

electing our officials should be a right reserved for citizens. It is wrong and dangerous to allow even the potential to exist for undue foreign influence in electing our government, and H.R. 34 is one of the numerous important steps to do so.

The abuse that allegedly resulted from foreign campaign contributions in the recent presidential campaign is a terrible indictment of our current campaign finance system.

Indeed, the Congress must be concerned about the issue of legal and illegal foreign campaign contributions. Everyone here today should be concerned about this recent insidious development in our presidential election process, and should understand that these statutory and procedural changes like the passage of H.R. 34 are necessary to protect the integrity of the American electoral process. We must insure that it is Americans who choose our President and Congress.

We simply cannot allow foreign corporations and foreign individuals to decide who is elected to public office at any level of our government. Therefore, my legislation (H.R. 34) to require that only U.S. citizens be allowed to make contributions to candidates for Federal office is one of my priorities for the 105th Congress. This issue must be addressed and this Member intends to push for this change until successful.

With regard to soft money from American subsidiaries of foreign corporations, we must, as a minimum, enforce the current law that such contributions can only come from the profits of their U.S. subsidiaries until greater and appropriate changes can be made.

This Member would ask his colleagues to support H.R. 34 as an important step toward campaign finance reform.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 34, as amended.

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

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

PAYCHECK PROTECTION ACT

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2608) to protect individuals from having money involuntarily collected and used for political activities by a corporation or labor organization.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2608

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Paycheck Protection Act".

SEC. 2. PROHIBITING INVOLUNTARY ASSESSMENT OF EMPLOYEE FUNDS FOR POLITICAL ACTIVITIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 316 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 441b)

is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(c)(1) Except with the separate, prior, written, voluntary authorization of each individual, it shall be unlawful—

"(A) for any national bank or corporation described in this section to collect from or assess its stockholders or employees any dues, initiation fee, or other payment as a condition of employment if any part of such dues, fee, or payment will be used for political activity in which the national bank or corporation is engaged; and

"(B) for any labor organization described in this section to collect from or assess its members or nonmembers any dues, initiation fee, or other payment if any part of such dues, fee, or payment will be used for political activity in which the labor organization is engaged.

"(2) An authorization described in paragraph (1) shall remain in effect until revoked and may be revoked at any time. Each entity collecting from or assessing amounts from an individual with an authorization in effect under such paragraph shall provide the individual with a statement that the individual may at any time revoke the authorization.

"(3) For purposes of this subsection, the term 'political activity' means any activity carried out for the purpose of influencing (in whole or in part) any election for Federal office, influencing the consideration or outcome of any Federal legislation or the issuance or outcome of any Federal regulations, or educating individuals about candidates for election for Federal office or any Federal legislation, law, or regulations."

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to amounts collected or assessed on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) and the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON) each will control 20 minutes.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. BOB SCHAFFER) and ask unanimous consent that he be allowed to manage the time.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, Thomas Jefferson once said that to compel a man to furnish contributions of money for the propagation of opinions which he disbelieves is sinful and tyrannical.

Mr. Speaker, this really is the quote that epitomizes House Resolution 2608 that is before us now, the Paycheck Protection Act, and I would commend it to the House's consideration and urge its adoption.

The Paycheck Protection Act is a piece of legislation that came to many of us here in Congress at the urging of working men and women from throughout the country, working men and women who are fed up and tired of seeing portions of their wages, their paychecks, being siphoned off and directed

toward political purposes of various causes without their consent, many times without their knowledge.

The Paycheck Protection Act applies to all wage earners across the country, all paychecks. This is not an act that singles out any one group or organization. It is not a bill that proposes to place a greater burden on one organization or another. This is a bill that speaks directly to paychecks and wage earners.

The fact of the matter is that many people who join various groups and organizations pay for their dues associated with those clubs and groups through wage deductions out of their paychecks. They may sign up for collective bargaining, for agency representation, for various sorts of worthwhile causes, and are frustrated to find that a portion of those funds are frequently and routinely siphoned off to pay for politics.

Mr. Speaker, this bill puts an end to that. It protects paychecks for all wage earners in America. Let me say this, there are people who do not like this. There are many people throughout the country who are political operatives of various sorts who pay for huge campaigns of various kinds, ballot initiatives subsidizing candidates, various political messages. This bill does add one more step of inconvenience to their lives because it requires them to go seek the permission of those who are working hard to earn the cash to pay for these various political games.

But I say, Mr. Speaker, that it is high time that we depoliticize people's paychecks. In fact, survey after survey that has been conducted throughout the country on this topic suggest that the American workers are squarely with us, the proponents of this bill. Eight percent of union households agree with us that they would like to see legislation passed by this Congress that would shut off the practice of siphoning off portions of wages for political purposes.

Today I ask the Congress to stand with me, to stand with the 165 cosponsors of H.R. 2608, to stand with the hard-working men and women throughout the country who work hard to put bread on the table, to put shoes on the feet of their children, to live the American dream, and who would like to be participants in a political process on a voluntary basis. Who believe that Thomas Jefferson was absolutely right years ago when he said, and once again I repeat, to compel a man to furnish contributions of money for the propagation of opinions which he disbelieves is sinful and tyrannical.

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

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes and 20 seconds to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR), one of our great leaders on the Democratic side and someone who has been fighting for justice and campaign reform for as long as he has been in Congress.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, invoking the name of Thomas Jefferson in support of this bill is sacrilegious to say the least. This bill, this idea, is the concept and the efforts of special interests and multimillionaires who are running around the country trying to convince people that workers do not have a right to speak on their own behalf. The Grover Norquists, the Patrick Rooneys of the world pretending to speak for people who pack a lunch and punch a clock and work hard every day.

This bill, Mr. Speaker, is a Trojan horse. It is a sneak attack on working families. It is an ambush designed to silence their voices with a workers gag rule. This bill says if there is a debate over Social Security or minimum wage or Medicare, democratically elected unions cannot even talk about it with their own members. That is what this bill says.

This gag rule would actually prohibit millions of Americans from communicating with each other about their elected representatives, about the political process, of which we have very little tonight, by the way, and about the policies that affect them.

Mr. Speaker, shutting down free speech like this does not just border on tyranny, something Mr. Jefferson knew something about, it crosses the line. Today my colleagues on the other side are trying to silence people who believe in unions. Tomorrow, will they be trying to silence people who believe in a particular religion?

And who is behind this attack on working families' freedom of speech? Well, the answers should not surprise us. It is those special interests, the very wealthy in this country who want to break the backs of workers and unions in this Nation. And they are aligned with Speaker GINGRICH to do it. They want to silence the voices of people who speak out for decent wages, affordable health care, and a secure retirement. And at the very same time, they want to open up the floodgates of special interest money from corporations and the very wealthy in our society.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is a sham. It is a travesty. The majority of this House would vote today on a genuine bipartisan campaign reform bill, the McCain-Feingold bill, if we had a chance, if we had an opportunity, but the Speaker is denying us that opportunity. The only option we have is to march to this well and to sign the discharge petition to get true, open, effective campaign debate on this floor.

And I would say to my friends on this side of the aisle, they have eight courageous people, I believe, who have signed that petition today. In the next days, weeks, months, we will be watching. If Members believe in changing this system that denigrates all of us, a system in which we have to parade over and spend a good part of our day

dialing for dollars, a system which has ruined the confidence of the American people in our government, and anybody who cannot see that cannot see the numbers declining every year participating, if Members want to change that, come down and sign the discharge petition and vote against this bill.

Mr. BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. TIAHRT).

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Paycheck Protection Act and I do so because I believe as Americans we should have control over the money that we earn, especially when the money goes to support a political opinion or a political candidate.

Now, there are some, as the previous speaker noted, who would say that this will go so workers do not have a right to speak. Well, that is not true. Workers do have a right to speak. All that this requires is they will have to say, "Yes, I want you to take my money and I want you to spend it however I see fit."

And to say that THOMAS Jefferson did not say what he said, it was not sacrilegious, it is very clear what he said. He said it was tyranny.

It has been said that the unions will not be able to talk to their members because of this bill. Again, that is not true. In my district the unions communicate weekly with their members through newspapers. They talk to them and have union meetings. People freely come and go. All this bill says is that if organizations are going to use money for political purposes, they just have to get permission.

□ 2030

You just have to ask people for it. Who is behind this? Eighty percent of union households and about 90 percent of Americans that are not in union households. They want to protect the paychecks that people work so hard for. I think everyone of us should be involved in the political process. But I think you should control how your political support goes.

I think you should control who your political money goes to support. In America today that does not happen. Millions of dollars are deducted directly from hard-working Americans' paychecks and sent to organizations that never ask for permission. They never ask if they support issues. They never ask if they support candidates. They take the money and they spend it how they see fit.

The gentleman from Colorado quoted Thomas Jefferson. He simply said that process is sinful and tyrannical. I believe Thomas Jefferson was right. The Paycheck Protection Act overcomes this tyranny that exists right here in America. I think we all ought to vote in support of this. I think we all ought to be in favor of protecting workers' paychecks. Let them control how their money is going to be spent in the political process.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute and 10 seconds to the

gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BAESLER), who has been leading the effort on the petition drive to get the discharge petition. He has 181 brave souls on it.

Mr. BAESLER. Mr. Speaker, back in November, the Republican leadership promised a fair and bipartisan vote on campaign finance reform. This is not a fair, bipartisan vote. This is a cynical fraud being perpetuated on the Congress here tonight. But we have an opportunity to have a bipartisan vote on real campaign finance reform. I urge all my colleagues, if they really want reform but just do not want to talk about it, walk down and sign the discharge petition. It is the only way left to reverse this fraud that has been perpetuated on us tonight.

The blue dog discharge petition would give us a fair and open debate on all the leading reform bills: McCain-Feingold, Shays-Meehan, the freshman bill, the Republican leadership bill, the Democrat bill. It would even give us a vote on the Doolittle bill, which abolishes all limits on contributions. We need only 31 more signatures.

I urge my 25 Democratic colleagues who have not signed to do so and also see if we can get 7 or 8 more Republicans. The discharge petition means that campaign reform would not die today, it will not die this week, or over the recess.

Mr. Speaker, the game is not over. After we get through with this cynical exercise tonight, sign the discharge petition.

Mr. BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER).

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, it is sacrilegious, it is a Trojan horse, we are working somehow to gag and to silence the opposition. We are shutting down the opposition, shutting down free speech, and we are trying to silence people and this is a cynical fraud. We hear all of these very pejorative phrases, and Members seem to be trying to do everything they possibly can not to focus on exactly what we are debating here.

It is one thing to stand up and call everybody a bunch of names, but it is another thing to try to confront exactly what we are voting on. We are voting here, and what we are supposed to be discussing is whether or not people who are working should be permitted, should be required, before they can take something out of their paycheck and use it for political purposes, that they should have the right to have to have a signoff, that before you can take something from somebody, they should sign a document saying, it is okay for you to take it and use it for political purposes.

I do not think calling it sacrilegious, a Trojan horse and talking about we are trying to silence somebody, we are trying to prevent people from being robbed. We are trying to prevent people from saying, you have a right to take

something out of your paycheck and use it for something that you do not believe in. We are not the government. We are a private group and we have that right with your money. Well, that is what we are defining here.

It is not sacrilegious. It is not trying to silence anybody. It is simply trying to set down, is it proper to give the power to the individual who is working out there in whatever company the right to control his own paycheck so people do not take it away from him without his permission and use it for political purposes that he or she may not agree with. That is very reasonable. This is a very reasonable bill. The hysterics that I am hearing from the other side would indicate that there are other things at work here.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I just want to say this is about warning, as the lost in space movie comes out, if you do not vote for Republicans, they will get you. That is what this is about.

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

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to be able to rise today and acknowledge that finally we have brought to the floor of the House the campaign finance sham act of 1998. These collective bills double the amount of money wealthy special interests can give. They silence the most vulnerable working families in America, not allowing them to come before the body that makes laws for all of this Nation, the United States Congress. Then the bill attempts to intimidate our newest and most innovative and interesting and wonderful voters, our voters who will become new citizens, particularly targeting Hispanic voters.

What more can one say than this is a sham? If this is not against what America stands for, 293 charitable groups, including the League of Women Voters, say do not vote for this bunch of sham. The gag rule is a gag on the Constitution of the United States of America. I am ashamed of this sham.

I ask my colleagues to defeat all of these bills, bring real campaign finance reform to the floor of the House. Vote for the discharge. Vote for the bills that have been put on that really mean something and take the Constitution and make it work.

Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening in strong opposition to the Paycheck Protection Act, a bill that more appropriately should be titled the Worker Gag Rule. This legislation will prohibit unions from making political expenditures without prior written consent from their members. It requires labor unions to obtain written, prior authorization from each member before collecting money from him or her to be used for the union's political activity. At the same time, the bill allows corporations to spend corporate funds for political purposes—unless individual shareholders object.

Proponents of this legislation have dishonestly argued that it is intended to protect the

rights of union members. In reality, it is intended to effectively silence the ability of America's working families to have a voice in the political process by singling out American workers for burdensome restrictions on their right to have their voices heard here in Washington.

This legislation is an attack on working families who freely choose to organize and to join together to fight for access to health care, better education, pensions, safer workplaces, and other important issues that some of my colleagues find to be uncomfortable. Although cleverly disguised as campaign finance reform, this legislation is clearly a coordinated effort to silence workers and their families and remove them from the political playing field.

Make no mistake, this represents an effort to punish the American labor movement for supporting working families. Unfairly, but not surprisingly, this legislation only singles out union for these new restrictions. Corporations are not subject to the same burdensome requirements. In fact, corporations are required only to provide their shareholders with an annual statement detailing the proposed amount of money to be spent on political activities in the upcoming 12-month period, the percentage of that amount attributed to the individual shareholder, and a form allowing the shareholder to object to the expenditure of the funds for political purposes. This one-sided approach creates an unfair advantage in the political system for wealthy special interests, when business already out spends unions by an 11-to-1 margin.

My colleagues, I urge you to oppose this transparent attempt to make working families more irrelevant to the American political system by increasing the power of the rich. I urge to oppose this legislation.

Mr. BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH).

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Colorado for yielding me this time.

I think it is very instructive for Members of this House and those who join us coast to coast beyond these walls on C-SPAN to hear the familiar cacophony of complaints, criticism and carping from those who claim to champion the rights of workers, but yet would move to abridge the most fundamental right, the freedom of any citizen to say, I do not agree with the political endeavor. How dare you reach into my pocket and take any of my pay and use it for a political cause with which I fundamentally disagree. And that is the issue which this House debates tonight.

And it is very, very instructive that amidst all the arguments, we have heard nothing substantive tonight from the other side. We have heard no one try to stand up and defend the rights of abridging workers. Instead, we hear these playground taunts and this type of class warfare, but, Mr. Speaker, the fact is that on this one, the American people, regardless of their work status and affiliation, are speaking with a united voice. They know this is all about freedom of association, freedom of dissent, first

amendment rights. And this is the real campaign reform that Members can vote for.

So I would urge my colleagues to resist the temptation of class warfare and driving wedges amongst the so-called classes of the American people and in fact cast a vote for freedom.

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

Mr. HAYWORTH. No, I will not yield at this time. The gentleman has his own time on which he can speak. This time has been given to me by my colleague, and I am going to make this case for the American people because not only with poll numbers, but with principles the American people say, it is our money. Let us spend it as we see fit. Adopt this act.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) who has worked with us and toiled on this issue as well from his first day in the House.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, what the authors of these bills forget is that in America voting is not a dream. It is not just another government benefit or program to be means tested. It is a constitutional right. And Americans should not be subjected to a Federal Government background check when they register to vote. But that is what these bills do.

It turns the ballot box into an interrogation zone where Americans are guilty until they are proven innocent. And to show they are citizens, Republicans want the Social Security Administration and the INS to run background checks and share private information on American voters.

Not surprisingly, Republicans want this test to be taken out where? In California, in Texas, in Florida, in Illinois and New York, States with large minority populations, especially Americans of Hispanic descent. We know already what they tried to do in the discredited Dornan investigation. We will not permit you to do that under the name of campaign finance reform. The right to vote in this Nation should not be subject to government intrusion, and Hispanic-American voters will not forget their continuing persecution of their rights.

Lastly, the founders of the union movement battled corporate-sponsored, club-wielding thugs who tried to silence them with beating and violence. Today Republicans are trying to accomplish in a law what they could not accomplish with a billy club.

Democrats stand with working people and their families who still believe that a person who puts in a full workweek deserves a fair wage to support their family and to have a voice here in the Congress. We will not let you stop unions from speaking on behalf of working families in this country.

Mr. BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time remains between the two sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOLEY). The gentleman from Colorado

(Mr. BOB SCHAFFER) has 10½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON) has 12½ minutes remaining.

Mr. BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1¾ minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BOYD). I apologize for being so stingy with the time, but the other side, the leadership in this House, has given us so little time.

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

Mr. BOYD. Mr. Speaker, I came into this Congress over a year ago as a part of a class of 73 Members, Democrats and Republicans, who had two mandates from our electorate. One was to stop the partisanship. Two was to reform the campaign finance laws of this Nation.

Mistakenly and naively, most of us believed that we could do that. Today we learn the truth.

There are several real campaign finance reform proposals the House should be debating today. Unfortunately, all we are allowed to vote on are four campaign finance reform bills, designed to promote a partisan advantage for the majority party, not real campaign finance reform.

What is missing from the debate today? The sad truth is we are not even allowed to consider legislation developed by Members from both sides of the aisle. Why is not the House debating Shays-Meehan or the bipartisan freshman bill? Because the House Republican leadership is afraid one of those solutions might actually pass.

Last year, Speaker GINGRICH promised the American people and this House a fair and open debate on campaign finance reform. Unfortunately, the American people will see today what that promise really means. Debate limited to 20 minutes per side, no amendments allowed and a two-thirds majority for passage.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle also like to talk about how they have opened up the process by allowing open rules. That is simply not true. The charade we are witnessing today on campaign finance reform cheats the American people of the open, honest debate they have demanded and more importantly deserve.

I urge my colleagues to vote against H.R. 2608, the worker gag act, and sign the discharge petition Number 3 so we can help the Speaker deliver on his promise.

□ 2045

Mr. BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLITTLE).

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

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, the first amendment is quite clear, "Con-

gress shall make no law bridging the freedom of speech." And yet, the whole business of campaign reform as has come out before the Members of the House largely centers on how do we bridge the freedom of speech. There is a whole litany of ways, many of which are displayed before us. However, the bill by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. BOB SCHAFFER) is designed to protect the freedom of speech, the freedom of speech of those members of the unions who have the right to make sure that their money is not spent contrary to their own purposes.

It is a good bill. It is one of the few bills out here I can say I support wholeheartedly today.

Mr. Speaker, I listened to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON) cite the history of the Democrats' involvement with campaign finance reform. He quite correctly pointed out in 1974 they did pass the present law, the disastrous present law that skewed contributions to PACs over contributions to individuals. We never really heard of PACs before, until that became the law.

By the way, 2 years ago, as recently as that, PACs was the great Satan; and today it is soft money. Soft money was given to us as well by this law, which places such severe restraints on direct contributions to candidates that money could flow then into the area of soft money, the unregulated area.

Of course, this Congress seems to want to regulate many things; and, happily, we have been able to resist that because regulation oftentimes is not the answer. Regulation has compounded the problem in the area of free speech. Now, having limited the amount of hard dollars that go to candidates, we see efforts to limit and regulate soft money. And, yes, let us get those evil issue advocacy ads.

I would say if we would go back and diagnose the problem correctly and recognize what it is, we could stop treating the symptoms of the problem and go right to the problem. The problem is too much regulation.

I urge support for the Schaffer bill.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), a Member who has led this House on so many important fights and who has been so helpful in this particular area.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time and for his leadership on this very important issue.

In fact, I do not think there is any issue more important than this one because it is about nothing less than our oath of office. Every single person who comes to this body to serve takes an oath of office to protect and defend the Constitution against all enemies, foreign and domestic. The greatest enemy to our democracy is foreign and domestic money poisoning our system.

On top of it all, we have the cynical, cynical action on the part of the Speaker today which gags American

workers. The deck is so stacked against the average American today, the way is greased for corporate America and wealthy Americans to have their voices heard; and today in this body the Republican majority wants to add an additional burden to average Americans having their voices heard here.

Mr. Speaker, when Washington first became the capital of our country, it was built on a swamp. It is still a swamp, a swamp putrid from the huge amounts of money that pours in here, special interest money stacking, as I said, the deck against the average American.

Let us rid ourselves of this poison. Let us rid our system of this poison. Let us honor our oath of office. Let us ask the Speaker to have freedom of speech on this floor, allowing us to support the bipartisan McCain-Feingold bill and restore freedom in our country.

Mr. BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM).

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, when the other side says that they support the working man and woman, it is not true. Over 90 percent of the jobs in the United States are small and large business, nonunion affiliated. What they support are the big union bosses. That want bigger government because they want the power; and that causes higher taxes, higher spending, which goes right along with the Democratic leadership.

Secondly, that over 30 percent of union workers are Republican, 10 percent of the workers are third party, and they are coercing that 40 percent to spend their money on campaigns against candidates that they support. And that is wrong. What this bill does is says that the union has got to ask those members, if they use their dollars, can they use them against the opponents. And that is wrong.

Thirdly, let us say that a Republican, there are a great number of them that represent union districts, let us say that they vote along with the unions. The President will veto anything that is kicked out against the unions because he wants that power also.

If the Republicans vote along with the unions, we lose that. If they vote against it, the President vetoes it; and the Senate probably will not pass it. But let us just say that the union stuff is kicked out. That leaves a disaster in campaigns, because it throws the majority of power to the Democrats.

That is exactly what they want. That is why they want the campaign finance reform, because they know it is a lose-lose situation. They want their unions to be able to contribute hundreds of millions of dollars. They want the Lincoln bedroom. They want the Tries, the Riadys and the Jeffersons and the rest of them to contribute, but yet they do not want the other side of it. They caused the problem in 1974 with the

PAC money. We are trying to clear it up.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY).

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

Mr. Speaker, this bill is another example of the Republican majority's strategy to silence anyone who dares to disagree with its extremist agenda. The worker gag rule muzzles the legitimate voice of working men and women who dare to tell the truth about the Republican leadership's anti-labor agenda.

It is amazing that supporters of this proposal claim to be concerned about union workers. Where was that concern when they tried to bring back company unions, eliminate overtime pay, gut health and safety protections, repeal the Davis-Bacon Act, or oppose an increase in the minimum wage?

Mr. Speaker, let us get the facts straight. No worker may be forced to join a union. Union membership is always voluntary. And no worker may be forced to pay union dues. In right-to-work States, unions must fairly represent all workers in a bargaining unit, but individual workers may be free riders and pay nothing for their share of representation costs.

In other States, unions and employers are permitted to agree on union security clauses that require all employees to pay an agency fee to cover their fair share of collective-bargaining-related costs. No worker may be required to pay any fee for a political activity. Further, unions must notify all workers that they are not required to join the union and that such workers are not required to pay full union dues.

This bill imposes onerous burdens on the labor movement that do not apply to corporations or to nonprofit groups such as NRA and the Christian Coalition. This bill is nothing but a politically motivated attack on the workers of America.

Mr. BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DUNN).

Ms. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, Thomas Jefferson once said, "To compel a man to furnish contributions of money for the propagation of opinions which he disbelieves is sinful and tyrannical." His thoughtful observation appeared a few years ago to be validated by the United States Supreme Court in the Beck decision.

Many of my colleagues have stated this evening that union workers do not need the protections given in this legislation. But let me give them a clear example of the effect this bill can have and what union leaders so fear.

In 1992, the voters of Washington State approved Initiative Measure 134, a state law prohibiting labor unions from withholding or diverting portions of an employee's wage for political purposes without the employee's written consent. The effect of the new law,

which essentially implements the spirit of the Supreme Court ruling, has been striking. Prior to Initiative 134, one union, the Washington Federation of State Employees and American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, was among the Nation's leaders in terms of money raised and the number of workers contributing through payroll deductions.

Since I-134, more than 90 percent of this union's members chose not to give the union access to their earnings to pay for the union leaders' political agenda. The number of contributing union members dropped from 2,500 workers to 82 workers, this as a result of giving union members choice. Clearly, there is need to give the Supreme Court ruling in Beck the visibility and force of the Federal law.

How can this same kind of awareness in paycheck protection be extended to all American workers? Federal legislative action is needed. The Paycheck Protection Act addresses the core issue spotlighted by the Supreme Court preventing forced collection of union dues before the fact. The worker would not, as Beck allows, be required to request a refund of his dues after the dues have already been seized.

I encourage all my colleagues to vote for this legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOLEY). The gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON) has 7¾ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. BOB SCHAFFER) has 4½ minutes remaining.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his inquiry.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, on paragraph 2 of the bill that is before us right now, paragraph 2, line 11, on page 3 of the bill, it says "an authorization described in paragraph (1) * * *" And we go back to paragraph (1), Mr. Speaker. It says, "except with the separate, prior, written, voluntary authorization of each individual * * *"

What do we mean in that paragraph number 2? What does that mean? That is a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair cannot interpret the bill. That is for the House to determine in debate.

Mr. PASCRELL. May I ask through the Speaker to the sponsor?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has rhetorically posed his question and may pursue it in debate.

Mr. PASCRELL. I was asking for a parliamentary inquiry. Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may propound the question on time yielded by the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. GEJDENSON. We will have to do that later, we are so short on time. Unless the gentleman from California has some extra time he might yield at this point just to explain that to one of our Members. The language is so new.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. BARRETT).

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, when I saw this bill came up today, I thought I read the calendar wrong; I thought it was April Fool's Day. Because this is an April Fool's joke. This bill should be up Wednesday, not today, because this bill is nothing more than a joke and a pretense to reform our campaign finance system.

These bills do nothing more than deform the system. Because this is not an honest attempt to reform the system. The only honest attempt to reform the system is a bipartisan attempt. The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGRICH) and his followers have refused to let this House consider any bipartisan legislation. It is an attempt to gag not only the workers in this country in this bill but the members of the minority party.

Mr. Speaker, the American people are not going to be fooled by this. It may be April Fool's week, but it is not the time to try to pull one over on the American people. What we should be doing in this House is addressing real campaign reform. Let us do the McCain-Feingold bill. Let us do the freshmen bipartisan bill. But we have to do it on a bipartisan basis.

Any attempt to jam this down our throats on a partisan basis is nothing more than a sham, and the American people know it. The people of this House know it.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this so-called campaign finance reform debate. I hope my Republican colleagues do not think that they are going to pass this debate off as genuine campaign finance reform. It is a sham, it does not have any integrity, and the American people know that.

I just want to ask my colleagues, who do they think they are fooling in this process? We know that this is a hodgepodge of measures that the House has already rejected. We know that this "reform" would intimidate voters from registering to vote. This particular piece, the Paycheck Protection Act, is a dishonest proposal. It is meant to silence workers, prevent them from having a voice in the political process.

As a matter of fact, it requires labor unions to get written prior authorization before assessing a fee to finance political activities; and, conversely, it allows corporations to make political contributions unless and until individual shareholders or members object. It is mindless what they are proposing here today.

□ 2100

The fact of the matter is and the tragedy of this is that, in this House, we have the votes to pass real reform. They figured out that we could pass it, so they have come up with this charade

here tonight that says we have got to get two-thirds of this body in order to pass reform. It is nonsense. We can pass it. It is nothing but a way to deny the people in this country a voice in the democracy. It is wrong. Vote against these bills.

Mr. BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers on my side. I would reserve the right to close and reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

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

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, tonight's process is such a sham. It brings shame on its perpetrators. They use the argument about free speech when it comes to campaign reform, but they thwart free speech right on this floor.

Public cynicism is already too high. They are only going to increase it. There is already too much money in politics. They are going to bring in more. They talk about coercion, even though they know every union member who wants out in terms of use of his or her money has the right to exercise that.

I want to say one thing to each and every one of them, those of us who live with the present system should be the ones who take the lead in reforming it. Instead, the Republicans have finally brought a set of proposals here precisely because they know they will fail. They will fail. And you, Mr. Speaker, and company, will have failed the American people.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I presently have?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Connecticut has 4¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HEFNER), who has done such an outstanding job; and we will all miss him as he is not seeking reelection. We thank him for all of his contributions.

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

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, if this was not such a serious subject, this would be laughable. It is unfortunate we would not all be under oath. If we were under oath, we would be issued subpoenas for perjury for calling this campaign reform.

I ran for office the first time and spent \$70,000, and that was a lot of money. Now it is not uncommon to spend \$1 million to get elected to Congress.

I remember we had a debate around here, and we were talking about unions, we were talking about special interests and PACs and GOPAC. We do not, to this day, know who the contributors to GOPAC are.

At least when we get a contribution from the labor union, we know it is

from the teamsters, the steelworkers or carpenters, whoever. We know who it is from. This is absolutely a charade.

If it were not for a good people that I am leaving in this place, I would say, hallelujah, I am glad I am out of here. This is an absolute travesty that is being perpetrated on the American people.

It is a mystery to me why Members put a bad bill under suspension. They have got to get two-thirds of the Members of the House to vote for a bad bill. It seems to me, if they are going to bring a bad bill out here, they should bring it out under regular order where they could at least get 51 percent.

I know what the spin is going to be, the Democrats kill campaign financing. If Members are able to do that, they are masters of it. But I do not believe you are going to be able to put it off this time, boys. You are not that good.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS).

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

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, this Paycheck Protection Act provision is one more step in the oppression of working families by the Republican majority. If they are interested in stopping people from involuntarily contributing to political campaigns, then they should single out the corporations that can outcontribute the Democrats, the unions, by 20 to 1 in soft money.

How many of the millions of shareholders in America were consulted or asked their opinion as to what position these corporations took when they contributed that soft money on which candidates they endorse? We are talking about many millions more than unions spend.

Unions are under the control of the Beck decision. They have to do a lot of reporting. Each union member has certain rights in terms of the positions taken by the union, but what rights do shareholders have?

Thomas Jefferson has been misquoted here several times. Certainly Thomas Jefferson will be in favor of equal oppression and equal repression if the government is going to oppress anybody. Why do we not do the same for corporations that we do for unions?

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the great gentleman from Marin, California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

(Ms. WOOLSEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, for years the American people have told us loud and clear what they want with campaign finance reform. They want a system that encourages every American to participate, they want a system to close special interest loopholes, and they want to ban all soft money.

But instead of what the American people want, we have the special inter-

est groups and their friends giving us a bill that benefits big business and their lobbyists.

The worker gag rule singles out workers, making it not easier but more difficult for them to participate in the electoral process. At the same time, large corporations are allowed to pour shareholder money into campaigns.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, in the last election cycle alone, corporations outspent unions by a margin of 11 to 1. This is like letting a CEO vote 11 times while giving the worker only 1 vote. That is the worker gag bill.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield three-quarters of a minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER); and I hope the Chair will be generous with his gavel.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, let us go to basics here. The basics are that unions are voluntary democratic institutions. We do not tell library associations how they can spend their money. The members determine that by majority vote and by the leaders they elect.

If a union member under current law does not want his money spent to explain legislation to members or for other political reasons, he can ask that his money not be spent, which is more than most organizations.

This bill is hypocritical. This bill says a union cannot spend money for these purposes until they get every individual signed off, but a corporation can spend money unless the individual shareholder says no. Why do we not make them both the same? The union and the corporation can spend money unless the individual says no, or neither can spend money unless the individual said yes. Then the bill would not be hypocritical.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOLEY). The gentleman from Colorado (Mr. BOB SCHAFFER) has 4 and one-half minutes remaining.

Mr. BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of time that has been allotted.

Mr. Speaker, this is a simple bill. It is one and a half pages long. It is not complicated. It applies to paychecks, period, paychecks across the board. Whether they are union paychecks, whether they are corporate paychecks, whether they are paychecks associated with banks or any other organization, this bill protects the wage earners who earn paychecks wherever they may be. It says this, no portion of their wages can be siphoned off and directed toward political causes unless we previously have the consent of the wage earner.

The other side who have come up and opposed this campaign finance reform measure have time and time and time again mentioned every topic under the sun except for the issue at hand. They have talked about extremist agendas, worker gag rules, overtime pay, minimum wage, Davis-Bacon Act, McCain-Feingold, and on and on and on.

Let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, why there is a reluctance to address the issue at hand. And 80 percent of the American public agrees with us when surveyed and polled. Union households, 80 percent of union households agree that the Paycheck Protection Act needs to be passed in order to protect their paychecks.

For the other side here who says this is radical, they agree with 16 percent of the union households in America. For the other side that says protecting paychecks is radical, they are agreeing with 16 percent of voters overall.

When it comes to teacher union households, they agree with 13 percent of teacher union households, 16 percent of nonunion households.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot say it loudly enough: 80 percent of the American public believes that it is right and just to protect paychecks and prevent a portion of someone's wages from going toward a political cause unless the wage earner agrees and approves.

Let me say this, the people of America tonight have a big question. They want to know who is in control of Congress and who is listening to whom here. They want to know whether this Congress is going to listen to the 80 percent of the American people, union households and nonunion households alike, who want their paychecks protected or whether this Congress is going to listen to the very small, extreme minority who believes that it is fair and just to steal cash out of someone's wages without their consent and without their approval.

That is the question that needs to be resolved today; and I say, Mr. Speaker, this question needs to be resolved as forcefully and clearly as it possibly can.

Mr. Speaker, Thomas Jefferson's name has come up a couple times; and the quote has come over three times tonight. Let me make it a fourth time, Mr. Speaker, because I believe it is most compelling. Thomas Jefferson said, to compel a man to furnish contributions of money for the propagation of opinions which he disbelieves is sinful and tyrannical.

The question, also, tonight is whether Thomas Jefferson's legacy is correct or whether it will be ignored and trampled by those who believe that union bosses should have their voices heard over and above the voices of common, everyday, hard-working Americans.

There is precedence for this, Mr. Speaker. The State of Washington passed similar legislation where 72 percent of the voters approved the Paycheck Protection Act. The teachers union, 48,000 members strong, dropped their political contributions down to 8,000 members when voluntary standards were applied to those laws. That is freedom, Mr. Speaker. That is liberty. That is real fairness.

That is why the Paycheck Protection Act has more cosponsors in this House than any other campaign finance reform effort. It is the compelling reason

that we put the voices, the concerns of every honest American hard-working taxpayer ahead of those of large, loud union interests.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2608.

The question was taken.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, on that, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

CAMPAIGN REPORTING AND DISCLOSURE ACT OF 1998

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3582) to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to expedite the reporting of information to the Federal Election Commission, to expand the type of information required to be reported to the Commission, to promote the effective enforcement of campaign laws by the Commission, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3582

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Campaign Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1998".

SEC. 2. EXPEDITING REPORTING OF INFORMATION.

(a) **REQUIRING REPORTS FOR CONTRIBUTIONS AND EXPENDITURES MADE WITHIN 90 DAYS OF ELECTION TO BE FILED WITHIN 24 HOURS AND POSTED ON INTERNET.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 304(a)(6) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 434(a)(6)) is amended to read as follows:

"(6)(A) Each political committee shall notify the Secretary or the Commission, and the Secretary of State, as appropriate, in writing, of any contribution received and expenditure made by the committee during the period which begins on the 90th day before an election and ends at the time the polls close for such election. This notification shall be made within 24 hours (or, if earlier, by midnight of the day on which the contribution is deposited) after the receipt of such contribution or the making of such expenditure and shall include the name of the candidate involved (as appropriate) and the office sought by the candidate, the identification of the contributor or the person to whom the expenditure is made, and the date of receipt and amount of the contribution or the date of disbursement and amount of the expenditure.

"(B) The notification required under this paragraph shall be in addition to all other reporting requirements under this Act.

"(C) The Commission shall make the information filed under this paragraph available on the Internet immediately upon receipt."

(2) **INTERNET DEFINED.**—Section 301(19) of such Act (2 U.S.C. 431(19)) is amended to read as follows:

"(19) The term 'Internet' means the international computer network of both Federal

and non-Federal interoperable packet-switched data networks."

(b) **REQUIRING REPORTS OF CERTAIN FILERS TO BE TRANSMITTED ELECTRONICALLY; CERTIFICATION OF PRIVATE SECTOR SOFTWARE.**—Section 304(a)(11)(A) of such Act (2 U.S.C. 434(a)(11)(A)) is amended by striking the period at the end and inserting the following: ", except that in the case of a report submitted by a person who reports an aggregate amount of contributions or expenditures (as the case may be) in all reports filed with respect to the election involved (taking into account the period covered by the report) in an amount equal to or greater than \$50,000, the Commission shall require the report to be filed and preserved by such means, format, or method. The Commission shall certify (on an ongoing basis) private sector computer software which may be used for filing reports by such means, format, or method."

(c) **CHANGE IN CERTAIN REPORTING FROM A CALENDAR YEAR BASIS TO AN ELECTION CYCLE BASIS.**—Section 304(b) of such Act (2 U.S.C. 434(b)) is amended by inserting "(or election cycle, in the case of an authorized committee of a candidate for Federal office)" after "calendar year" each place it appears in paragraphs (2), (3), (4), (6), and (7).

SEC. 3. EXPANSION OF TYPE OF INFORMATION REPORTED.

(a) **REQUIRING RECORD KEEPING AND REPORT OF SECONDARY PAYMENTS BY CAMPAIGN COMMITTEES.**—

(1) **REPORTING.**—Section 304(b)(5)(A) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 434(b)(5)(A)) is amended by striking the semicolon at the end and inserting the following: ", and, if such person in turn makes expenditures which aggregate \$500 or more in an election cycle to other persons (not including employees) who provide goods or services to the candidate or the candidate's authorized committees, the name and address of such other persons, together with the date, amount, and purpose of such expenditures;"

(2) **RECORD KEEPING.**—Section 302 of such Act (2 U.S.C. 432) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(j) A person described in section 304(b)(5)(A) who makes expenditures which aggregate \$500 or more in an election cycle to other persons (not including employees) who provide goods or services to a candidate or a candidate's authorized committees shall provide to a political committee the information necessary to enable the committee to report the information described in such section."

(3) **NO EFFECT ON OTHER REPORTS.**—Nothing in the amendments made by this subsection may be construed to affect the terms of any other recordkeeping or reporting requirements applicable to candidates or political committees under title III of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971.

(b) **INCLUDING REPORT ON CUMULATIVE CONTRIBUTIONS AND EXPENDITURES IN POST ELECTION REPORTS.**—Section 304(a)(7) of such Act (2 U.S.C. 434(a)(7)) is amended—

(1) by striking "(7)" and inserting "(7)(A)"; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

"(B) In the case of any report required to be filed by this subsection which is the first report required to be filed after the date of an election, the report shall include a statement of the total contributions received and expenditures made as of the date of the election."

(c) **INCLUDING INFORMATION ON AGGREGATE CONTRIBUTIONS IN REPORT ON ITEMIZED CONTRIBUTIONS.**—Section 304(b)(3) of such Act (2 U.S.C. 434(b)(3)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by inserting after "such contribution" the following: "and the