Center, we will build, we think, a revitalization of the downtown area.

Over time it is estimated that the situation only gets worse in terms of attracting tourism if we were to go with the existing center. The District of Columbia’s existing Convention Center is now only the 30th largest in the country, and it can accommodate only approximately 55 percent of national conventions and exhibition shows. That is a serious blow to the District’s economy. A new convention center will provide much needed jobs for the city, and an increase in locally-generated local tax base revenue. It will boost morale for the entire region.

I want to thank the General Accounting Office and the General Services Administration for their respective roles in analyzing the development of the financing plan for the new Washington Convention Center. Their thorough analysis has reinforced our confidence in permitting the District to move forward with this project.

I also want to thank the District’s Financial Control Board for their hard work and oversight on the development of this project. The Control Board is empowered to approve or disapprove all city borrowing, and this sign-off of the financial package I think gives everyone more confidence in its viability.

After reviewing information from both the proponents and opponents of the project, the committee has unanimously approved the project, and the Control Board has, in effect, reported to Congress that all aspects of the project, including borrowing and costs, are compatible with the interests of the District of Columbia. The next step is for Congress to go ahead and pass this bill. Our action this evening is a giant step forward for the District.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

(Mr. MORAN of Virginia asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support this legislation that moves the convention center forward for the District of Columbia. Frankly, having a world class convention center in the Washington metropolitan area is something that the entire region needs, and there are suburban jurisdictions that would have loved to have had this center within their jurisdiction. I can say, quite frankly, we had some great sites for it.

But the fact is, it could be only in the center city. Had the business community, the residential community, the political community not gotten their act together they might have lost this, but this is a credit to the fact that there is that kind of symbiotic relationship that is acting in this manner today, particularly the hotel, the restaurant, and the tourism industry.

They deserve this convention center. Most importantly, the people of the District of Columbia deserve this convention center and all the economic benefits it will provide.

I thank the gentleman who chairs the District of Columbia authorizing committee for moving this legislation forward at a rapid pace, and I look forward to the day that we can all go to this convention center and enjoy not only the center itself, but all the economic and social benefits it will bring to this great capital city.

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I also want to thank Tracy Cox and Peter Sirh of my staff for the staff work they have done on this.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to amend the D.C. Convention Center and Sports Arena Authorization Act of 1995 in order to enable the Washington Convention Center Authority (Authority) to finance revenue bonds for the cost of constructing a new convention center in downtown D.C. This legislation moves forward the hope and promise of the 1995 legislation for a sports arena and a convention center, twin centers of economic development and jobs in the city and revitalization of downtown in the District. The quick and efficient construction of the MCI Center and the new jobs and revenue the arena has brought to D.C. residents have encouraged the city to complete its work on a convention center, where the need has long been acknowledged.

In every other city in the United States, this matter would not come before any but the local city council. Unfortunately, unlike every other city, the District does not have legislative
and budget autonomy and therefore cannot spend its own funds unless authorized by Congress.

Extensive hearings in the D.C. City Council have been held on the underlying issues, with an informed and vigorous debate by members of the Council. On June 16, 1998, the Council approved legislation to finance the new convention center, and on July 7, the City Council passed a bond inducement resolution to approve the Authority’s proposal for the issuance of dedicated tax revenue bonds to finance construction of the convention center. On July 13, the D.C. Financial Responsibility and Management Assistance Authority (Control Board) gave its final approval to the financing plan for the project, leaving only congressional authorization, which is necessary for the District to proceed to the bond market.

On July 15, the Subcommittee on the District of Columbia heard testimony from Mayor Marion Barry, City Council Chair Linda Cropp, City Council Member Charlene Drew Jarvis, Control Board Chair Andrew Brimmer, Authority President Terry Golden, and representatives of the Accounting Office (GAO) and the General Services Administration (GSA) on the financial aspects of the project.

After hearing this testimony, I am satisfied that the Authority is ready to proceed with the issuance of bonds to secure financing, allowing the District to break ground possibly as early as September. Considering the many years’ delay and the millions in lost revenue to the District, ground breaking cannot come too soon.

Although the GAO testified that the cost of constructing the new convention center would be $708 million, $58 million more than the $650 million estimate, this $58 million is not attributable to the cost of the center but to certain costs that should be borne by entities other than the Authority. For example, vendors who will operate in the facility are anticipated to contribute $17.7 million in equipment costs; the District government will provide $10 million for utility relocation from expected Department of Housing and Urban Development grants; and the President has requested $25 million in his budget to expand the Mount Vernon Square metro station.

The GSA testified that the agency had worked closely with the Authority to keep the costs of the project down. With the GSA’s assistance, the Authority secured a contract with a construction manager for a ‘‘Guaranteed Maximum Price,’’ whereby the private contractor is given incentives to keep costs down and assumes the risk for any cost overruns.

Mayor Marion Barry testified, among other things, regarding the promise of additional jobs to District residents. He said that the new convention center would create nearly 1,000 new construction jobs, and that once the facility is completed, it would generate nearly 10,000 jobs in the hospitality and tourism industries. He testified that, using some of the approaches that were successful with the MCI Center, special training and goals for jobs for D.C. residents would be met.

The District of Columbia Subcommittee hearing was not a reprise of the lengthy D.C. City Council hearings, and, on home rule grounds, did not attempt to repeat issues of local concern. However, since the issues of financing and bonding before the Congress implicate other areas, the Subcommittee asked extensive questions and received testimony concerning many issues, including location, size, and job creation, in addition to the strictly financial issues.

This convention center has an unusual financial base, which I believe other cities might do well to emulate. The financing arises from hotel and restaurant industry fees, taxes on the food industry that would not have been available to the city for any other purpose. The proposal was made at a time when the city’s need for revenue and jobs has been especially pressing. For many years, the District has been unable to attract large conventions. Not only has the District lost billions as a result; the local hotel and restaurant industry has suffered from the absence of a large convention center. It is estimated that the inadequacy of the current facility led to the loss of $300 million in revenue from lost conventions in 1997 alone. My legislation will enable the District to compete for its market share in the convention industry for the first time in many years.

The delay in building an adequate convention center has been very costly to the District. In a city where real estate is expensive, and especially government buildings, a convention center is one of the few projects that can bring significant revenues. To that end, the District intends to break ground this September. I ask for expedited passage on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, an act making appropriations for the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes; and Mr. B. B. Smith, one of its clerks, an act making appropriations for the Department of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate adopts the amendment to the bill (H.R. 4328) ‘‘An act making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes,’’ requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. Shelby, Mr. Domenici, Mr. Specter, Mr. Bond, Mr. Gorton, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Faircloth, Mr. Stevens, Mr. Lautenberg, Mr. Byrd, Ms. Mikulski, Mr. Reid, Mr. Kohl, Mrs. Murray, and Mr. Inouye, to be the conference on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate passed a concurrent resolution of the following title in which concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 114. Concurrent resolution providing for a conditional adjournment or recess of the Senate and a conditional adjournment of the House of Representatives.

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. Blunt (Chairman pro tempore) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 42 and rule XIX, the Speaker 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.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. Barr).

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw amendment No. 22, and ask the House to consider amendment No. 23, at the Chairman’s desk.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BARR OF GEORGIA TO THE AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. SHAYS

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I offer amendment No. 23 to the amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 13 offered by Mr. Shays.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The text of the amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:
Amendment No. 23 offered by Mr. BARR of Georgia to the amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 13 offered by Mr. SHAYS:

Add at the end the following new title:

TITLE VIII. PROHIBITING BILINGUAL VOTING MATERIALS

SEC. 01. PROHIBITING USE OF BILINGUAL VOTING MATERIALS

(a) PROHIBITION.—

(1) IN GENERAL. Who may provide voting materials in any language other than English.

(2) VOTING MATERIALS DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term “voting materials” means registration or voting notices, forms, instructions, assistance, or other materials or information relating to the electoral process, including ballots.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—The Voting Rights Act of 1965 is amended

(1) by striking section 203 (42 U.S.C. 1973aa–1); and

(2) in section 204 (42 U.S.C. 1973aa–2), by striking “;”, or “203”; and

(3) in section 205 (42 U.S.C. 1973aa–3), by striking “;”, “202”, or “203” and inserting “or 202”.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House on Friday, July 17, 1998, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BARR) and a Member opposed each control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BARR).

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I have introduced an amendment which bans the use of bilingual ballots in Federal elections. We know that almost 25 years ago this Congress provided for bilingual ballots. Back then our country was just beginning to see a huge influx of immigrants to our shores who wished to exercise their right to vote when they became American citizens.

We need to recognize that if an individual becomes a naturalized citizen of this country, they are required to demonstrate a knowledge of English before they can achieve citizenship status. This Congress, in 1950, explicitly added a specific requirement that persons who wish to become citizens must “demonstrate an understanding of English language, including an ability to read, write, and speak words in ordinary usage in the English language.”

While we require individuals to learn English, bilingual ballots contradict this by allowing them to vote in their native language, a language other than the English language.

We all recognize, Mr. Chairman, that our Nation is made up of more nationalities than any other country in the world. We are all proud of that fact, because it demonstrates and confirms to us what we have always known about America, that it remains the best country in the world.

However, all we need do is look to our neighbor in the north, Canada. Canada is a divided nation, a deeply divided nation, because of the acceptation of but two, but two, national languages, only two. Look at the problems they have: near secession, rioting.

These are the wages of lingual disunity. It is essential to our national interest to maintain one language, the English language, in the transaction of our Nation’s business, government services, and, most importantly, voting.

What business of government is more important to the government and the people of a country than voting? By making the choice to become an American citizen, immigrants make the choice to learn the English language and to become productive citizens of this country. A foreign language on a Federal ballot provides that an individual can still easily exercise one civic duty, and yet completely neglect their other duty of mastering the English language.

Mr. Chairman, let us also note a paradox which exists with respect to this issue. Supporters of bilingual ballots have argued that they are necessary for all citizens to have the ability to understand what is written on the ballot, and that this helps eliminate the complexity of the ballot. Yet, the same people who support bilingual ballots because people are not learning English turn right around and say a constitutional amendment making English the official language of American government is unnecessary because everybody is already learning the language.

Mr. Chairman, the only essential thing is that all languages other than English appear on a ballot, the language of the “immigrant ancestors” is given official status by the Federal Government co-equal with the English language. That is neither contemplated nor contemplated in our citizenship laws, which require proficiency in the English language to become a citizen.

Bilingual ballots are just one more way that well-meaning people hinder the progress of certain groups in this country of foreign ancestry. English is the language of this Nation. Those who do not learn it will be unable to take their rightful place and excel in the political arena, in the economic arena, in the educational arena, and every other arena in this land.

I ask my colleagues to vote for this important amendment, which simply reaffirms existing law on citizenship and brings that down to the ballot box, where it belongs. It is the most important index and most important chore and responsibility, and indeed, right that any citizen has, naturalized or native born.

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN) rise in opposition to the amendment?

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, I do, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ).

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Again, the amendment of the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BARR) has nothing to do with campaign finance reform. Mr. Chairman, Republicans have a great idea to improve democracy: let us hold an election, but make sure some specially singled out voters do not have the chance to read fully about what the issues are, or who they are voting for.

Who do they seek to single out? True to form, they single out immigrants who fled political persecution or economic repression, who encourage their children to study hard, who attend weekend classes to improve their English skills, all the while holding down two jobs to support their families. These are people proud to be American citizens.

Yes, there is an elementary language provision under the immigration law to become a United States citizen, but there are also exceptions for those seniors who are elderly and who are exempted. They would not be having the access to understand what they are voting for.

Think about the ballot questions that come forth and the complexity of those ballot questions. These are people who want to punish. I say to my friends on the other side of the aisle, people who use bilingual voting materials are people who want to participate in the process, who want to be informed about the issues, who want to know where the candidates stand. Otherwise, they would not be using these materials in the first place.

Come November, I believe these hard-working Americans who pay their taxes, serve in the Armed Forces of the United States, and at the same time keep Shays-Meehan free from anything that is not campaign finance reform.

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I begin by saluting my colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN), and the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS), for their tremendous patience. Because as we are seeing with this amendment, we have been offered everything but the kitchen sink as an amendment to this bill.

This really has nothing to do with the underlying issue of campaign finance reform. It does have to do with a movement concerning proficiency in English, which I agree is an important part of being an American. But I also
know that there are many people that are some of our strongest and best Americans whose first language is, in my community, Spanish or Vietnamese. They are some of our hardest working citizens. They pay taxes, they contribute to our community, and they deserve a right to participate in the electoral process.
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As I review the specifics of this amendment that the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. Barr) is offering, it allows the ballots to be bilingual, which they certainly should be. It is the voting materials that he says cannot be in another language.

My goodness, in our State, we provide instructions, we use bilingual instructions to teach people how to get a driver’s license. Why can we not provide the same manner of instruction for those who want to exercise their franchise as Americans? I can tell my colleagues that in the State of Texas, unlike some other parts of the world, language is not dividing us. It is only those who attack other languages and other cultures from their own misunderstandings that divide us.

Mr. Chairman, let us come together and support what this bill is all about and not get divided over a question of bilingual information for voters.

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, how much time do we have remaining?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. WEYGAND), a leader in the effort of bilingual information for voters.

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. WEYGAND), a leader in the effort of campaign finance reform.

Mr. WEYGAND. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN) for yielding me this time, and for the great work he has been doing on this. In closing, let me remake a couple of the points that have been said so eloquently by my colleagues here.

First, this proposed amendment is not about campaign finance reform. This is more properly before discussion and debate on voters’ rights and the Voting Act.

Number two, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BARR) talks about this is not an allowable provision under the Voting Act. He in fact says that it is not allowable for people who do not understand English to be American citizens under the 1957 Voting Act.

Mr. Chairman, that is not true. The fact is that people that are older and have been here for 15 or 20 years, depending upon their age, are allowed to become citizens of the United States by taking a test in their own language. This, therefore, would discriminate against many of the older immigrant Americans who have been naturalized from participating in the voting process that they have worked so hard and so dearly to attain.

Last but not least is the complexity by which many questions are placed on the ballot. Again, they need some description, some assistance. By having ballot materials provided in their own language, it provides an easy way for people who are truly Americans to be able to participate in the voting process that we so rightly and so richly deserve.

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Chairman, it is interesting, of course, that the opponents of this very simple and straightforward amendment regarding the fact that voting materials provided by the government should be in English, not in other languages, it is very interesting that they refer several times to an amendment to the laws of this land that provide for a small category of persons, elderly, who speak another language who have been in this country for a certain lengthy number of years. They keep referring to that, yet I am sure that they would not agree with the amendment by which those people indeed could have bilingual materials. They are just opposed to having these materials in the English language.

Mr. Chairman, they are so opposed to it, that they call this a poison pill. A poison pill, simply saying that ballot materials, voting materials shall be in the English language. That is somehow poisonous to this country, that is poisonous to the standards, to voting procedures in this country.

That, I think, says perhaps more than anything else, more than all of the great eloquent words on the other side that this to them is poisonous, simply standing up for the English language.

Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BARR) to the amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 13 offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to the rules, proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BARR) to the amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 13 offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) will be postponed.

It is now in order to consider the amendment by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT).

Amendment No. 24 offered by Mr. TRAFICANT to the amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 13 offered by Mr. SHAYS.

Add at the end the following new title:

Title —Exclusion Proceedings for House Members Receiving Foreign Contributions.

Section 01. Permitting Consideration of Privileged Motion to Expel House Member Accepting Illegal Foreign Contributions.

(a) In General.—If a Member of the House of Representatives is convicted of a violation of section 319 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (or any successor provision prohibiting the solicitation, receipt, or acceptance of a contribution from a foreign national), it shall be in order in the House at any time following the date on which the Member is convicted to move to expel the Member from the House of Representatives. A motion to expel a Member under the authority of this sub-section shall be highly privileged. An amendment to the motion shall not be in order, and it shall not be in order to move to reconsider the question of which the motion was agreed to or disagreed to.

(b) Exercise of Rulemaking Authority.—This section is enacted by Congress—

(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the House of Representatives, and as such it is deemed a part of the rules of the House of Representatives, and it supersedes other rules only to the extent that it is inconsistent therewith; and

(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of the House of Representatives to change the rules at any time, in the same manner and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of the House of Representatives.

Modification to Amendment No. 24 Offered by Mr. TRAFICANT to the Amendment in the Nature of a Substitute No. 13 Offered by Mr. SHAYS.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment be modified with the language that will be sent to the desk forthwith.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to read it and send it up to the Clerk here. It would strike on page 1, line 12, after “foreign national,” and all that follows through line 14, page 2, and insert the following:

“The Committee on Standards of Official Conduct shall immediately consider the conduct of the Member and shall make a report and recommendation to the House forthwith concerning that Member, which may include a recommendation for expulsion.”

Mr. Chairman, I will send it to the Committee and I would like to, if the Committee is satisfied and there is no objection, proceed with my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Chair will treat the modification as having been read.

Is there an objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The amendment is modified.
Pursuant to the order of the House on Friday, July 17, 1998, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Traficant), and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Traficant).

Mr. Traficant. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, it was not my intention to bypass the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct. It is my intention, however, to highlight the importance of the infusion of illegal foreign money into our campaigns.

If we are to truly reform this system, there must be that statement which exists within this reform. The original Traficant language said within 5 days it must be brought to the floor, once a Member has been convicted of having knowingly accepted an illegal campaign contribution.

The Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, and some of the Members who have done a good job, including the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. Cardin), believe that perhaps it would be seen as an effort to circumvent and to bypass the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct. It is not my intentions to do that, but I will say this. The key words in there, “it shall be immediately referred” to that committee and “it shall be brought forthwith” without placing any specific dates on that.

And the original Traficant amendment never did say that that Member had to be expelled, but there had to be a vote on expulsion. It would still be subject to the same constitutional requirements. I am hoping that this will satisfy, but it will still associate with that heinous crime some punishment timely with the deed.

Mr. Chairman, the House should not let those matters be carried over too long. I am back with my compliments to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Tr„), Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. Wamp. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Traficant) for his willingness to work with us on this amendment. The point that he is raising is a very important point, and that is if a Member has been convicted of violating the foreign contribution ban. That that matter must be immediately considered by the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct and a report must come back forthwith to the House for action.

I think that that is the appropriate way to handle it. I want to congratulate the gentleman for bringing this to our attention. It is very important that the House have an opportunity to act promptly when these types of circumstances develop. Hopefully, it will never happen, but it is important that that statement be made. I congratulate my colleagues.

Mr. Traficant. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. Wamp).

Mr. Wamp. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Traficant) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, for those that may be following this, I wonder at times what “poison pill” and some of the references actually mean, I want to point to the motives of the Shays-Meehan effort. That is really to try to remove the influence that special interests have on Federal election campaigns.

I also want to point out, with this amendment being an example, that we are not killing everything that comes up. If it is of special interest, if it is about money in Federal elections, and it is something that is going in the same direction of real reform, we are willing to work with the authors of amendments such as the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Traficant) and this is a great example.

Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman for his work and his persistence on this legitimate issue of foreign money coming into the American Federal political process. There is some domestic money that we think is also egregious and we are trying to put some reasonable limitations on soft money and the proliferation of those outside interests. I thank the gentleman for his efforts.

Mr. Traficant. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the efforts of the committee in helping to fashion this amendment. It was no intent to circumvent the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct. They have done a fine job.

Mr. Chairman, I urge an “aye” vote.

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

Mr. Campbell. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time otherwise reserved for one who is in opposition.

The Chairman pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California (Mr. Campbell)?

There was no objection.

Mr. Campbell. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Chairman pro tempore. The question is on the amendment, as modified, offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Traficant) to the amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 13 offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. Shays).

The amendment, as modified, to the amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The Chairman pro tempore. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 25.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BLUNT TO THE AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. SHAYS

Mr. Blunt. Mr. Chairman, I offer amendment No. 25 as the designee of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DeLay) to the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The Chairman pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The text of the amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

Amendment No. 25 offered by Mr. Blunt to the amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 13 offered by Mr. Shays:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. 6. EXPRESSION ADVOCACY DETERMINED WITHOUT REGARD TO BACKGROUND MUSIC.

Section 301 (2 U.S.C. 431) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

“(20) In determining whether any communication by television or radio broadcast constitutes express advocacy for purposes of this Act, there shall not be taken into account any background music used in such broadcast.”

The Chairman pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House, Friday, July 17, 1998, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. Blunt) and the gentleman from California (Mr. Campbell) will each control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. Blunt).

Mr. Blunt. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment in defense of music. I represent one of the music capitals of the world. Branson, Missouri. In Branson, we do not quote Voltaire often, but if we did, we might paraphrase Voltaire by saying, “I may not like your choice of music but I will defend to the death your right to play it.”

If we are to truly reform this system, we are willing to work with the gentlema...
Commission speech police deemed background music relevant. I, like most reasonable people, do not think that the FEC has the authority or the right to decide what background music can or cannot be used in issue ads. This is the heart of my amendment and prohibits that kind of regulatory intimidation.

Now, I am not joking about this, Mr. Chairman. The FEC has a history of prosecuting on the basis of background music. For instance, in the case of Christian Action Network versus FEC, the FEC stated that background music should be a determining factor in establishing the presence of express advocacy. Thankfully, this case was dismissed and the FEC was severely castigated in court for pursuing it.

The Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals even awarded the victims of the FEC, the Christian Action Network, attorneys’ fees because the prosecution was not substantially justified.

The Shays-Meehan bill is extremely vague and the expansive definition of express advocacy gives the FEC even more rope to strangle speech by private citizens and groups. Without my amendment, the FEC could again cite background music as a basis for persecution without my amendment, who knows what would happen if Shays-Meehan became the law of the land.

The Battle Hymn of the Republic, express advocacy if I ever heard it; J ohn Philip Souza, forget it. You would have to have a legal defense fund. Famous Scott Key in the background, you better call your lawyer.

We are not just whistling Dixie with this amendment, Mr. Chairman. The FEC has already tried using background music in an enforcement action. If not for the Fourth Circuit Court, they would have gotten away with it. Do not let them try it again. It is time for the FEC to face the music, Mr. Chairman. Stand up for freedom of speech and freedom of music. Vote for this amendment. It is time for the first amendment.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Washington (Mr. METCALF).

Mr. METCALF asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Chairman, I have strongly supported campaign finance reform for many years and I have worked very hard for Washington State’s excellent campaign finance reform bill, but our basic task today is to pass the Shays-Meehan bill.

Many of the amendments offered are good amendments, concepts I have supported for years. In fact, I would like to urge that we clarify this and take the FEC clearly out of the realm of speech and, in defense of music, that we add this modified amendment to the bill. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), as modified, to the amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 13 offered by Mr. SHAYS.

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Chairman, I rise as the designee of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DeLay) to offer amendment No. 84 to the amendment in the nature of a substitute. The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment. The text of the amendment is as follows.

Amendment offered by Mr. MCINTOSH to the amendment in the nature of a substitute No.13 offered by Mr. SHAYS:

In section 301(b) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended by section 205(a)(3)(B) of the substitute, add at the end the following:

"(F) For purposes of subparagraph (C), no communication with a Senator or Member of the House of Representatives (including the staff of a Senator or Member) regarding any pending legislative matter, regarding the position of any Senator or Member on such matter, may be construed to establish coordination with a candidate."

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of Friday July 17, 1998, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MCINTOSH) and a Member opposed, each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MCINTOSH).

Mr. McINTOSH. Mr. Chairman, I understand there would be agreement to limit the time on each side to 3 minutes, which I would be willing to do, and I ask unanimous consent to so limit the debate.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. McINTOSH).

Mr. McINTOSH. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I just want to understand the amendment, and I yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MCINTOSH).

Mr. MCEHAN. Mr. Chairman, I have seen it numbered 84. I have also seen it numbered 16 in some of the materials. And 26 is the number I understand that it is.

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, could the gentleman read the amendment so we are clear?

Mr. McINTOSH. For purposes of subparagraph (C), no communication with a Senator or Member of the House of Representatives (including the staff of a Senator or Member) regarding any pending legislative matter, regarding the position of any Senator or Member on such—

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.
The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Indiana. Mr. McINTOSH is recognized for 3 minutes. (Mr. McINTOSH asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McINTOSH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This amendment secures the right of Members of Congress and our staffs to receive information on pending legislative matters and transmit information regarding our positions on issues without them being deemed to be coordinated with the various outside organizations that provide or receive such information.

For example, section 205 of the Shays-Meehan bill defines “coordination with a candidate” as any of 10 broad categories of direct or indirect contacts, actual or presumed, between a candidate, including offices of incumbent Members of Congress and a citizen group. This coordination includes all types of contact that are routine for issue-oriented groups that lobby Congress, whether it be an environmental group, a health issues group or an abortion control group, gun control or any other issue.

This amendment allows those type of communications. It is now in order to consider the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. McINTOSH) to the amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 13 offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS).

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

Mr. McINTOSH. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 442, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. McINTOSH) will be postponed.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 27. The Chair understands that the amendment will not be offered.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 28. It is the Chair’s understanding that that amendment will not be offered.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 29. It is the Chair’s understanding that that amendment will not be offered.

This is not about campaign finance reform. This is essentially about how to let more lobbyists into the door of legislative offices and be involved in designing and collaborating for campaigns.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FARR of California. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I want to say to the gentleman from Indiana that the present FEC law where there is that kind of a communication would result in an in-kind contribution. You really are changing, with your amendment, unintentionally perhaps, present FEC regulations. I would urge very much that you take another look, because we would have to oppose this as loosening present law. I think that is clear.

Mr. McINTOSH. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, certainly the intent is not to loosen existing law, though I am not convinced that existing law puts those types of limits on issue-oriented campaigns. There is coordination as to helping a candidate with campaign activities; that is a different matter. It is certainly not the intention to change existing law.

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, it does. And the language, just look at it, no communication may be construed to establish coordination. Those are the operative words. I do not think that is in the best interest of campaign reform.

Mr. FARR of California. It does. You cannot sit down in your office with a lobbyist for the tobacco industry to figure out how you are going to vote and what Members are going to vote on and devise a campaign out of that. I do not think that is really what you want to happen.

Look at the language, no communication with a Senator or Member of the House, including a staff member, regarding any pending legislative matter regarding the position of the Senator or the Member on such matter may be construed to establish coordination with a candidate. You are saying that you cannot use that collaboration with citizens or collaborate under the law, Therefore, illegal.

Mr. McINTOSH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FARR of California. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. McINTOSH. Mr. Chairman, I am not aware of any current law that makes that type of communication illegal currently.

Mr. FARR of California. It does. You cannot sit down in your office with a group that wants to do a campaign and figure out and coordinate how you are going to be working on legislation and then go out and run a campaign on it. That is just totally illegal. You are making an exception for legislation.

I think it is an exception being made, frankly, that the big political battle here is for the tobacco interests. This bill would allow the tobacco interests and the legislators to sit down and figure out what would be a national campaign. Maybe that is not what you intended, but that is what the law allows. And I do not think it is good, and I would oppose it.
It is now in order to consider the amendment by the gentleman from California (Mr. Horn). AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HORN TO THE AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. SHAYS.

Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute. The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment. The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 32 offered by Mr. Horn to the amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 13 offered by Mr. Shays:

Add at the end the following new title:

TITLE—REDUCED POSTAGE RATES.

SEC. 02. REDUCED POSTAGE RATES FOR PRINCIPAL CAMPAIGN COMMITTEES OF CONGRESSIONAL CANDIDATES.

(a) IN GENERAL. Section 3626(e)(2)(A) of title 39, United States Code, is amended by striking "and the National Republican Congressional Committee" and inserting "and the National Republican Congressional Committee and the National Democratic Congressional Committee, or any of their committees. This simply changes the law to authorize in law for national party committees and State party committees. This means is that you will get the postage rate will give those who are not household in their district. What this is simply clearing out the intermediaries and the middle people and this is simply for incumbents and getting it directly to the challengers and to the incumbents. The difference is they would deliver the mail at 69 cents for generally a mailer of 60 to 125 cents for the 132 cents that is already paid. So it would help everybody. That, I think, is in the interest of the public to have a decent political debate in this country.

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

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of Friday, July 17, 1998, the gentleman from California (Mr. Horn) and a Member opposed, each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. Horn).

Mr. HORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. The amendment I am offering is a straightforward effort to take a positive step toward improving our campaigns. This proposal would reduce the cost of campaigns for all candidates for Congress, those that are incumbent, those that are challengers. It will create a better balance between incumbents and challengers and it will encourage real debate and discussion of these issues that are very important to our voters. This is a pattern of legislative playing field, for challengers and incumbents.

With more and more millionaires entering politics, the change in the postal rate will give those who are not wealthy the opportunity to get out their message to more mailings to each household in their district. What this means is that you will get the postage at half the price it is now for candidates but at the price that is already authorized in law for national party committees and state party committees. This simply changes the law to include candidates for Congress, that includes the Senate and Members of the House of Representatives.

Under the current rules of the House, Mr. Chairman, we prohibit mass mailings under the frank in the 60-day period before a primary or a general election. This limit reduces one advantage enjoyed by incumbents under the current law. The SMD bill would expand this prohibition by eliminating mass mailings under the congressional frank for the 6 months before an election. The limiting advantages for incumbents can be very appropriate for incumbents, but I believe we have to take into account, playing field for all candidates and thus improve the quality of the political dialogue. That is the goal essentially of this amendment. I think that the fact that we already can do that through the State and national committees, this is simply clearing out the intermediaries and the middle people and this is simply for incumbents and getting it directly to the challengers and to the incumbents. The difference is they would deliver the mail at 69 cents for generally a mailer of 60 to 125 cents for the 132 cents that is already paid. So it would help everybody. That, I think, is in the interest of the public to have a decent political debate in this country.

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

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from California (Mr. Snowbarger). The gentleman from California (Mr. Fazio) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. Fazio. California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I think this is a very well-intentioned amendment, but I have problems with it from several perspectives.

First of all the estimate of cost made by the Postal Service based on eight candidates per district, primary and general, is $130 million. That is a very high price tag. And bringing this bill under criticism from many who support Shays-Meehan but do not support public financing. This would be perceived to be a backdoor way of providing public financing to candidates.

Now, there are those who would advocate some sort of proposal like this if it were tied to the concept of spending limits. But this bill has avoided getting into that thicket because the controversy would weigh down the basic benefits of passing the Shays-Meehan law which many of us think does not go far enough but many also believe is about all we can accomplish with this very even balance we have achieved here on a bipartisan basis in this Congress. Since there is no spending limit and there would be no way of inducing people, therefore, into agreeing to limit their public spending, we would have to raise issues with this amendment that frankly would cause us to come down on the side of a "no" vote. That is that it is perceived as a way of giving challengers funding. And while there may be people in the country and certainly in this body who would like to help challengers, most of us want to deal with people on an equal basis and therefore provide equal benefits to people running as incumbents and as outsiders. Shays-Meehan has done a major thing to restore some balance by setting the date at 6 months prior to an election. I know the gentleman from California (Mr. Horn) voluntarily does not mail at all in the last year of the two-year cycle, but I do think that the effort made in this bill moves in the right direction, moves the franking privilege away from being a benefit to incumbent candidates.

I worry that the combination of opposition that might result both because it is too much reform, public financing and because it takes on the incumbent with money that would go to his challenger, creates a situation in which regretfully we would lose votes for this bill from both ends of the political spectrum and perhaps endanger the movement that we all believe is a major improvement, maybe not perfection, but certainly the best we can do in this very evenly balanced proposal. I would have to on that basis regretfully indicate opposition.

Mr. WAMP. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. Fazio. California. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. WAMP. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I rise, too, in a reluctant opposition and I say reluctant because the author of this bill the gentleman from California (Mr. Horn) is not only one of the brightest individuals in the House, he has been a true reformer, offering multiple bills and multiple amendments, really an academic expert in this issue of campaign finance reform. But I do come from the other ideological perspective.

I encouraged the authors of Shays-Meehan early on when it was in a different form to move away not to public financing, not to go to the route of broadcaster financing and we have put together this coalition amazingly well of people who had great heartburn with those two provisions. This would effectively take us there, albeit in a small way, but it would take us there to public financing. Frankly I am on this train with the understanding we were not going to go to this destination. So I certainly want to speak to that. But I very much support the gentleman from California (Mr. Horn) for all that he continues to do because he is truly trying his best to go in our direction.

Mr. Fazio. California. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. Horn. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. Mr. Chairman, to say this is public financing is not really accurate. Sure, money is involved in postage. This is the postal administration that has several billion. I believe, in profits. I would like to have separate at both the nonprofit rate and the higher rate. It does not really make any cost change in adding people to the route they run. It simply gives
now what is given to State parties to the candidates. The original Shays-Meehan bill and McCain-Feingold reform plans had a proposal like this in them. Now, they probably took it out for some reason. But I think it is incumbent and the incumbents would not like this because that would give their challenger a chance. I think we ought to get a little broader and not just be protecting incumbency, we ought to let the challengers have the same type of opportunity we have; because, in all honesty, generally, unless you are running against a millionaire, can have a lot in their bank accounts, I do not happen to. So do hundreds of others in here. But a few of our Members, as we know, have million-dollar campaign funds, and that scares off the competition. This would at least give the competition a chance to get the message out twice, to the households in the district at the nonprofit rate. MR. CHAIRMAN, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Let me just conclude by saying I personally believe public financing is the way of the future. I think we have neglected it in the presidential system and need to reinvigorate public support for it. But I am more concerned tonight that we not impede progress on Shays-Meehan, that we not upset the balance that has been achieved in this version of this bill. It is the best we can accomplish under the circumstances. I would not want to endanger its enactment because we went too far in the direction that some of our colleagues that support this bill cannot go. I do not want to inflame some of our colleagues on the other end of the spectrum who are concerned about advantaging their challengers. I realize we have not made perfection, but I think we have come a lot further than any would have anticipated. We are on the verge of success, enacting something we can all be proud of. I hope the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN) can accept our reluctant opposition to his amendment, and I hope he can support Shays-Meehan as a major step in the right direction. Hopefully in subsequent Congresses we can readdress some of these same kinds of issues and perhaps reach common ground going forward.

Mr. HORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The gentleman from California knows that I have been a sponsor and coauthor of Shays-Meehan. I think there are a lot of good things in it. But I cannot imagine except incumbent the United States, candidates for the presidency, and that is, to have the money that is fungible throughout your campaign with no limit on when it is. This is one limit, getting the two mailers to the households in your district.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN) to the amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 13 offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS).

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

Mr. HORN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 442, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN) to the amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 13 offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) will be postponed.

It is now in order to consider the amendment by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON). Is there a designee for the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON)?

It is now in order to consider the amendment by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH) as modified by the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS).

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The amendment offered by Mr. SHADEGG to the amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 13 offered by Mr. SHAYS.

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The text of the amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

Amendment No. 35 offered by Mr. SHADEGG to the amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 13 offered by Mr. SHAYS. Add at the end of title V the following new section (and conform the table of contents accordingly):


(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 309 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 437g) is amended—(1) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (e); and
(2) by inserting after subsection (c) the following new subsection:

(iii) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, if a candidate (or the candidate’s authorized committee) believes that a violation described in paragraph (2) has been committed with respect to an election occurring after the date of the election, the candidate or committee may institute a civil action on behalf of the Commission for relief against the alleged violator in the same manner and under the same terms and conditions as an action instituted by the Commission under section (a)(6), except that the court involved shall issue a decision on as soon as practicable after the action is instituted and to the greatest extent possible issue the decision prior to the date of the election involved.

(ii) A violation described in this paragraph is a violation of this Act or of chapter 95 or chapter 96 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 relating to "(A) whether a construction is in excess of an applicable limit or is otherwise prohibited under this act; or
(b) whether an expenditure is an independent expenditure under section 309(17)."

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to elections occurring after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of Friday, July 17, 1998, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SHADEGG) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SHADEGG).

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I have an amendment which seeks to solve a problem in existing law. That problem is that under the way the FEC laws are currently written, if a campaign law violation occurs in the last 90 days before an election is held, there is no remedy. That is that the violation goes by and cannot be remedied. The reason for that is that under current law, the only existing remedy is to go to the Federal Election Commission in Washington, D.C., file a complaint and unregulated. The FEC guidelines says no action, absolutely no action is to be taken on that complaint for a period of 90 days.

What that means is that during the last 90 days of a campaign, there simply is no remedy for many of the violations which occurred. Indeed there is no remedy whatsoever. The FEC cannot get to it before the election. Often times such complaints are rendered moot by the election and, therefore, there is a gaping hole in existing law. What my amendment would do is to solve this. It solves the problem by simply saying that for any violation of the FEC provisions which occurs in the last 90 days before the election, a candidate involved in that campaign would be able to pursue a remedy in Federal District Court in the candidate's state, and it requires that the Federal District Court give that candidate expedited review of their complaint.
What that means is that when an egregious violation of law occurs during this key last 90 days of the campaign, the candidate would have an option to go to Federal District Court, file a pleading, request a remedy, ask the court to give them a remedy, and say, yes, this is a violation and provide an answer to the problem. It is, I think, an eminently fair provision. It would bias neither side, but it would solve the problem in the way the current Federal Election Code is written.

I urge my colleagues to adopt this amendment. It is good sense. It would provide the court with the authority to grant injunctive relief if necessary, and it requires the court to both act on an expedited basis and if possible to resolve the complaint before the election. I think it has tremendous merit. I urge my colleagues to support it.

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

Mr. WAMP. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim my time normally in opposition but not to oppose the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Tennessee is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. This is another good example where the gentleman offering the amendment is in a constructive way enhancing what we are trying to accomplish with good reform. Certainly the reformers here in support of Shays-Meehan accept the amendment and commend the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SHADEGG) for bringing this idea to us and actually putting it into a form that will certainly strengthen the Federal Election Commission and the laws and rules that govern us as candidates here in the House and in the Senate. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Chairman, is it my understanding the amendment has been accepted?

Mr. WAMP. Mr. Chairman, the amendment has been accepted, but we will have a voice vote at the pleasure of the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SHADEGG).

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the expression of support from both this side and the other side. I think it is an improvement in the current law that will benefit the system and help to clean up elections in this country.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SHADEGG) to the amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 13 offered by Mr. SHAYS offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW).

Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The text of the amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SHAW to the amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 13 offered by Mr. SHAYS:

Add at the end of title V the following new section (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

SEC. 510. REQUIRING MAJORITY OF AMOUNT OF CONTRIBUTIONS ACCEPTED BY HOUSE CANDIDATES TO COME FROM IN-PERSON.

Section 315 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 441a) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

(3) With respect to each reporting period or an election, the total of contributions accepted by a candidate for the office of Representative in Congress or Resident Commissioner to the Congress from in-State individual residents shall be at least 50 percent of the total of contributions accepted from all sources.

(2) As used in this subsection, the term ‘in-State individual resident’ means an individual who resides in the State in which the congressional district involved is located.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of Friday, July 17, 1998, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I recognize the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW).

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. Mr. Chairman, we are here tonight at a quarter of eleven. Unfortunately, it is so late the offices are closed; the staff have gone home; there is only a handful of Members here on the floor tonight. I was tempted to call a point of order to bring the Members back in because I think this is really pitiful that we are talking about here tonight. What do they want me to yield time. Does anybody want me to yield time because they can criticize the amendment? Or do they want to criticize it because it is a poison pill?

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHAW. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman. I think this is a very, very reasonable amendment. I cannot see how anybody could possibly oppose it. As a matter of fact, someone could come up here and say to me that I have got a good reason to say this is bad, this should not be, I would yield them the time.

I would say to the gentleman from California (Mr. Fazio) who is standing there and all the gentlemen over there who are going to jump up and talk about a poison pill, if they can tell me how this is bad, I would yield them the time. Does anybody want me to yield time because they can criticize the amendment? Or do they want to criticize it because it is a poison pill?

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Chairman, is it my understanding the amendment has been accepted?

Mr. WAMP. Mr. Chairman, the amendment has been accepted, but we will have a voice vote at the pleasure of the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SHADEGG).

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. Mr. Chairman, we are here tonight at a quarter of eleven. Unfortunately, it is so late the offices are closed; the staff have gone home; there is only a handful of Members here on the floor tonight. I was tempted to call a point of order to bring the Members back in because I think this is really pitiful that we are talking about here tonight. What do they want me to yield time. Does anybody want me to yield time because they can criticize the amendment? Or do they want to criticize it because it is a poison pill?

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. Mr. Chairman, we are here tonight at a quarter of eleven. Unfortunately, it is so late the offices are closed; the staff have gone home; there is only a handful of Members here on the floor tonight. I was tempted to call a point of order to bring the Members back in because I think this is really pitiful that we are talking about here tonight. What do they want me to yield time. Does anybody want me to yield time because they can criticize the amendment? Or do they want to criticize it because it is a poison pill?

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. Mr. Chairman, we are here tonight at a quarter of eleven. Unfortunately, it is so late the offices are closed; the staff have gone home; there is only a handful of Members here on the floor tonight. I was tempted to call a point of order to bring the Members back in because I think this is really pitiful that we are talking about here tonight. What do they want me to yield time. Does anybody want me to yield time because they can criticize the amendment? Or do they want to criticize it because it is a poison pill?

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.
That cannot possibly be on the merits. If Members are from Kansas City, then they have got to decide which side of the border they are from, and then they should decide where they are running from, where their support should come from, and the people are that they are representing and bring this back closer to the people. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. Faizi of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I was beginning to point out in my colloquy with my friend from Florida the unworkability of this amendment but also the fact that it is an artificial barrier. We ought to be focusing on the region that the individual comes from, for example, and why would not people who come from Kansas City, Missouri, have the same interests that people two miles away in the other State have on issues of importance to them, to its economy, to its employers, to its workers?

This sets an artificial standard. For example, Members may have hundreds of bus drivers who want to support them in their district and in their State, but their home office where their PAC is located may be States away. This would mean that those people would, in effect, not been counted as people from their State. The same would be true of a corporate PAC that is home based at corporate headquarters. A few miles, thousands of miles away from where many of its workers are located in a plant in their district. They would not be counted as part of the in-State or in-district contributor base.

The marketplace of political debate should determine whether it is appropriate or not to raise money from any given place or individual. This can be an issue in a campaign. If Members are surviving only on the basis of Washington money, then I would say it is a legitimate issue to be brought up. But to establish this standard is an artificial one, particularly difficult for Members who come from poor and low-income areas.

Secondly, for people that may be low income or minority in my State or other small States, they often connect with other people from other States that happen to be of the same ethnic background or same political direction, and it becomes very important for them to do that.

This bill, if every State were the size of the State of Florida, I could understand the gentleman’s point. If everybody were centered in the middle of a large State, I could understand his point. But for every small State it becomes almost impossible.

The second point that the gentleman from California (Mr. Faizi) made which is critical:

People with labor or business or advocacy groups that happen to be located in my State but their home or major office is someplace else, in Washington, New York, California or Texas, the funds that they use to support candidates in Rhode Island go to those Washington, Texas or California offices, then come back to us. They would not fall into the category within the confines of the gentleman’s amendment, again hurting small States and low-income areas.

So I can sympathize with the intent of trying to keep the money within the area that Members represent, and when there is 30 seats, or 26 seats, or 52 seats in the Congress from one State, that is possible. But when there is only one or two seats, like Rhode Island, South Dakota, North Dakota, Delaware, it becomes very impossible.

Mr. Faizi of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

To conclude, Mr. Chairman, I would simply say this is an important effort in Shays-Meehan to stop the explosion of soft money and shaim issue ads. It does not deal with many of the other issues that have been brought up in the House, such as a reform bills. It is a carefully crafted and balanced proposal, and many people who support it do not agree with the gentleman from Florida (Mr. Shays) and therefore, regretfully for him, would oppose the overall bill were this amendment to be adopted.

So I hate to say it, but it is, in fact, the proverbial poison pill. It would cause the coalition to shatter and end destroying what chance we have in this land. In this Congress to take some fundamental steps forward, not perhaps addressing all of the issues that all the Members would like to have before us but making a real difference in the electoral process and in the restoration of confidence in the American political system.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. Shaw. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I would briefly say in rebuttal to the gentleman I think what we are talking is trying to bring balance back to the American political system and to stop the charge that PACs may have some problem with this particular amendment is not a very good argument.

What we are talking about, Mr. Chairman, is trying to bring the political system back to the people that we represent. Now to bring it back to just their congressional district creates a problem, and we understand that problem because there are some districts that are extremely poor. But to say that we cannot bring it back to a State, I do not think that we have any States that are that poor that they cannot support the people that they sent up here to represent them.

I think this is an important, Mr. Chairman, and I think that for us to turn our backs on the people that we represent and say that we are going to vote against this particular amendment, which just simply says to take back the political system back to the States, back to the people who have sent us here, it is very important and vital for us to remember where we came from and remember the people that sent us here.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Shaw. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 442, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. Shays) to the amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 13 offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. Shays).

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

Ms. Kaptur. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 442, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. Shays) to the amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 13 offered by Mr. Shays will be postponed.

It is now in order to consider the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Ms. Kaptur).

Ms. Kaptur. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Will the gentlewoman designate which amendment? Is it amendment number 39?

Ms. Kaptur. Mr. Chairman, for purposes of the RECORD, this would be the original amendment listed as 39. I will not be officially offering it this day. It has to do with the constitutional amendment to overturn Buckley versus Valeo, which I think is the real answer to these questions. But we will be moving on to Amendment 39.
The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Does the gentlewoman wish to offer Amendment No. 38?

Ms. KAPTUR. Not at this point. The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider Amendment No. 39 offered by the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. KAPTUR TO THE AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. SHAYS

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The text of the amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. KAPTUR to the Amendment in the Nature of a Substitute No. 13 offered by Mr. Shays:

Add at the end the following new title:

TITLE V—ETHICS IN FOREIGN LOBBYING

SEC. 01. PROHIBITION OF CONTRIBUTIONS AND EXPENDITURES BY MULTICANDIDATE POLITICAL COMMITTEES, OR SEPARATE SEGREGATED FUNDS SPONSORED BY FOREIGN-CONTROLLED CORPORATIONS AND ASSOCIATIONS.

Title III of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 441 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"'PROHIBITION OF CONTRIBUTIONS AND EXPENDITURES BY MULTICANDIDATE POLITICAL COMMITTEES, OR SEPARATE SEGREGATED FUNDS SPONSORED BY FOREIGN-CONTROLLED CORPORATIONS AND ASSOCIATIONS.'

"SEC. 323. (a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law—

(1) no multicandidate political committee or separate segregated fund of a foreign-controlled corporation may make any contribution or expenditure with respect to an election for Federal office; and

(2) a foreign-controlled corporation may make any contribution or expenditure with respect to an election for Federal office if 50 percent or more of the operating fund of the trade organization, membership organization, cooperative, or corporation without capital stock is supplied by foreign-controlled corporations or foreign nationals.

"(b) INFORMATION REQUIRED TO BE REPORTED.—The Commission shall—

(1) require each multicandidate political committee or separate segregated fund of a corporation to include in the statement of organization of the multicandidate political committee or separate segregated fund a statement (to be updated annually and at any time when the percentage goes above or below 50 percent) of the percentage of ownership interest of which is controlled by persons other than citizens or nationals of the United States;

(2) the term 'multicandidate political committee' means a committee identified by subsection (a) that is not a separate segregated fund referred to in section 316(a); and

(3) the term 'foreign national' has the meaning given that term in section 315(a).

"SEC. 02. PROHIBITION OF CERTAIN ELECTION-RELATED ACTIVITIES OF FOREIGN NATIONALS.

Section 319 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 442e) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (b) as subsection (c), and

(2) by inserting after subsection (a) the following new subsection:

"'(b) A foreign national shall not direct, dictate, control, or directly or indirectly participate in the decisionmaking process of any, such as a corporation, labor organization, political committee, or political committee, with regard to any person's Federal or non-Federal election-related activities, such as decisions concerning the making of contributions or expenditures in connection with elections for any local, State, or Federal office or decisions concerning the administration of a political committee.

"SEC. 03. ESTABLISHMENT OF A CLEARINGHOUSE OF POLITICAL ACTIVITIES INFORMATION WITHIN THE FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There shall be established within the Federal Election Commission a clearinghouse of public information regarding the political activities of foreign principals and agents of foreign principals. The information comprising this clearinghouse shall include only the following:

(1) all registrations filed pursuant to the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.) during the preceding 5-year period;

(2) all registrations and reports filed pursuant to the Foreign Agents Registration Act, as amended (22 U.S.C. 611 et seq.), during the preceding 5-year period;

(3) the listings of public hearings, hearing witnesses, and witness affidavits printed in the Congressional Record during the preceding 5-year period;

(4) all public information disclosed pursuant to the rules of the Senate or the House of Representatives, to the Comptroller General, such rules, regulations, and forms, in conformity with the provisions of chapter 5 of title 5, United States Code, as are necessary to carry out the provisions of this section and this section in the most effective and efficient manner; and

(5) at the request of any Member of the Senate or the House of Representatives, to prepare and submit to such Member a study relating to the political activities of any person and consisting only of the information in the records, reports, and other information comprising the clearinghouse.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—As used in this section—

(1) the terms "foreign principal" and "foreign agent" shall have the meanings given those terms in section 1 of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended (22 U.S.C. 611).

(2) the term 'issue before the Congress' means the total of all matters, both substantive and procedural, relating to any pending or pending resolution, report, nomination, treaty, hearing, investigation, or other similar matter in either
the Senate or the House of Representatives or any committee or office of the Congress; or

(B) any pending action by a Member, officer, or employee of the Congress to affect, or attempt to affect, any action or proposed action by any officer or employee of the executive branch; and

(3) the term "issue before the executive branch" means the total of all matters, both substantive and procedural, relating to any pending action by any executive agency, or by any officer or employee of the executive branch, concerning—

(A) any pending or proposed rule, rule of practice, adjudication, regulation, determination, examination, investigation, contract, grant, license, negotiation, or the appointment of officers and employees, other than appointments in the competitive service; or

(B) any issue before the Congress.

SEC. 05. PENALTIES FOR DISCLOSURE.

Any person who discloses information in violation of section 03(b), and any person who sells or uses information for the purpose of soliciting contributions or for any profit-making purpose in violation of section 04(a)(2), shall be imprisoned for a period of not more than 1 year, or fined in the amount provided in title 18, United States Code, or both.

SEC. 06. AMENDMENTS TO THE FOREIGN AGENTS REGISTRATION ACT OF 1938, AS AMENDED.

(a) QUARTERLY REPORTS.—Section 2(b) of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended (22 U.S.C. 612(b)), is amended in the first sentence by striking out "within thirty days" and all that follows through "preceding six months period" and inserting in lieu thereof "(i) January 31, April 30, July 31, and October 31 of each year, file with the Attorney General a supplement thereto on a form prescribed by the Attorney General, which shall be substantially similar in form to the quarterly reports described in the three-month periods ending the previous December 31, March 31, June 30, and September 30, respectively, or if a lesser period, the period since the initial filing."

(b) EXEMPTION FOR LEGAL REPRESENTATION.—Section 3(g) of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended (22 U.S.C. 613(b)), is amended by adding at the end the following: "(i)(1) Any person who is determined, after notice and opportunity for an administrative hearing—

(A) to have failed to file a registration statement under section 2(a) or a supplement thereto under section 2(b),

(B) to have omitted a material fact required to be stated therein, or

(C) to have made a false statement with respect to such a material fact, shall be required to pay a civil penalty in an amount not less than $2,000 or more than $5,000 for each violation committed. In determining the amount of the penalty, the Attorney General shall give due consideration to the nature and circumstances of the violation.

(2)(A) In conducting investigations and hearings under paragraph (1), administrative law judges may, if necessary, compel by subpoena duces tecum the attendance of witnesses and the production of evidence at any designated place or hearing.

(B) In the case of contempt or refusal to obey a subpoena lawfully issued under this paragraph and, upon application by the Attorney General, an appropriate district court of the United States may issue an order requiring compliance with such subpoena and any failure to obey such order may be punished by such court as a contempt thereof."

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of Friday, July 17, 1998, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, could I claim the 5 minutes in opposition?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Connecticut has claimed the time in opposition and will be recognized later for 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, historically, Congress has been very clear about disallowing foreign contributions to U.S. campaigns at the federal level. If we look, however, at the foreign lobbying activities that have grown, especially in this past quarter century, and the organization of multinational corporations that have in many ways outgrown existing legal frameworks, it is clear that the amendment like this is needed and, as originally proposed, my amendment sought to both clarify the definition as well as the disclosure by foreign-controlled political action contributions to U.S. election campaigns.

But I am going to offer a modified version of this after considerable consultation with the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. GILLMOR) and others on the other side of the aisle and this one.

But it is certainly true to say that U.S. law has been abundantly clear about who can contribute to U.S. campaigns: citizens of this country as individuals and citizens through political action committees expressly organized for that purpose. But corporations can go on in other trade unions outside of a formally recognized political action committee.

But because of a loophole dating back to 1934, while foreign nationals and foreign citizens cannot directly or indirectly contribute to U.S. campaigns, foreign-controlled corporate and trade associations, including those based in the United States, can contribute.

The Federal Election Campaign Act, section 431(e), says, and I quote, a foreign national shall not directly or through any other person make a contribution or expressly or implicitly promise to make a contribution in connection with an election or any act or decision in connection with any primary election, convention, or caucus held to select candidates for any political office or for any person to solicit, accept, or receive such contribution from a foreign national.

The Federal Elections Act defines a foreign principal as a government of a foreign country or a foreign political party: a person outside the United States who is not a citizen; or a partnership, association, corporation, or organization, or other combination of persons organized under the laws of or having its principal base of business in a foreign country.

The loophole in all of that is that foreign-owned corporations and trade associations which are organized under U.S. law and have their principal place of business in the United States are not defined as foreign principals and, therefore, are allowed to operate PACs, even though their control and ownership are foreign in nature.

The principal law governing the disclosure of foreign lobbying by these entities, the Foreign Agents Registration Act, when the GAO studied in 1990 what had been happening, it is that, in fact, disclosure of those activities are very thin.

Currently, public information on these activities is collected by the government in scattered ways. But this information would be brought together in one place and place the public and the Congress a better idea of what is actually going on in our nation's foreign lobbying and giving activity.

No one will be required to provide any information that is not already collected but in several disparate places. Nor would anyone be required to provide duplicative information to a new agency.
The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will report the modification. The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment, as modified, offered by Ms. KAPTUR to the amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 13 offered by Mr. SHAYS. Add at the end of title V the following new section (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

SEC. 503. ESTABLISHMENT OF A CLEARING-HOUSE OF INFORMATION ON POLITICAL ACTIVITIES WITHIN THE FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT. There shall be established within the Federal Election Commission a clearinghouse of public information regarding the political activities of foreign principals of foreign political committees. The information comprising this clearinghouse shall include only the following:

(1) All registrations and reports filed pursuant to the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.) during the preceding 5-year period.

(2) All registrations and reports filed pursuant to the Foreign Agents Registration Act, as amended (22 U.S.C. 611 et seq.), during the preceding 5-year period.

(3) The listings of public hearings, hearings, and other information comprising the clearingshouse.

(b) DISCLOSURE OF OTHER INFORMATION PROHIBITED. The disclosure by the clearinghouse of public information regarding the political activities of foreign principals of foreign political committees shall be prohibited.

(c) DIRECTOR OF CLEARINGHOUSE. The Director shall—

(1) DUTIES. The Director shall have a duty to carry out the purposes of this section in the most effective manner.

(2) APPOINTMENT. The Director shall be appointed by the Federal Election Commission.

(3) TERM OF SERVICE. The Director shall serve a period of time determined by the Commission, but not to exceed 5 years.

(d) PENALTIES FOR DISCLOSURE OF INFORMATION. Any person who discloses information in violation of subsection (b), and any person who sells or uses information for the purpose of soliciting contributions or for any profit-making purpose, shall be subject to a fine not exceeding $10,000 and not to exceed 1 year in prison.

(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the activities of the clearinghouse.

(f) Foreign Principal. Foreign principal shall mean any foreign corporation or association, or any person organized under or created in or administered within the United States and that has its principal place of business within the United States.

Ms. KAPTUR (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the modification be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. There is no objection to the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I would just like to state that, first, this is a fairly comprehensive amendment, but we are not sure whether it is in conflict with the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. GILLMOR). So what I am going to be suggesting to this Chamber is that we have a vote. I will be voting ‘no’ tonight. I will be suggesting that we go over in depth line by line the gentleman’s amendment to see if it is an amendment that, when we have an actual rollcall vote, it will be one that we can accept or not.

Because the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. GILLMOR) has a right to fight for things they think are important for Chrysler and its workers just as the employees of Chrysler, that makes sure that we have that same process that the workers have when they organize as well. I am not passing judgment because we still just are not sure of it.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mrs. KELLY).

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, I want to point out that it is my Home State of New York. I think that American citizens work for American subsidiaries of companies headquartered abroad. These are hard-working Americans that are employed by American subsidiaries of companies, and I believe, need to have the right to contribute their own money to candidates through employer-based PACs. It is a political right that is granted to all American citizens at this time.

Because we are not certain at this time about whether or not this amendment will change the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. GILLMOR), I want to be certain that we have an actual rollcall vote tomorrow since the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. GILLMOR) is not here.

I believe that the political rights of all Americans should not be determined by where they work. I think it should be determined because they are American citizens. They should not be disenfranchised from the political process.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire of the Chair how much time I have remaining?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) has 2 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) has no time remaining.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, evidently, I have misrepresented the gentleman’s amendment. I would like for her to describe what she thinks her amendment does, and I would respond to that.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume from the gentleman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) to explain what she feels her amendment does and does not.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman very much for yielding to me and the gentleman from New York, because, in consultation with both of them, we substantially scaled back our original amendment. This particular amendment, as modified, that we are offering this evening would only take the clearinghouse section out of the original proposal to collect information from the lobbying disclosure.

Mr. SHAYS. Reclaiming my time, when the gentleman says take it out of the original proposal to collect information from the lobbying disclosure, the gentleman was saying and the gentlewoman from New York was saying that Chrysler Corporation employees could not contribute or people...
should not be allowed to contribute. We agree that U.S. citizens should be allowed to contribute. This amendment, as modified, has nothing to do with that. All it provides is for disclosure as we do with U.S. contributions that are currently flowing into campaigns.

We are saying that we want to create a clearinghouse at the FEC for all these donations. We will do that by recording existing information from the Lobbying Disclosure Act, from the Foreign Agent Administration.

Mr. SHAYS. If I can reclaim my time, if I can say to the gentleman, as the amendment is described, I am comfortable and I think other Members are. I do think it will be healthy to have a vote on this tomorrow. I am not going to oppose it if there is all yesses. I still ask for a rollcall vote. I think it is important for us to sit down with the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. GILLMOR) and others and make sure that we are clear to our recommended vote to our colleagues when they vote on the floor.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House on Friday, July 17, 1998, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS), and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House on Friday, July 17, 1998, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS), and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 13 offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS).

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 13 is as follows:

Amendment No. 47 offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) to the amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 13 offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS):

Add at the end of title V the following new section (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

SEC. 510. CONSPIRACY TO VIOLATE PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGN SPENDING LIMITS.

(a) In General. Ð Section 9003 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (26 U.S.C. 9003) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

(2) CONSPIRACY TO VIOLATE LIMITS. Ð A candidate or another person who acts for such candidate, seeks to avoid the spending limits applicable to the candidate under such chapter or under the Federal Election Campaign Act and, to avoid such limits, transfers or directs funds from any source other than such fund for the direct or indirect benefit of such candidate's campaign, such candidate shall be fined not more than $1,000,000, or imprisoned for a term of not more than 3 years, or both.

(b) Effective Date. Ð The amendment made by this section shall apply with respect to elections occurring on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 13 offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS).

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 442, further proceedings on the amendment, as modified, offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) to the amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 13 offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) will be postponed.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 46 offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUHL) to the amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 13 offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS).

Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I yield my time.

Mr. STEARNS. I yield to the gentleman from Samoa (Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA).

During the debate a couple of weeks ago, this amendment that I sponsored and also the gentleman from New York (Ms. FASSELLA) sponsored, both of which were referred to by Mr. FASSELLA. But there was something that was in both his amendment and mine that concerned me a bit. My amendment banned all political contributions from Federal, State or local elections from noncitizens, which included resident aliens.

But I realized, Mr. Chairman, during the debate that the gentleman from Samoa had a very good point about resident aliens who are serving in the military. Such permanent residents may be drafted, as they were in Vietnam and other military actions.

So what I am trying to do tonight is to say okay, if one is serving in the military, I think one should be able to participate.

So frankly, this amendment seeks to rectify the situation with resident aliens who serve in the U.S. military, which includes the reserves.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEARNS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, does this make them permanent residents if they served and then leave the service, or do they lose their right to vote after they have left military service?

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, if they hide the service for 1 or 2 years, they automatically become U.S. citizens.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, in other words, at that point the issue goes away.

Mr. STEARNS. No, Mr. Chairman, but if during that period for 1 or 2 years they are serving in the military, as we are saying we will allow them to contribute.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Now, Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, as I remember the gentleman's comments from that earlier debate, he was also talking about people who were taxpayers, as many legal residents are, who are not citizens.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I do not remember what I said about taxpayers other than that I felt that non-U.S. citizens should not be participating, but I think after talking to the gentleman from Samoa, I think if they served in the military or are presently serving in the military, then I think that one should have a chance to vote on this.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I certainly do not oppose this, I think it makes a bad proposal less bad, but if I understand that the gentleman has the votes on his side, so I certainly will not oppose it. In fact, I encourage him to offer it.

But I do think that when we begin to think about those things that cause us to recognize the contributions of legal residents, we should not just stop with military service; we should think of all of the things they do, including contributing in many other ways, as well as being taxpayers.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I think the amendment is pretty simple and it will pass overwhelmingly. I think my good friend from Samoa had made a good
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Serving in the military and those that have served 3 years and are out of the military, what about those people who have served a year-and-a-half, 2 years, and perhaps were not reached the 3-year period of time?

Is the gentleman saying that anyone who has served, that is a resident, could contribute to a campaign?

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, if they are serving in the military.

Mr. WEYGAND. Mr. Chairman, presently serving?

Mr. STEARNS. Presently serving, yes.

Mr. WEYGAND. Mr. Chairman, so that if they have served in Vietnam, in Desert Storm, if they have done that, but they are now out of the military, they are not eligible?

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, that is correct.

Mr. WEYGAND. Mr. Chairman, I understand the gentleman’s effort to try to make some amends, but it would seem to me that whether one is serving presently or one has served in Vietnam and now has provided that service to this country, the motivation for the gentleman’s amendment would be indeed to provide some kind of an allowance for someone to contribute to a campaign by way of serving in the military, and I would think if anyone served 5 years ago, 10 years ago or 20 years ago, they would be eligible for the same merits that the gentleman is giving to the people who are presently serving in the military.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEYGAND. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. WEYGAND).

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, of course, if they served 3 years, then they automatically become U.S. citizens. So we are trying to bridge here a little bit of support.

Mr. WEYGAND. Mr. Chairman, claiming my time, I understand what the gentleman is saying, but if someone had served only a year-and-a-half, who was injured and was discharged from the military because of injury or something else and does not qualify for that 3-year citizenship that the gentleman is talking about, and therefore, in that case, may be still not an American citizen, but have served valiantly for this country, perhaps even given part of their body for this country, would now be eligible to contribute to a campaign?

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEYGAND. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman should certainly offer an amendment to change what we have passed here on the House floor, but I think this amendment goes a long way and probably will receive a majority of support.

Mr. WEYGAND. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman be willing to accept an amendment that would allow for someone who has served in the military, been discharged, to be eligible for this benefit of contributing to a campaign?

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEYGAND. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, probably not, just because I am just going to keep this as it stands, but I think certainly the gentleman could offer his own amendment.

Mr. WEYGAND. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts, (Mr. MEEHAN).

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, I think my colleague makes a very valid point. I thank the gentleman for offering this amendment. Clearly, a member of the Armed Forces or the Armed Forces Reserve should have the right to contribute to a Federal election. Yet I would remind the gentleman that all legal permanent residents have the right to contribute in Federal campaigns, according to the United States Supreme Court.

With this amendment, it seems to me the gentleman is making a value judgment that legal permanent residents who served in the Armed Forces are worthy of first amendment protection because they laid down their lives for this country. But how about those legal permanent residents who are doctors? They save American lives every day. Or how about the legal permanent residents who are the parents of those young men and women who have lost their lives in our country? Should they not also be given the full protection of the first amendment?

I do not object to the gentleman’s amendment, but I do want to point out the arbitrary nature of this particular exclusion. This amendment is only necessary because the gentleman, rightly, perceives the inequities of a flat-out ban. The problem is, I could think of many worthy exemptions and exceptions.

There are so many ways that legal permanent residents prove their allegiance to this government and to the United States. Serving in the Armed Forces is only one example. But I certainly would accept the gentleman’s amendment, but I think it is important to point out the injustice of just picking out one small group.

Mr. WEYGAND. Mr. Chairman, I yield to gentleman from California (Mr. FARR).

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, I just have a question of how the gentleman would manage this, if the author would so indulge. One is a legal resident of the United States, one is here, the law says one is here.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FARR of California. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, a permanent legal alien, not a U.S. citizen.
Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) to the amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 13 offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) will be postponed.

It is now in order to consider the amendment No. 48 offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) to the amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 13 offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS).

Amendment offered by Mr. STEARNS to the amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 13 offered by Mr. SHAYS.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 13 offered by Mr. SHAYS.

Amendment No. 48 offered by Mr. STEARNS to the amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 13 offered by Mr. SHAYS.

Add at the end of title V the following new section (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

SEC. 510. PERMITTING PERMANENT RESIDENT ALIENS SERVING IN ARMED FORCES TO MAKE CONTRIBUTIONS.

Section 319 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 444) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"The amendment offers by the gentleman from Florida, my friend Mr. Shays, No. 48, allowing permanent residents in the armed forces to make contributions to the D.N.C., in my opinion, is without merit.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment at this time, I think, is going to mean literally saving the nature of our amendment to allow the private contributions. And the gentleman from Florida is going to support and join the amendment. Now, we are going to vote tomorrow. And I think it is going to pass. So in essence, Mr. Chairman, what I have done is put in a penalty. I think the presidential or vice presidential candidate who receives public funding from raising soft money. While we support the gentleman's position, this amendment is really unnecessary in the context of the Shays-Meehan bill.
Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEEHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman knows, there are a lot more amendments to come. Also, several amendments I voted for today were defeated. I think the Goodlatte amendment is a good example.

So I think this campaign finance bill is still in doubt. I think there are lots of areas that need to be improved, and frankly, some of the other substitute and other bills that are going to be offered that I think we should look at.

I think it is premature to talk about that. I would remind the gentleman from Massachusetts that I think what he has to worry about is the executive branch micromanaging either the DNC, or either party.

Mr. MEEHAN. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, what we on this side and both sides who are fighting for campaign finance reform, what we have to worry about is making sure we get as many votes as we can. I am delighted going to accept a couple of your amendments, but I just want to illustrate the point that ultimately you are not going to support our bill, which is unfortunate. But I will point out, this evening we had several astoric votes, broad bipartisan support to defeat poison pill amendments.

I am encouraged, I think my colleagues who are here are encouraged with the tremendous support. We look forward to dealing tomorrow with the remaining amendments and voting yes on those amendments that we are accepting and voting no on those amendments which would destroy the unique and historic bipartisan coalition that we have in support of our legislation.

I look forward to working with the amendments this evening. We are moving along slowly but surely. I am delighted at how well things are going this evening.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Judging from the information given by my colleague, I assume he is supporting my amendment. I think that the idea of putting penalties in place is important. I think the whole idea of the executive branch micromanaging any other area of the campaign financing operations is what we are trying to prevent. I would say to my colleague that I appreciate his support for the remaining amendments and voting yes on those amendments that we are accepting and voting no on those amendments which would destroy the unique and historic bipartisan coalition that we have in support of our legislation.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) to the amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 13 offered by Mr. SHAYS: Amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

``(f) Illegal Solicitation of Soft Money.—No candidate for election to the office of President or Vice President may receive amounts from the Presidential Election Campaign Fund under this chapter or the purpose of influencing such election, including any funds used for an independent expenditure under the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, unless the funds are subject to the limitations, prohibitions, and reporting requirements of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971."

(b) Effective Date.—The amendment made by this section shall apply with respect to elections occurring on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of Friday, July 17, 1998, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) and a Member opposed, each will control 5 minutes.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This amendment is similar to the amendments offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS).

The amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I think we can support this amendment, although I was a little concerned when you indicated you are going to read into the RECORD some of Dick Morris' words. It makes me a little nervous as to whether or not we really support the amendment.

Everything sounded great until we got to that. I get a little concerned about which statements from Dick Morris were going to be read into the RECORD.

I think that the Shays-Meehan legislation addresses precisely the matter that you are concerned about. I do not want to address matters that Dick Morris may be concerned about, but in any event, we generally support the amendment.

I think that the Shays-Meehan legislation addresses precisely the matter that you are concerned about. I do not know that it does address matters that Dick Morris may be concerned about, but in any event, we are delighted to accept the amendment, notwithstanding the statements of Mr. Morris that have been submitted into the RECORD.

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the reason I mentioned Dick Morris was just to give an
example of what occurred, and I think the folks realize that he was the principal advisor to the President and basically they started running these ads that were constantly lauding the President all around the country and his record and also involved in the campaign and the problem was funding those ads.

So I am not categorically going after Mr. Morris or anybody but other than to say this is a clear example of what the committee on the Senate was talking about, so after so many Republican campaigns and I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 seconds.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman makes some very good points. I have no idea why the President ever hired Dick Morris to run the Republican campaigns, I have no idea why he hired him. I think when the history books are written, the President will regret ever having hired him.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 seconds as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I think Congress needs to strengthen the law by preventing the type of activity that Dick Morris mentioned in his testimony. This type of abuse should be prevented from ever happening again in presidential campaigns, and I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

The infamous Dick Morris testified to the Committee that:

The President had significant involvement with the DNC media consultants in the areas of polling, advertising, speech-writing, legislation strategy, and general policy advice. The President had significant involvement for the President "related to substantive issues in connection with his job as President, but is (also) could be considered political." The President wanted to keep total control over the advertising campaign designed by Morris and the DNC media consultants.

The defenders of the President will argue that this is not a violation of the letter of the law under the Federal Election Campaign Act, but the nature of the coordination between the President, his political advisors, and DNC media consultants is certainly a violation of the spirit of the law.

Congress needs to strengthen the law by preventing this type of abuse from happening again during another presidential campaign. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, a few weeks ago when we were discussing campaign finance abuses, I spent some time on the floor talking about a system that has been developed over time by both parties, where blame really needs to go, to both parties, and change really has to come from both parties.

So I listened with some interest tonight when the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) was making his comments, because my recollection is there is an investigation going on around the Clinton-Gore campaign, there is currently an investigation going on around the Dole-Kemp campaign for their micromanagement of their money and coordination of their efforts in the campaign issues.

So I think what we need to do is to go back to the very place I started several weeks ago, which is we have a campaign system that has been built by both parties that does not work anymore, that has to be changed by people on both parties.

I applaud the fact that the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) is now interested in soft money and very interested in making sure that some people in the system will not a lot of soft money.

Those of us that are part of the reform group want to make sure that no one in the system abuses soft money, and I would invite the gentleman from Florida to join us in supporting a ban on all soft money, and then we would not have had this problem. Words would have to be read into the Record. Then we would know that no one is going to engage in the kind of behavior that we all find offensive.

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I would just add on that, there is still a lot of room left on this Shays-Meehan bandwagon, and we would love to have you joining with us on abolishing soft money, shame issue ads, giving teeth to FEC, the teeth that they need to enforce the election laws that are on the book.

We are very, very proud of the Members on both sides of the aisle that have demonstrated I think this evening on a number of votes wonderful support, Republicans, Democrats, conservatives, liberals. There is still plenty of room on this bandwagon, and I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS).

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SNOWBARGER). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) to the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) will be postponed.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. It is now in order to consider Amendment No. 50.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WHITFIELD TO THE AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. SHAYS

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 50 offered by Mr. WHITFIELD to the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by Mr. SHAYS: Add at the end of title I the following new section (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

SEC. 104. INCREASE IN CONTRIBUTION LIMIT FOR CONTRIBUTIONS TO CANDIDATES BY PERSONS OTHER THAN PACS.

Section 315(a)(1)(A) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 441a(a)(1)(A)) is amended by striking "$1,000" and inserting "$3,000".

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to the Order of the House of Friday, July 17, 1998, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD) and the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. WAMP) each will control 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. As we conclude the debate on this important legislation, I have been associated with this bill for a long and lengthy debate and I think we have covered about every aspect of campaign finance that one can cover. The advocates for campaign finance have talked a lot about special interests. They have talked a lot about sham ads. They have talked a lot about too much money. They have talked about inadequate disclosure. We have said many times, I guess, that special interest depends on who supports you and who does not; and sham ads if you do not like it, maybe it is a sham ad.

So those are valid reasons that people have for supporting this legislation. I have told some people, and I firmly believe this, that one of the unintended consequences of this act is to protect incumbents. The amendment that I am offering is to try to help alleviate the burden that is placed on people running for Congress the first time. I think all of us know that about 80 percent of the political action committee money goes to incumbents. One thing about the Shays-Meehan bill, it does not do anything about the way candidates raise their money or spend their money. It applies only to the way other groups

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 442, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) to the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) will be postponed.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. It is now in order to consider Amendment No. 50.
out in the country spend their money and participate in the political system.

This is a very simple amendment in that it increases the amount that an individual can give a candidate from $1,000 to $3,000. Now, this contribution limit has not been changed since Watergate. When the gentleman from Kentucky was probably one of my co-sponsors, which actually did in fact increase the individual contribution limit. But over the last 4 years as I have worked this body on both sides of the aisle to try to build consensus around this issue of campaign reform, knowing that there were land mines throughout the entire process and knowing that this fundamental system has not been changed since Watergate because we good many good reasons to kill it, I looked for a consensus around a few principles, and that is what we have on the floor tonight represented in Shays-Meehan. That is why I reluctantly oppose the gentleman’s amendment. Because there is an intellectual argument to be made for the fact that an individual contribution in 1974 is actually worth about $3,000 today, but the fact is there is not much support in this body for raising individual contribution limits, and none of us can be sure. But if were king for a day, I would have my own bill here and it would be much different than what we have. But this process is a process of compromise and consensus. We are looking for a majority, especially a bipartisan majority, so that we can actually accomplish something that has not been accomplished in a generation because there are too many ways to chop the legs out from underneath this particular issue, because this was set in 1974. When you consider inflation, it is worth in today’s dollars $325 instead of the $1,000 that was in 1974. But I would ask that Members give some serious thought to this, because, as I said, 80 percent of political action committee money goes to incumbents. All of us know the first time that we ran, it is very difficult to raise the money. If we can increase the amount that an individual can contribute from $1,000 to $3,000, I think it will go a long way in making this a more equitable system, particularly for those very few candidates, one of which may be on the floor this evening, who do not accept political action committee money. This kind of even the playing field, and that is really my purpose in introducing this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time.

Mr. WAMP. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself as much time as I may consume. I may be uniquely qualified to address this amendment because, as the gentleman from Kentucky knows, and he and I got here together in early 1995 and within just a few weeks, I had a bill on the floor called the Wamp Congress Act of 1995. The gentleman from Kentucky was probably one of my co-sponsors, which actually did in fact increase the individual contribution limit. But over the last 4 years as I have worked this body on both sides of the aisle to try to build consensus around this issue of campaign reform, knowing that there were land mines throughout the entire process and knowing that this fundamental system has not been changed since Watergate because we good many good reasons to kill it, I looked for a consensus around a few principles, and that is what we have on the floor tonight represented in Shays-Meehan. That is why I reluctantly oppose the gentleman’s amendment. Because there is an intellectual argument to be made for the fact that an individual contribution in 1974 is actually worth about $3,000 today, but the fact is there is not much support in this body for raising individual contribution limits, and none of us can be sure. But if were king for a day, I would have my own bill here and it would be much different than what we have. But this process is a process of compromise and consensus. We are looking for a majority, especially a bipartisan majority, so that we can actually accomplish something that has not been accomplished in a generation because there are too many ways to chop the legs out from underneath this particular issue, because this was set in 1974. When you consider inflation, it is worth in today’s dollars $325 instead of the $1,000 that was in 1974. But I would ask that Members give some serious thought to this, because, as I said, 80 percent of political action committee money goes to incumbents. All of us know the first time that we ran, it is very difficult to raise the money. If we can increase the amount that an individual can contribute from $1,000 to $3,000, I think it will go a long way in making this a more equitable system, particularly for those very few candidates, one of which may be on the floor this evening, who do not accept political action committee money. This kind of even the playing field, and that is really my purpose in introducing this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR).

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment because I cannot understand what is broken and needs fixing. This amendment suggests that there is not enough money in campaigns. This whole debate, this whole process started when we tried to put limits on what candidates running for a seat in Congress would spend in campaigns. They have already had an excessive bill on the floor. That is the way this bill started out. Nowhere were we going to try to get more money into campaigns. And just to show you that only .1 percent of the American people, about 235 individuals gave contributions of $1,000 or more in 1995 and 1996 to Federal candidates and to PACs and parties that support candidates. Yet this group gave as much money for Federal elections, $638 million, as the millions who gave under $1,000.

This is not the part of the campaign finance system that is broken and needs fixing, to get more money into the system. In fact, this amendment, as well-intentioned as the author may be on it, is a poison pill. It is opposed by all of those groups that advocated for campaign finance reform, including League of Women Voters, Public Citizen, Common Cause, the U.S. PIRG and others.

I ask my colleagues to oppose this amendment, because it is not going to help get the Shays-Meehan bill passed, and it is not going to help the perception of the American public that we need to have more money and bigger contributions in campaigns.

Mr. WAMP. Mr. Chairman, recognizing that the gentleman from Kentucky has the right to close, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS).

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I just would like to say that Shays-Meehan does three primary things: It bans soft money, it limits the unlimited sums of money that go from individuals, corporations, labor unions and other interest groups; it deals with the sham issue ads and it calls them what they should, campaign ads; and it also has FEC enforcement and disclosure.

It does not have a lot of things. We did not deal with issues that some Members would like us to deal with, in-state, out-of-state. It does not deal with motor voter and Voter Rights Act. There are a number of things we do not do. We do not deal maybe with the need to increase PAC contributions or individual contributions but this only limits and allows individual contributions to be increased, and I would oppose it.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time. I want to quote Justice Thurgood Marshall whom I do not think anyone could say is a very conservative judge, but in Buckley v. Valeo he said, “One of the points on which all Members of the Court agree is that money is essential to effective communication in a political campaign.”

And we do live in a world where it costs a lot of money to buy TV ads, to buy newspaper ads, to buy radio ads, and I guess I am not surprised that incumbents would not support this because it would be easier for opponents to raise money if they raised the amount that an individual can give.

And we talked about the groups that supported Shays-Meehan, and one of those groups is Public Campaign that has been running negative ads in my district against me for the last day or two and also in the Washington Post; and, as I said earlier, I did not particularly like it, but I think they have a right to do that. That is an issue ad in my view. I think they have a right to do that, but they really pounded me because they said, “Ed Whitfield is trying to triple the amount of money that an individual can give,” and yet I find it quite ironic that one of their largest contributors is a guy named Mr. Solls, who is one of the wealthiest men in the world. He contributes heavily to them.

So I guess that sometimes it just depends upon who gives the money, but I think that we are doing a great disservice to our political system if we prevent individuals from giving up to $3,000 to candidates that they have confidence in, that they believe in and they want to support, particularly when they know that challengers are not going to receive political action committee money.

So I would urge the adoption of this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SNOWBARGER). All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD) to the amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 13 offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS).

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

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 442, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD) to the amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 13 offered by Mr. Shays will be postponed.

It is now in order to consider Amendment No. 51 offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD).
AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WHITFIELD TO THE AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. SHAYS:

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The text of the amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WHITFIELD to the amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 13 offered by Mr. SHAYS:

Amend section 301(20)(A) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as added by section 201(b) of the substitute, to read as follows:

"(A) IN GENERAL.—The term `express advocacy' means a communication that advocates the election or defeat of a candidate by containing a phrase such as `vote for', `re-elect', `support', `cast your ballot for', `name of candidate', `vote against', `defeat', `reject'."

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of Friday, July 17, 1998, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD) and a Member opposed will each control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD).

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment simply defines `express advocacy' using the exact terms that the Supreme Court has used repeatedly in defining express advocacy. This issue goes to the very core, the very heart, of what this debate is about because the Shays-Meehan bill expands the definition of `express advocacy'. And when we expand the definition of `express advocacy', we automatically increase the opportunities for hard money to be spent and decrease the opportunities for individuals to spend money who do not have political action committees, who have not hired lawyers to file all the reports with the FEC, and I think it is going to be a chilling effect upon the participation and the political system.

Now Shays-Meehan expands the definition in a number of ways way beyond what the Supreme Court has said. One way that they do it is they say if an ad refers to one or more clearly-identified candidates in a paid advertisement that is broadcast by a radio broadcast station or a television broadcast station within 60 calendar days preceding the date of an election of the candidate, that is express advocacy. And in essence what they are doing here at a time when people focus on political campaigns, as we get closer to the election, people focus on it, and that is when we have groups like the Sierra Club, the Right to Life, Pro-choice, labor unions; all these groups take out ads, and they talk about voting records of candidates as you get within 60 days of an election.

Under this bill, they will not be able to run those ads unless they had raised the money under the hard money rules. In other words, they would be totally caught up in the rules of the Federal Election Commission. They would have to meet all the requirements of the Federal Election Commission, have to meet all the limits, all of the financial disclosures. And the courts have repeatedly said that that is a very chilling effect on the participation of people in the political process, and the Supreme Court has actually said that the very core of our system is to allow participation, and this definition explicitly makes it more difficult to participate.

An"the thing that I find the most troubling about it in this particular section is that when we get down to the end of the campaign, the only people that are going to be talking about these campaigns are the candidates themselves, the money that they spend for their ads. Then we are going to have political action committees, that they can buy ads, and then we are going to have the news media doing editorials on who they support.

But the mass of people out there who belong to organizations, they are not going to have much say—so unless they want to go through all of this trouble, all of this burden of forming a political action committee, raising money, hiring lawyers, filing reports and so forth.

So I am very disappointed, I am extremely disappointed, in the way they expand the definition of `express advocacy,' and my amendment simply brings it down to precisely what the Supreme Court has said: a bright line test so there is no question about what is and what is not express advocacy.

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

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition.

Mr. Chairman, is the gentleman opposed to the amendment?

Mr. CAMPBELL. I am.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, the words kill. It is the spirit that giveth life. The Scriptural reference applies to this part of the bill.

My good dear friend from Kentucky has given us the words, and he says that all that may be condemned are those ads which are so explicit in using words that they qualify in his definition as express advocacy. But what about the spirit that giveth life? What about ads that, in every other meaningful way, affect the citizens, purport to be express advocacy ads, they are clever enough not to use the word `vote for' or `vote against.'

This kind of abuse has been documented so many times in this debate so I do not need to get that into detail, but I refer all of my colleagues to the examples that have been raised regarding such comments as President Bill Clinton has done these wonderful things, but we do not at the end say `Vote for President Bill Clinton.' Senator Bob Dole has done these wonderful things, great American, but at the end we do not say `Vote for Bob Dole.'

It is the most gravest interpretation of campaign advocacy to say that only those ads that actually use the word `vote for' or `vote against' are express advocacy.

Second point: The gentleman intentionally strikes from this bill the prohibition on using undisclosed money, money from whom no one knows the source for advertisements that mention the name of the candidate on radio and television in the last 60 days of a campaign.

What is wrong with disclosure? Our good friend and colleague argues that disclosure chills. Not at all. In other contexts those who have been advocating against the Shays-Meehan bill have said all we need is disclosure.

The Supreme Court's interpretation of this measure certainly clarified the concern about membership in NAACP, for example, at a time when that civil rights group was under a great degree of strain in our country but have never said that it is chilling for the American people to know what source of money puts an ad on 60 days before the election using the name of the candidate and hiding the identity of the donor.

Yet that would be struck by the proposal of our good friend, the gentleman from Kentucky.

The Supreme Court has actually opined in an area very close to this in the matter before us, in Massachusetts Committee For Life.

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

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?
Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, will the Chair tell me how much time I have remaining?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SNOWBARGER). The gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, I have been reading the gentleman's amendment, and I think that I can come up with a number of phrases that would apparently be permitted but which, under his amendment, would be very questionable.

Think of words like "Think Joe Smith" or "Joe Smith thinks about our Nation's future every day" or "Joe Smith, the 1st District's Congressman or on the crime theme, "Joe Smith, the 1st District's Congressman"

"Think of words like "Think Joe Smith" or "Joe Smith thinks about our Nation's future every day" or "Joe Smith, the 1st District's Congressman or on the crime theme, "Joe Smith, the 1st District's Congressman"

That would apparently be permitted.

All of these would be passing muster under the amendment that the gentleman from Kentucky offers. I think that they all have a clear purpose and intent. But under this amendment, they would be permitted.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, all that we ask is that they all have a clear purpose and intent. But under this amendment, they would be permitted.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, first of all, we keep talking about disclosure. As I said before, the labor unions can run ads against me last time on television, but they have a right to do it.

In closing, I would simply say the third expansion of express advocacy in this bill has already explicitly been declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court in FEC versus Maine Right To Life. The exact wording is in here, already been declared unconstitutional.

I would ask for the adoption of my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. All time has expired.

The question was taken; and the nays appeared to have it.

The question is on the amendment?

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 442, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD) to the amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 13 offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) will be postponed.

It is now in order to consider Amendment No. 52 offered by the gentleman from Pennslyvania (Mr. ENGLISH).

AMENDMENT No. 52

Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

"(A) advice to another person as to how a contribution may be made through an intermediary or conduit, except that a person may facilitate a contribution by providing—

"(8) No person may make a contribution by bundling.

"(9) No person may make a contribution by bundling.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this amendment, to close this terrible conduit for cash.

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

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to claim the 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the amendment?

Ms. DELAURO. Yes, I am.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) for 5 minutes.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

In strong opposition to the English amendment. Three years ago when campaign finance reformers started out to change the American election system, our goal was to try to increase the number of participants in the political process and to take elections out of the hands of the big-money special interests.

This amendment would, in fact, do just the opposite. It would rob Americans of an essential tool in leveling the playing field. It effectively prevents bundling, which lets ordinary Americans with limited resources pool their funds together into a single contribution and put themselves on equal footing with the more well-heeled political interests. It would also allow corporate officers to host campaign functions for candidates and collect checks.

I urge you an example of women in politics. Today, thanks to coordinated grassroots efforts, over 45,000 members of Ms.100's List went to House members during the 1994 election cycle. The center surveying this practice wrote that bundling is "as predictable as the sunrise." This practice undermines the whole established structure of campaign finance.

My amendment simply states that intermediaries cannot engage in this practice. They can only provide advice to individuals about making a contribution.

In the past, opposition to bundling was close to a consensus issue among supporters of campaign finance reform.

In the past, most campaign finance reform proposals have included some kind of antibundling language; indeed, earlier versions of Shays-Meehan included bundling restrictions.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this amendment, to close this terrible conduit for cash.

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the amendment?

Ms. DELAURO. Yes, I am.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) for 5 minutes.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 13 offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) to the amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 13 offered by Mr. SHAYS.

Add at the end of title V the following new section (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

SEC. 512a. PROHIBITING BUNDLING OF CONTRIBUTIONS.

Section 312a(a)(8) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 441a(a)(8)) is amended to read as follows:

"(8) No person may make a contribution through an intermediary or conduit, except that a person may facilitate a contribution by providing—

"(A) advice to another person as to how the other person may make a contribution; and

"(B) addressed mailing material or similar items to another person for use by the other person in making a contribution.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of Friday, July 17, 1998, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ENGLISH) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ENGLISH).

Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise to offer an amendment that speaks to an issue fundamental to campaign finance reform, one that would close a gaping loophole in the existing campaign laws through which a torrent of special interest cash has poured in every recent election.

My amendment is a basic reform of the current system and something that the Shays-Meehan substitute unfortunately does not address.

Bundling is the process by which special interest groups solicit funds from donors around the country and then deliver the money in large bundles. It is a way of avoiding limits on donations to campaigns.

The Center for Responsive Politics identified at least 32 bundles in excess of $20,000 that went to House members during the 1994 election cycle. The center surveying this practice wrote that bundling is "as predictable as the sunrise." This practice undermines the whole established structure of campaign finance. My amendment simply states that intermediaries cannot engage in this practice. They can only provide advice to individuals about making a contribution.

In the past, opposition to bundling was close to a consensus issue among supporters of campaign finance reform. In the past, most campaign finance reform proposals have included some kind of antibundling language; indeed, earlier versions of Shays-Meehan included bundling restrictions.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this amendment, to close this terrible conduit for cash.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.
Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to close.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ENGLISH) is recognized.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) has expired.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to close.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman has the right to close.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how much time I have remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) has 1 1/2 minutes remaining.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Ms. RIVERS).

Ms. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I found it very interesting to hear the comments from the gentleman from Pennsylvania because I was very concerned when this came forward about what evil was trying to be remedied by this particular amendment.

What the gentleman had to say does not square with my personal experience and my understanding of this system of contributing to campaigns. Number one, these are small donors, small donations. EMILY'S List, for example, has 45,000 members from all 50 States, and they have made an average contribution of less than $100 per time. There is no ability to exceed campaign limits. All individual limits are counted in the aggregate. For any individual donor anywhere in the country, they cannot exceed the campaign limits placed on any other donor. It simply is not true.

The other thing is that all of this money is fully disclosed twice, once when the donation is made to the bundling organization and secondly when the candidate receives it. So any individual who is interested in following this money can do to a much greater degree than any other campaign contributions that a candidate will get.

Again, I have to say, what is the evil that is to be remedied by this, unless, of course, that there are more women in Congress.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SNOWBARGER). The gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) has 1/2 minutes remaining.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. Fazio).

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend for yielding.

I think if we look at this amendment, it is obviously flawed in one sense, and that is that it only covers hard dollars. It would be a much better thing if that longer list that has gone out and organized all kinds of soft money bundling activities, including an entity called Citizens for the Republic Education Fund, which gave $2 million in the final weeks of the 1996 campaign to Republican candidates in targeted races all across the country. One of them happened to be, by the way, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ENGLISH).

I am wondering why this amendment is directed only at donors, largely, who are contributing through processes we have just heard described as hard dollars, to the campaigns of candidates. We ought to be attacking soft money bundling somehow has something to do with few women being in Congress. Quite the contrary. Bundling favors incumbents, and women as challengers would benefit from the reduction in the practice of bundling.

In the past, the authors of this substitute have opposed the practice of bundling. Unfortunately, they have chosen to support this widely acknowledged abuse by opposing this amendment, along with many other worthy amendments necessary to perfect this substitute and restore balance to this campaign finance reform proposal.

I urge any Member who is serious about campaign finance reform to support it. Do not flip-flop tonight.

Remember, instead, the statement of Common Cause, which, as I said, is printed on their Web site, and I quote: “Bundling, thus, is harmful because it is a way around the contribution limits for both individuals and PACs. It allows individuals and PACs to get credit for the practice of bundling. It is a kind of bundling that the contribution limits are intended to deter.”

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is fundamental reform and it is fundamental to perfecting this legislation. I urge the House Member who is serious about campaign finance reform to support it. It is the right thing to do. I urge a “yes” vote on the English amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Ms. DELAURO) has expired.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. English) is recognized.

Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ENGLISH) has expired.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ENGLISH) is recognized. Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, much how much time do I have remaining?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ENGLISH) has expired.

Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.
the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) will be postponed.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 53 offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GEKAS) to the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS).

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GEKAS TO THE AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. SHAYS.

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The text of the amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GEKAS to the amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 13 offered by Mr. SHAYS.

Add at the end of title V the following new section (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

SEC. 510. DEPOSIT OF CERTAIN CONTRIBUTIONS AND DONATIONS IN TREASURY ACCOUNT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title III of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 437 et seq.), as amended by sections 101, 401, and 507, is further amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"(1) TREATMENT OF CERTAIN CONTRIBUTIONS AND DONATIONS TO BE RETURNED TO DONORS. Ð The return of a contribution or donation deposited in the escrow account under subsection (a)(3) to the person making the contribution or donation if—

(A) the contribution or donation is in an amount equal to or greater than $500 (other than a contribution or donation returned within 60 days of receipt by the committee); or

(B) the contribution or donation was made to the committee in accordance with section 315, and has not been the subject of an investigation by the Federal Election Commission or the Attorney General of the United States regarding any contribution or donation under the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (as added by subsection (a)) by such amount deposited in the escrow account and subtracted from the returnable contribution or donation.

(2) RETURN OF CONTRIBUTION OR DONATION AFTER DEPOSIT IN ESCROW.—

(I) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall return a contribution or donation deposited in the escrow account under subsection (a)(3) to the person making the contribution or donation if—

(A) within 180 days after the date the contribution or donation is transferred, the Commission has not made a determination under section 309(a)(2) that the Commission has reason to believe that the making of the contribution or donation was made in violation of this Act; or

(B)(i) the contribution or donation shall not be used to cover fines, penalties, or costs pursuant to section 310, and shall not be used to cover fines, penalties, or costs imposed pursuant to section 311;

(ii) if the contribution or donation will be used for purposes, that the amounts require for those purposes have been withdrawn from the escrow account and subtracted from the returnable contribution or donation.

(3) NO EFFECT ON STATUS OF INVESTIGATION.—The return of a contribution or donation by the Commission under this subsection shall not be construed as having an effect on the status of an investigation by the Commission or the Attorney General of the United States regarding the contribution or donation or the circumstances surrounding the contribution or donation, or on the ability of the Commission or the Attorney General to take future actions with respect to the contribution or donation.

(b) AMOUNTS USED TO DETERMINE AMOUNT OF PENALTY FOR VIOLATION.—

Section 309(a) of such Act (2 U.S.C. 437a(a)) is amended by inserting after paragraph (9) the following new paragraph:

"(10) For purposes of determining the amount of a civil penalty imposed under this subsection for violations of section 326, the amount of the donation involved shall be treated as the amount of the contribution involved.

(c) DONATION DEFINED.—

Section 309 of such Act (2 U.S.C. 437) is amended by inserting after paragraph (9) the following new paragraph:

"(22) Donations. Ð The term ‘donation’ means a gift, subscription, loan, advance, or deposit of money or anything else of value made by any person to a national committee of a political party, to a national political party, or to a national political organization, for political purposes or for the purpose of influencing the result of an election.

(d) DISGORGEMENT AUTHORITY.—

Section 309 of such Act (2 U.S.C. 437g) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(e) Any conciliation agreement, civil action, or criminal action entered into or instituted under this section may require a person to forfeit any contribution, donation, or expenditure that is the subject of the agreement or action for transfer to the Commission for deposit in accordance with section 326.”.

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsections (a), (b), and (c) shall apply to contributions or donations refunded on or after the date of the enactment of this Act, without regard to whether the Federal Election Commission or Attorney General of the United States has made a determination under section 326 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (as added by subsection (a)) by such date.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to the Order of the House of Friday, July 17, 1998, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GEKAS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GEKAS).

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Chairman, I have discussed this amendment with the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) and with some representatives of the collaborators on the Democrat side in this venture. This is an amendment that simply will affect, for instance, a political party, for instance, discovers all of a sudden that it has in its hands let us say $100,000 which it knows has an illegal source, my amendment would compel that organization to turn that money over to the FEC for a transfer to some law enforcement agency should be brought into the picture before that money is returned to the donor, as is the practice now. This would go a long way in bolstering our confidence that some illegal foreign source or some drug dealer who contributes grand sums of monies to a political party does not get the benefit twice, first of getting favor from a political party to which he makes a donation, and then when it is declared illegal, he gets the money back; he sort of launders his own money, as it were.

If we would accomplish with my amendment would be to have a scrutiny placed upon that money before, and it may still be returned, before it is returned to the donor when it is found to be illegal. That is the simple text of my amendment.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to control the 5 minutes, since I do support the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield my time to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GEKAS), and I appreciate him waiting so late to offer it, an amendment that I think we can support.

It makes logical sense that if money that was donated was not donated
SHAYS: the nature of a substitute No. 13 offered by Mr. GEKAS to the amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 13 offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment that would require the FEC to expend its resources on investigating a minor violation at the expense of focusing some of its time on other resources.

I would just point out that I support the amendment, but I am a little concerned about the resources of the FEC, and I would hope that as we look down the road when we give the FEC more responsibility that requires them, for example, in this case to keep track of these contributions, I hope that in the future we will try to give the FEC not only their job, but the resources that they need in order to do their job and keep the laws that are on the books and enforce the laws that will be on the books.

---

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Chairman, I do not care to offer any more debate, but we do need to do an amendment process to extend the FEC's responsibility.

Mr. CAMPELL. Mr. Chairman, re-establishing the time limit that the gentleman's support on the final acceptance here. And we will accept the gentleman's support on the final acceptance that we accept their acceptance, and they may not ask for a recorded vote. I accept the acceptance that I accept the acceptance, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The amendment is modified.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment, as modified, offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GEKAS) to the amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 13 offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS).

The amendment, as modified, to the amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 13 is agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. It is now in order to consider the amendment No. 54 offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLITTLE).

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to Section 501 of the Shays substitute amendment to H.R. 2183, the Bipartisan Campaign Integrity Act. Section 501, entitled "Codification of Beck Decision," does nothing to correct the current injustices in our federal labor law relating to the unions' use of their members hard-earned paychecks for political and other purposes.

The Shays amendment is not a codification of the Supreme Court's 1988 Beck decision relating to the use of union dues. First, Section 501 provides absolutely no notice of rights to members of the union—it applies only to non-members. Second, Section 501 redefines the dues payments that may be objected to, by limiting such to "expenditures in connection with a Federal, State, or local election or in connection with efforts to influence legislation unrelated to collective bargaining." This definition not only infers that there may be other types of political expenditures to which workers may object—but it also ignores Beck's holding that workers may object to any dues payments for any union activities not directly related to collective bargaining activities.

Mr. Chairman, if Congress is truly going to try to deal with the issue of organized labor taking dues money from rank-and-file members laboring under a union security agreement—taking it without their permission and spending it on causes and activities with which the workers disagree—then let us really deal with it. Mr. Shays' amendment is a fig leaf which falls woefully short of covering the problem.

The Shays amendment codifies a broken system that allows unions to raid workers' wallets, forces workers to resign from the union, and I hope that in the future we will try to give the FEC not only its job, but the resources that they need in order to do their job and keep the laws that are on the books and enforce the laws that will be on the books. 

---

So, I certainly support the gentleman's amendment and would like all of us to keep in mind the importance of fully funding the FEC in the future so that they can do not only their job on this amendment, but their job in other amendments and enforcing the laws that are on the books.

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

MODIFICATION TO AMENDMENT NO. 53 OFFERED BY MR. GEKAS TO THE AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. SHAYS.

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment pursuant to form A, which is at the desk, be modified.

The Clerk read as follows:

Modification to amendment No. 53 offered by Mr. GEKAS to the amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 13 offered by Mr. SHAYS:

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment, as modified herein, be accepted for the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GEKAS).

The Clerk read as follows:

Modification to amendment No. 53 offered by Mr. GEKAS to the amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 13 offered by Mr. SHAYS:

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment, as modified herein, be accepted for the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GEKAS).

Mr. Shays language.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The amendment is modified.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment, as modified, offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GEKAS) to the amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 13 offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS).

The amendment, as modified, to the amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 13 is agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. It is now in order to consider the amendment No. 54 offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLITTLE).

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to Section 501 of the Shays substitute amendment to H.R. 2183, the Bipartisan Campaign Integrity Act. Section 501, entitled "Codification of Beck Decision," does nothing to correct the current injustices in our federal labor law relating to the unions' use of their members hard-earned paychecks for political and other purposes.

The Shays amendment is not a codification of the Supreme Court's 1988 Beck decision relating to the use of union dues. First, Section 501 provides absolutely no notice of rights to members of the union—it applies only to non-members. Second, Section 501 redefines the dues payments that may be objected to, by limiting such to "expenditures in connection with a Federal, State, or local election or in connection with efforts to influence legislation unrelated to collective bargaining." This definition not only infers that there may be other types of political expenditures to which workers may object—but it also ignores Beck's holding that workers may object to any dues payments for any union activities not directly related to collective bargaining activities.

Mr. Chairman, if Congress is truly going to try to deal with the issue of organized labor taking dues money from rank-and-file members laboring under a union security agreement—taking it without their permission and spending it on causes and activities with which the workers disagree—then let us really deal with it. Mr. Shays' amendment is a fig leaf which falls woefully short of covering the problem.

The Shays amendment codifies a broken system that allows unions to raid workers' wallets, forces workers to resign from the union,
requires workers to object—after the fact—to their money being removed from their paycheck, and then requires workers to wait for the union to rebate those funds, if they get around to doing so.

As Chairman of the Subcommittee on Employer-Employee Relations, I have held six hearings on this issue in the past four years. In each one, the Subcommittee has heard from worker after worker telling us about the one thing they wanted from their union—the basic respect of being asked for permission before the union spent their money for purposes unrelated to labor-management obligations. Yes, most of these employees were upset over finding out their head-earned dollars were being funneled into political causes or candidates they did not support. However, these employees supported their union and still overwhelmingly believe in the value of organized labor. A number of them were stewards in their union. All they want is to be able to give their consent before their union spends their money on activities which fall outside collective bargaining activities and which subvert their deeply held ideas and convictions.

As our six hearings demonstrated, individuals attempting to exercise their rights under current law often face incredible burdens, including harassment, coercion, and intimidation. The current system is badly broken and it is Congress’ responsibility to fix it—not to legitimize it by adopting the Shays amendment. I urge Members to join me in opposing Section 501’s sugar-coated placebo and enact meaningful reform on behalf of union workers.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the amendment by Representative ROGER WICKER. Much like the standard bearers to long dead civilizations, Representative WICKER’s amendment illustrates the same antiquated belief that there should be hurdles that citizens must clear in order to exercise their Constitutionally guaranteed right to vote. Land owners. Male. Caucasian. One by one the spirits of freedom and democracy have worked against other misguided attempts to disenfranchise certain American voters, and it is my hope that they will prevail here today.

There is an old saying that states, “Those who cannot remember the past are condemned to repeat it.” Well, Mr. Speaker I remember. I remember the days when African Americans in Mississippi sat cowering in their homes on election day because they were too afraid to go to the polls. I remember when men like Medgar Evers and Vernon Dahmer were murdered in cold blood because they realized the importance of voting and tried to impress their convictions onto other African Americans in Mississippi. I remember the two youths wounded by shotgun blasts fired through the window of a home in Ruleville, Mississippi where they were planning ways to register blacks to vote. I remember the dead bodies of three civil rights workers, who had been trying to register blacks to vote, being discovered on a farm near Philadelphia, Mississippi.

I remember James Meredith being wounded by a white sniper as he walked in a voter registration march from Memphis to Jackson. I remember poll taxes and literacy tests. Mr. Speaker I remember voter intimidation and have fought long and hard against it. This debate belongs in 1960’s not in 1998, and it is time to bury ideas like Representative WICKER’s in the same grave with separate drinking fountains and making blacks sit at the back of the bus. This legislation is simply another attempt to appeal to mainstream sensibilities while ignoring the realistic and historically based fears of Black Americans.

Having both grown up in Mississippi, Representative WICKER and I obviously have had universally different experiences, but the things I remember make it impossible for me to support this amendment. It would be a slap in the face of the civil rights pioneers who risked their lives, were beaten and murdered in cold blood to protect both my right to vote and Representative WICKER’s.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, may I be clear that all amendment have been dealt with under Shays-Meehan? The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. That is the Chairman’s understanding. Mr. SHAYS. 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. GEKAS) having assumed the chair, Mr. SNOWBARGER, 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.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington? There was no objection.

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

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I submit a committee order from the Committee on House Oversight.

Resolved, That pursuant to 2 U.S.C. §57 and 2 U.S.C. §59e, the Committee hereby orders that:

SEC. 1. Effective January 3, 1999 the amount available within the Members’ Representational Allowance for franked mail with respect to a session of Congress shall not be limited by subsection (b) of Committee Order No. 41.

SEC. 2. The Committee on House Oversight shall have the authority to prescribe regulations to carry out this resolution.