

tails and, importantly, this site could re-employ those workers who would be displaced upon privatization. In addition, by creating the facility on site, the risks involved with the transportation of hazardous wastes are eliminated.

Uncertainty and fear have invaded these communities whose jobs and livelihoods are tied to the USEC. Families are worried about their future. Today, in Congress, we have the opportunity to provide some hope for these individuals. Passage of S. 2316 will fence off approximately \$400 million to be used to clean up the tails. Between construction, operation, and management of these facilities, hundreds of jobs can be created. This legislation is one small way we can help build a bridge to provide continued employment in the community. It is an opportunity to show these families we care about their future.

Mr. STRICKLAND. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 2316

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

SECTION 1. UNITED STATES ENRICHMENT CORPORATION.

(a) PLAN.—The Secretary of Energy shall prepare, and the President shall include in the budget request for fiscal year 2000, a plan and proposed legislation to ensure that all amounts accrued on the books of the United States Enrichment Corporation for the disposition of depleted uranium hexafluoride will be used to commence construction of, not later than January 31, 2004, and to operate, an onsite facility at each of the gaseous diffusion plants at Paducah, Kentucky, and Portsmouth, Ohio, to treat and recycle depleted uranium hexafluoride consistent with the National Environmental Policy Act.

(b) LIMITATION.—Notwithstanding the privatization of the United States Enrichment Corporation and notwithstanding any other provision of law (including the repeal of chapters 22 through 26 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2297 et seq.) made by section 3116(a)(1) of the United States Enrichment Corporation Privatization Act (104 Stat. 1321-349), no amounts described in subsection (a) shall be withdrawn from the United States Enrichment Corporation Fund established by section 1308 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2297b-7) or the Working Capital Account established under section 1316 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2297b-15) until the date that is 1 year after the date on which the President submits to Congress the budget request for fiscal year 2000.

(c) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that Congress should authorize appropriations during fiscal year 2000 in an amount sufficient to fully fund the plan described in subsection (a).

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their re-

marks and to insert extraneous material on S. 2316, the Senate bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

MODIFICATION TO ORDER OF THE HOUSE OF FRIDAY, JULY 17, 1998 REGARDING FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2183, BIPARTISAN CAMPAIGN INTEGRITY ACT OF 1997

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to correct an amendment that was included in the unanimous consent for the campaign reform procedure on the Shays-Meehan bill. That request is that Amendment No. 2 by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH) was duplicated and repeated as Amendment No. 34, when, in fact, the content of Amendment No. 34 is different than was accepted in the unanimous consent, and I would like to correct it with the amendment which is, in fact, the substance of Amendment No. 34.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the modification to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Modification of Amendment No. 34 offered by Mr. SMITH of Michigan: Add at the end of title V the following new section (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

SEC. 510. REPORTS ON FEDERAL POLITICAL ADVERTISEMENTS CARRIED BY RADIO STATIONS, TELEVISION STATIONS, AND CABLE SYSTEMS.

Title III of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 431 et seq.), as amended by sections 101, 401, and 507, is further amended by adding at the end the following section:

“REPORTS ON FEDERAL POLITICAL ADVERTISEMENTS CARRIED BY RADIO STATIONS, TELEVISION STATIONS, AND CABLE SYSTEMS.

“SEC. 326. (a) IN GENERAL.—In such manner as the Commission shall prescribe by regulation, prior to the dissemination of any Federal political advertisement, each operator of a radio broadcasting station, television broadcasting station, or cable system shall report to the Commission the true identity of each advertiser and the cost, duration, and other appropriate information with respect to the advertisement.

“(b) FEDERAL POLITICAL ADVERTISEMENT DEFINED.—In this section, a ‘Federal political advertisement’ includes any advertisement advocating the passage or defeat of Federal legislation, any advertisement advocating the election or defeat of a candidate for Federal office, and any advertisement characterizing the positions taken by such a candidate.”.

Mr. THOMAS (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I once again thank the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) for his efforts to try to expedite the process to enable the majority

leader's word to be honored and that we complete campaign finance reform, and to acknowledge that the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH) had requested three amendments, and one of them was, in fact, duplicated and therefore we needed to make that correction, so I thank the gentleman.

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

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

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to say that from an administrative point of view we are double-checking another amendment and there may be a need to offer another unanimous consent. This particular amendment is in the first batch. We hope that we will have an accurate list, and everyone will be informed, if, in fact, it is not accurate, and we will supply the correct text. Since all of them believe they were included, it was simply an administrative error in the compilation of the list, and I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The amendment will be reported, as modified.

REPORT ON H.R. 4276, DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1999

Mr. DELAY, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 105-636) on the bill (H.R. 4276) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered to be printed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All points of order are reserved on the bill.

BIPARTISAN CAMPAIGN INTEGRITY ACT OF 1997

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

□ 1828

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2183) to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to reform the financing of campaigns for elections for Federal office, and for other purposes, with Mr. MILLER of Florida (Chairman pro tempore) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. When the Committee of the Whole House rose on Tuesday, July 14, 1998, pending was Amendment No. 11 by the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. PICKERING) to Amendment No. 13 by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS).

Pursuant to the order of the House of Friday, July 17, 1998, no further amendment to the Amendment No. 13 by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) shall be in order, except those 55 amendments placed at the desk pursuant to that order.

Those amendments shall be considered in the order listed, may be offered only by the Member designated, or his designee, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified, equally divided and controlled by a proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

Pursuant to that order, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. PICKERING), and a Member opposed, each will control 5 minutes on the pending amendment.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. PICKERING).

□ 1830

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry, for the sake of this debate.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. MILLER OF FLORIDA). Will the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. PICKERING) yield for the purpose of a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. PICKERING. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS).

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, just to clarify how we are allocating time, are we under the requirement of 10 minutes? And does someone need to claim time if not in opposition, at least claim the time?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Time is controlled 5 minutes on each side. The gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. PICKERING) controls 5 minutes and an opponent.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I claim that 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) will be recognized for 5 minutes.

MODIFICATION TO AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR. PICKERING TO THE AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. SHAYS

Mr. PICKERING. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment be modified with the additional language at the desk. This language was printed under the unanimous consent agreement in Friday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the modification to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. PICKERING).

The Clerk read as follows:

Modification to amendment No. 11 offered by Mr. PICKERING to the amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 13 offered by Mr. SHAYS: The amendment is modified as follows:

In section 319(b) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as proposed to be inserted by the amendment—

(1) strike "was aware of a high probability" and insert "should have known"; and

(2) strike the period at the end and insert the following: "except that the trier of fact may not find that the defendant should have known that the contribution originated from a foreign national solely because of the name of the contributor.".

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The amendment is modified.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. PICKERING) for 5 minutes.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to complete the debate that we started the other night on the amendment now before the House which will take away and close the loophole that will allow those who take contributions from foreign sources the legal defense of willful blindness.

We used this illustration to show probably the best picture describing in a thousand words what can only be seen in this picture, and that is the expression and the term "willful blindness," the "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" policy of foreign campaign contribution.

What we want to do is stop the flow of illegal foreign contributions into our election process, to stop the money changing in our temple and to stop the money changing in our election and campaign process from foreign sources.

I appreciate the support from both sides of the aisle on this amendment because I do think we can close the loophole and stop many of the practices that we saw in the last presidential and campaign cycle, examples like the fund-raising in the Buddhist Temple, Charlie Trie bringing envelopes of cash and suspicious money orders to the DNC, Johnny Chung funneling cash provided by the Chinese military officer to the DNC.

Because, Mr. Chairman, what is at stake is our national security. As we have seen the proliferation and the nuclear proliferation issues in Asia and China and Iran and Pakistan and India, we want to make sure that these contributions or these types of contributions do not influence decisions and policies in this administration or any others to come. We want to clean the temple, we want to clean the process, and we want to have integrity in our election process.

I accept, and I gladly accept, the cooperation from both sides of the aisle on this amendment. I look forward to the acceptance in a few minutes.

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

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I would point out that we are again debating campaign finance reform and our effort to restore integrity to the political system, and the bill that is before us would ban soft money, the unlimited sums that individuals, corporations and labor unions and other interest groups give to the political parties that then get rerouted right back down to candidates.

We require that the sham issue ads be noted as campaign ads and legitimate campaign ads and that it come under campaign law.

We codify Beck, which gives individuals, not a member of a union, the right not to pay an agency fee for political activity, and we improve the FEC disclosure and enforcement.

In addition, we ban districtwide frank mailing 6 months to an election. Finally, we require that foreign money and fund-raising on government property be illegal.

The amendment before us offered by the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. PICKERING) is a good faith attempt to make sure that the intention of this bill is carried out, and we concur with it. We concur with the language that he has chosen to use, which is instead of "a high probability," that contribution originated from a foreign national, we would strike out that and say the individual "should have known." We concur with that.

Mr. Chairman, I think this is a good amendment and should be adopted.

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

Mr. PICKERING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes time to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY).

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise again in support of the Pickering amendment. Last week I rose to support this amendment and I understand that some of my comments at the time caused some concern in some quarters. Of course, I had the Clinton scandals in mind when I first spoke in favor of this amendment.

Evidence shows that the Clinton-Gore reelection effort and the Democrat National Committee purposely sought foreign money in an effort to bypass our election laws. As far back as 1992, the Clinton-Gore campaign was raising money from foreign sources. It was in this context that I made my remarks last week.

In no way was it my intention to suggest impropriety on the part of anyone other than those persons working for the Clinton-Gore campaign and the Democrat National Committee, and involved in the solicitation of illegal foreign donations.

Let me take this opportunity to once again offer my sincere apologies to anyone whom I may have inadvertently offended. I would like to note, however, that it was the height of hypocrisy for the DNC to attack me for reading the names of those who funneled illegal money into the DNC and

the Clinton-Gore campaign. After all, the DNC was the ones who broke the law and they have never offered anything other than arrogant, evasive justifications.

There have been seven people charged by the Justice Department for laundering illegal campaign funds from foreign sources to the DNC, and the DNC has returned millions in illegal contributions since the 1996 elections.

Mr. Chairman, at some point during the debate on campaign finance reform I am going to offer a sense of the Congress amendment that an independent counsel should be appointed to investigate the abuses by the Democrat National Committee. I hope the Members will support my amendment. In the meantime, I support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. PICKERING) and urge its adoption.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN).

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, let me just say to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. PICKERING), we enjoyed working with the language. I think to take "high probability" and insert "known or should have known" certainly makes a lot more sense in terms of coming up with a section of the law that would be enforceable, whether it is civilly or criminally.

I do wish, however, that as we work through these amendments, and many of the amendments are being proposed to the Shays-Meehan legislation by people who I suspect ultimately will actually oppose campaign finance reform, I would like to encourage those Members who are able to work out agreement on amendments to actively consider supporting the Shays-Meehan legislation.

This is an amendment we have agreed to. I think it is a good amendment. Most of us think it is a good amendment. But if we really want this amendment to become part of law, what we really need Members to do is to support the Shays-Meehan legislation, which is a bipartisan piece of legislation. It has support on both sides of the aisle.

It would make soft money illegal. It would also crack down and require disclosure on sham issue ads. It would give the FEC the teeth that they need to enforce the laws that are already on the books. I think many of us on both sides of the aisle have witnessed over the last year or two all kinds of areas where we need to make improvements in our campaign finance laws. The best way to make those improvements is by supporting the Shays-Meehan legislation.

I believe that we are at a point in time that we are on the verge of having a majority of the Members of this House who support that legislation. So, I look forward to working with both sides of the aisle on amendments, amendments that we can come to an agreement on. But I would hope that

the authors of these amendments, many of whom I suspect have no intentions of supporting the Shays-Meehan legislation, will consider changing their view ultimately on our bill and having a strong bipartisan vote in favor of Shays-Meehan at the end of this legislation.

Mr. PICKERING. Mr. Chairman, parliamentary inquiry. How much time do I have remaining?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. MILLER of Florida). The gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. PICKERING) has 1 minute and the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. PICKERING. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MCINTOSH).

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Chairman, I applaud the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. PICKERING) for bringing this amendment to the floor and wholeheartedly support it. What it says is that a political party official, if he should have known that a contribution originated from a foreign source, he or she cannot use the willful blindness as a defense. That seems to have happened at least once and we think many times in the various investigations in campaign irregularities that we have been doing in the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

According to one Associated Press report, a memo exists that proves that President Clinton was personally aware that hundreds of thousands of dollars were being funneled into his campaign from Indonesia as early as 1992 and yet they claim innocence, ignoring the fact that that knowledge was there.

This amendment would clarify the law that one cannot say, as that knowledge comes to them, willfully ignore it and continue to accept those donations. I think it is time that we put that into the law and show and learn from these scandals that ignorance is not going to be a defense for violating the law.

I applaud the gentleman from Mississippi for bringing forward this amendment and urge my colleagues to vote for it.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from California (Mr. FAZIO).

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from California (Mr. FAZIO) is recognized for 1½ minutes.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, I think the bipartisan agreement on this amendment, which has been made between both sides, is an important step toward improving an already excellent bill. I only wish that many of the people on the majority side of this aisle had taken upon themselves the responsibility to promote the enactment of the Shays-Meehan bill, because it fundamentally improves campaign finance reform and law, and we need to pass it.

Many of those who have been advocating this amendment, of course, see

it as a poison pill and do not intend to support the underlying law that it amends. But I think it is also important to point out that there has been no evidence at this point in any of the proceedings that have been held in this city that this administration in any sense knowingly and willfully participated in the receipt of funds from foreign sources.

In fact, I think if you look closely at the record, you will find that the DNC has gone a long way to exhaustively investigate those who have donated to it and has implemented a series of new vetting procedures for donors and guests so that none of these kinds of mistakes could be made again in the future. Those are already in place.

If we really look at the Republican Party's conduct in this same area, we will find just as much opportunity to improve procedures and to improve their party's approach to the receipt of funds that were ultimately determined to have come from foreign sources.

There are no elements of this debate that are free from the need to support fundamental reform like Shays-Meehan.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment, as modified, offered by the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. PICKERING) to the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by Mr. SHAYS.

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

Mr. PICKERING. 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 Mississippi will be postponed.

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

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

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. 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 offered by Mr. SMITH of Michigan to the amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 13 offered by Mr. Shays: Add at the end the following new title:

TITLE —PENALTY FOR VIOLATION OF FOREIGN CONTRIBUTION BAN
SEC. —01. PENALTY FOR VIOLATION OF PROHIBITION AGAINST FOREIGN CONTRIBUTIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 319 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 441e) is amended—

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

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

“(b) Any person who violates subsection (a) shall be sentenced to a term of imprisonment

which may not be less than 5 years or more than 20 years, fined in an amount not to exceed \$1,000,000, or both."

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to violations 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 Michigan (Mr. SMITH) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

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

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I have a modification at the desk. It is in writing and I ask unanimous consent that it be agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will report the modification.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment, as modified, offered by Mr. SMITH of Michigan 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. PENALTY FOR VIOLATION OF PROHIBITION AGAINST FOREIGN CONTRIBUTIONS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 319 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 441e) is amended—

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

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

"(b)(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), notwithstanding any other provision of this title any person who violates subsection (a) shall be sentenced to a term of imprisonment which may not be more than 10 years, fined in an amount not to exceed \$1,000,000, or both.

"(2) Paragraph (1) shall not apply with respect to any violation of subsection (a) arising from a contribution or donation made by an individual who is lawfully admitted for permanent residence (as defined in section 101(a)(20) of the Immigration and Nationality Act)."

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

Mr. SMITH of Michigan (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. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The amendment is modified.

The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

□ 1845

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

Mr. Chairman, the 1996 elections were marked by many questionable financial tactics in fund-raising for political

purposes, but I think the one that must concern us is the vast amounts of illegal donations by foreign contributors. The American people learned of the antics of those such as John Huang, Charlie Trie, and Johnny Chung, all of whom helped funnel illegal foreign funds into the American political process in 1996. So far, Trie, Chung and five others have been indicted for their roles.

Current law prohibits foreign nationals from donating to candidates for Federal office, yet it is clear that the penalties are not adequate to deter violations of this nature. This is, I think, made even more difficult by the location of the wrongdoers: outside of American soil. This means that penalties for this particular type of violation must be strengthened, and that is what my amendment does. It increases the maximum penalty from \$25,000 to \$1 million, and it increases the maximum jail time up to 10 years, at the discretion of the judge.

Indeed, this is one of the recommendations of the Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs report: that we increase the allowable penalties. Under my amendment, those who violate the prohibitions against contributions from foreign nationals will be subject, again, to a jail sentence of up to 10 years and/or a fine not to exceed \$1 million. I think this common sense measure will serve to deter foreign nationals from illegally donating to American elections, and those who would knowingly assist them.

Mr. Chairman, we cannot honestly say we have begun to fix the problems with our campaign finance system until we have made some effort to stifle the problem of illegal foreign donations, and I urge my colleagues to put the House on record as being as repulsed and outraged by the scandal of foreigners seeking to influence the American political system as I am, and I hope we would all vote for this amendment.

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. MILLER of Florida.) Is there a Member in opposition to the amendment?

The gentleman from California (Mr. FARR) is in opposition to the amendment and claims the time in opposition?

Mr. FARR of California. Yes, Mr. Chairman. I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. There is 5 minutes in opposition to the amendment. Is there someone who claims the 5 minutes?

Mr. FARR of California. I will accept the 5 minutes.

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

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

Mr. SHAYS. We do not need to be in opposition to claim the time, if no one is in opposition. So is the gentleman claiming time in opposition or just claiming the 5 minutes?

Mr. FARR of California. I am claiming the 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The 5 minutes is reserved for opposition.

Mr. FARR of California. Then I will claim the time in opposition.

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

I rise because I want to speak with some concern about the implementation of this amendment, and I would like the author to just answer a couple of questions here.

It says in the amendment, "Any person who violates the subsection shall be sentenced for a term of imprisonment," and with the gentleman's amendment the term of imprisonment is not more than 10 years and a fine in an amount not to exceed \$1 million.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. It is an option. And/or, or both, yes.

Mr. FARR of California. I understand that. The point that I would like clarified is that it goes to a foreign national. What is the gentleman's definition of a foreign national? There is a lot of confusion as to what is a foreign national.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. If the gentleman will continue to yield, the definition would be exactly the same as under current law. We have made an exception for the amendment that was passed last week for resident aliens or green card holders.

Mr. FARR of California. But those are not foreign nationals. So a foreign national would be a person who is coming to this country but does not have a green card? For example, a tourist could be a foreign national?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. That is correct.

Mr. FARR of California. And I am just curious as to why this penalty is a more severe penalty than if an individual was caught as an illegal alien. If a person crosses the border with no papers, they are not entitled to be in this country, they are not a tourist and they come to this country and they are caught, even if they were doing this kind of activity, being involved in a campaign, which I cannot imagine that, but if they were, the penalty here is more severe. Why is that?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. The penalty is not more severe. The option is more extensive. So in the eyes of the court, if they decide that the violation is egregious enough, they have an option of a greater penalty than under existing law.

Existing law has a maximum penalty of \$25,000 and a maximum jail sentence of not to exceed 1 year in jail. So we give the court greater latitude of increasing that to not more than.

Mr. FARR of California. Could the gentleman, for clarification, explain to me what type of person and contribution would trigger violation of this law?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Well, certainly if we look at the activities of Charlie Trie or John Huang or Johnny Chung, these individuals that now have been indicted for illegal contributions under existing law. Again, we do not change any of the definition in existing law, who falls under this act and who might be subject to these violations.

Mr. FARR of California. If a person came here, under the debate we are having on the floor now, under H-1B waivers, which are essentially the way we try to import high-tech people, professional engineers, scientists who are not American citizens to work with high-technology companies in America, if one of those while here in this country contributed, would they be in violation of the gentleman's amendment?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. They would be in violation of existing law, is my understanding. But if they have a green card, I have exempted these types of individuals from the more extensive parameters of the law under my amendment.

But if the gentleman would look to existing law, it is my understanding that these individuals now, not green card holders, but under the amendment we passed last week, we extended it to green card holders, and under that provision I have exempted that type of individual from the greater penalties.

Mr. FARR of California. Has anyone under existing law been convicted?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. They have been indicted under existing law. I am not familiar whether they have been convicted or not. There was a guilty plea this afternoon, I understand.

Mr. FARR of California. Never before in the history of this country has there been a violation of this law until the election of 1996?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I am sorry, could the gentleman say that again?

Mr. FARR of California. In the history of election reform law, going back to the mid-1970s, there has been nobody convicted in violation of this law?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I am not familiar. I do not know the answer to that.

Mr. FARR of California. That is existing law. And then the gentleman is making existing law much tougher; is that correct?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I would suggest I am not making existing law more tougher, but if the court decides, for lack of a better word, that the violation is egregious enough or the amount of the contribution or the potential for influence is egregious enough, that court would now have an option that is greater than under existing law.

So existing law limits the sentencing term to 1 year and/or not more than \$25,000, and as the gentleman understands, this amendment simply increases that option but has no minimum obligation.

Mr. FARR of California. But as I understand it, this goes to the key of the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR) has expired.

The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH) has time remaining.

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

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

Mr. FARR of California. As I read it, under existing law the penalties, in the gentleman's opinion, are very weak; nobody yet has been convicted. The gentleman stiffens the penalties and broadens the scope. And my comment on that, and I think that is correct, my comment is I think the gentleman is opening up a real Pandora's box because I do not know how people can go about being involved in an election process.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Reclaiming my time, I would say so far Trie, Chung and six others have been indicted for their roles of violating this part of our law.

Just today, Howard Glicken, a fundraiser and friend of the Vice President, pleaded guilty to soliciting \$20,000 in foreign contributions.

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

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

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague from Michigan for yielding just to say one quick thing. The sentencing guidelines still apply. And as I understand the gentleman's intention, he does not repeal, alter or adjust in any way the sentencing guidelines.

So the Federal judge's discretion will be as full as it was before. The upper level is permissibly higher, but the criteria applied by the sentencing judge will be the same because those are set by the sentencing guidelines.

I offer that as a way of assuaging some of the concerns of my colleague from California.

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

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DELAY. Just very quickly, I appreciate the gentleman from Michigan bringing this amendment. Normally I would have a little heartburn over this amendment, but I have to say that since we seem to be moving towards Shays-Meehan, with more regulations, more laws, and more ways to break the law rather than opening up the process, as we suggested in the Doolittle substitute, if we are going to do this, then we ought to do it with very strong, tough penalties.

The gentleman from Michigan has brought an amendment that imposes some very, very tough penalties for egregious violations of the law. I just appreciate the gentleman for bringing this amendment and I support the gentleman's amendment and ask our colleagues to support him.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Texas.

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

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

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. The point made by the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL), under the gentleman's law, I think it does not give the discretion the gentleman talks about, because this bill says "Any person who violates it shall be sentenced to a term."

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Reclaiming my time, my language is optional.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH), as modified, to the amendment in the nature of a substitute 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 the amendment by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY).

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

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, I offer Amendment No. 3 to the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DELAY to the Amendment in the Nature of a Substitute No. 13 offered by Mr. SHAYS: Add at the end the following new title:

TITLE _____SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING FUNDRAISING ON FEDERAL PROPERTY

SEC. _____01. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING APPLICABILITY OF CONTROLLING LEGAL AUTHORITY TO FUNDRAISING ON FEDERAL PROPERTY.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) On March 2, 1997, the Washington Post reported that Vice President Gore "played the central role in soliciting millions of dollars in campaign money for the Democratic Party during the 1996 election" and that he was known as the administration's "solicitor-in-chief".

(2) The next day, Vice President Gore held a nationally televised press conference in which he admitted making numerous calls from the White House in which he solicited campaign contributions.

(3) The Vice President said that there was "no controlling legal authority" regarding the use of government telephones and properties for the use of campaign fundraising.

(4) Documents that the White House released reveal that Vice President Gore made 86 fundraising calls from his White House office, and these new records reveal that Vice President Gore made 20 of these calls at taxpayer expense.

(5) Section 641 of title 18, United States Code, (prohibiting the conversion of government property to personal use) clearly prohibits the use of government property to raise campaign funds.

(6) On its face, the conduct to which Vice President Gore admitted appears to be a clear violation of section 607 of title 18,

United States Code, which makes it unlawful for "any person to solicit . . . any (campaign) contribution . . . in any room or building occupied in the discharge of official (government) duties".

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that Federal law clearly demonstrates that "controlling legal authority" prohibits the use of Federal property to raise campaign funds.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Friday, July 17, 1998, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) will control 5 minutes, and the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN) will control 5 minutes in opposition.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY).

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

I offer this amendment in order to clarify some comments made by the Vice President last year.

For Richard Nixon it was, "I am not a crook." For Bill Clinton it was, "I didn't inhale." For AL GORE it was, "No controlling legal authority." Sometimes our leaders say things they wish they would not have said. I am guilty of such at times. The Vice President's comments, though, regarding the various campaign abuses of the Clinton-Gore campaign, will be forever etched in the memory of the American people.

This amendment is very simple. It says that when it comes to our campaign laws, there is a controlling legal authority. It is called "the law".

□ 1900

At least 3 criminal statutes address the use of the White House for political purposes. Section 600 of Title 18 prohibits the promising of any government benefit in return for any kind of political support or activity.

Section 607 of Title 18 prohibits solicitation or receipt of contributions for Federal campaigns in Federal buildings.

Section 641 of Title 18 prohibits the conversion of government property to personal use.

According to the White House and the author of this so-called reform bill, these laws do not apply to Mr. GORE because he was raising campaign funds for the Democratic National Party and not the Clinton-Gore Re-election Campaign.

Well, that argument has no controlling logic. None other than Abner Mikva, the President's own legal counsel, issued a legal admonition that said, "campaign activities of any kind are prohibited in or from government buildings," he wrote. "This means fund-raising events may not be held in the White House; also no fund-raising phone calls or mail may emanate from the White House," he continued.

He did not contend that the White House or Members of Congress can raise soft money on government properties.

But even if that is true, the facts are that GORE also raised hard money from the White House. The Associated Press

reported that around the time that the Vice President was making fund-raising calls from the White House last year, GORE was advised that the Democrat media fund for which he was soliciting was spending hard money.

Mr. Chairman, the law, the controlling legal authority on this matter, prohibits the use of Federal property to raise campaign funds, period. But that did not stop the White House from holding the infamous White House coffees.

During January of 1995, President Clinton also authorized a plan under which the Democratic National Committee would hold fund-raising coffees and sleepovers in the White House. During 1995 and 1996, the White House held 103 of these coffees. 103.

To quote the New York Times, "the documents released by the White House themselves make explicit that the coffees were fund-raising vehicles." They also make clear that the Democratic National Committee was virtually being run out of the Clinton White House despite the President's initial efforts after the election to draw a distinction between his own campaign organization and the committee.

These reports make it obvious that the coffees, which President Clinton directly authorized, were nothing but fund-raising events.

According to the New York Times, the Democratic National Committee raised \$27 million from 350 people who attended White House coffees.

What about the Lincoln Bedroom sleepovers? Is that not Federal property? President Clinton also entertained 938 overnight guests in the White House during his first term.

This, too, became a means of fund-raising. When the original plan to hold coffees was suggested to the President, he not only approved it but also originated the idea of the overnight visits.

On the memo suggesting the plan, he wrote, "Ready to start overnights right away. Get other names at 100,000 or more, 50,000 or more."

The New York Times reports that these guests donated over \$10 million to a Democratic Party from 1992 to 1996.

The controlling legal authority, known as the law, prohibits the use of Federal Government property from raising campaign funds. The American people do not buy the argument that there is no controlling legal authority.

So, Mr. Chairman, there is a controlling legal authority, no matter what Mr. GORE believes. It is called the law. And the Vice President has the responsibility to follow that law no matter how old or inconvenient it may be.

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

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2½ minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this body makes laws. We do not generally try to interpret them. And when we do interpret them, we do not do very well in a number of cases. And this proposed amendment is

one case where we are not doing very well, in my opinion.

Now, I recognize that this is a sense of Congress, that is, this amendment if attached to the Shays-Meehan substitute would not be binding law. This is a sense of Congress. We are not really here making campaign finance reform law. We are trying to embarrass the Vice President. That is what we are trying to do here today, at least those on the other side are.

Now, I know that the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN) are willing to accept this amendment. It is kind of hard to explain the other side of it. And I understand that. There are many people on this side of the aisle who will vote for it, and they will vote for it because it ought to be the law and it ought to be clearly the law that they do not do fund-raising on Federal property.

But the fact is that the law is not that clear. We are talking about the Pendleton Act. That is what controls fund-raising from Federal property. And not once in the history of this Republic has someone been prosecuted for fund-raising from Federal property.

There is case law out there which suggests that the point of solicitation is not on the Federal property if you are making a telephone call but it is where the call is received. The fact is the law is not clear. But it ought to be clear, and that is why it is important that we pass campaign reform in this session.

That is why it is important, despite the objections on the other side, that we go further than the Pendleton Act, that we have a soft-money ban, that we deal with issue advocacy, and that we tighten up these campaign abuses that have occurred not just on one side, not just with Democrats, but with both sides and with Republicans as well as Democrats.

That is what we need to do here. We need real campaign finance reform. And those who have been pushing this particular amendment have not been supporters of real campaign finance reform.

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

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

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I want to put the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN) on notice that I am opposed to his view.

On the distinction of the gentleman as to the origin of the phone call, if the phone call is for private purpose or political purpose, it would then violate the laws against embezzlement, which is to use Federal property for personal purpose.

So as to the phone call not being on government property, they would run smack into the embezzlement law even if they got outside the Pendleton Act.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, the fact is that we are governed by the Pendleton Act and the Pendleton Act is not clear.

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

Mr. ALLEN. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I just would say that I am very comfortable accepting this amendment. It is a sense of Congress. And I think it is very clear, and I agree with the comments of the gentleman, we need to clarify the law.

The bottom line is that if we ban soft money, it is rare that we are going to have a President and Vice President, a Speaker, however, seek to raise money on government property for a \$5,000 PAC contribution. So I think we get at the problem by substantive change in the law. So I just make that point to my colleagues.

But I do think the sense of Congress is correct that even if the Vice President did not think it was illegal, I think it was clear that he knew it was wrong and it should not have taken place.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from California (Mr. FAZIO) who is a strong advocate of campaign finance reform.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, as we have already adopted the Cox amendment that clarifies the law, this amendment is entirely superfluous and offered only for political purposes. And it strikes me as highly hypocritical for any Member of this body who has been engaged in raising soft or hard money in the system we currently have in place to stand before his colleagues and a national audience and criticize the Vice President because he did something that has clearly under the law never been prosecuted.

The Pendleton Act, over 100 years old now, has never been used to prosecute anyone for the solicitation of funds from an office. I think we now have a clear understanding of what is appropriate. But we could find the names of at least 3 sitting Republican senators who have admitted raising funds in their offices on the telephone.

This is not a partisan issue. We are moving in the direction of reform. And for the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) to bring this amendment now is simply to try to imply that there is only one party or perhaps one individual that must alter behavior. We have all must do that.

This administration, including the Vice President, has been out front in advocating campaign finance reform, the Shays-Meehan bill the centerpiece of that effort.

I would urge all those Members who wish, in retrospect, to imply that they are above any kind of campaign misdeed to get behind reform and put their name down on the list of those who are willing to embrace change and not use this simply as an opportunity for political bashing.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 seconds to the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL).

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague for yielding.

What is wrong is clear. What is wrong is to use Federal Government property for personal advantage. And to say that it does not violate the Pendleton Act or that no one has been prosecuted under the Pendleton Act ignores the fundamental truth that there are clear statutes barring the use of Federal Government property for personal purposes and there have been many prosecutions under that statute. What happened violated that law.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) to the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS).

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

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

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

It is now in order to consider the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS).

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

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Chairman, as the designee of the gentleman from California (Mr. COX), I offer amendment No. 56 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. MCINNIS to the amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 13 offered by Mr. SHAYS:

Add at the end the following new title:

TITLE _____PROHIBITING SOLICITATION TO OBTAIN ACCESS TO CERTAIN GOVERNMENT PROPERTY

SEC. _____01. PROHIBITION AGAINST ACCEPTANCE OR SOLICITATION TO OBTAIN ACCESS TO CERTAIN GOVERNMENT PROPERTY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 11 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“§ 226. Acceptance or solicitation to obtain access to certain government property

“Whoever solicits or receives anything of value in consideration of providing a person with access to Air Force One, Marine One, Air Force Two, Marine Two, the White House, or the Vice President’s residence; shall be fined under this title, or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 11 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“236. Acceptance or soliciting to obtain access to certain government property.”.

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

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may claim the time in opposition.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Chairman, what has spurred my interest in this was an article in the Washington Post on tax day, on Tuesday, April 15, the day all of the citizens in this country have to pay their taxes. Let me read this article, or at least summarize a couple of paragraphs:

In the two years before President Clinton’s 1996 re-election, 56 campaign fund-raisers and big-money donors hopped rides with him aboard Air Force One. Between January 1, 1995, and November 6 of last year, 477 people traveled as guests aboard the presidential jet, Air Force One, according to a review of Air Force’s One manifest compiled by the White House. But Clinton aides decline to release the complete list and instead provided names only of those who contributed more than \$5,000 to the Democratic National Committee or who raised \$25,000 for the Democratic National Committee or the Clinton-Gore Re-election Committee. Many of these people have no history with the President, and their presence on Air Force one could add to suspicions that the plane was used as a vehicle to court and pay thanks to big donors.

Air Force One is not Clinton charter airlines. It is not to be used by the President to court the big donors across this country. That jet does not belong to the President of the United States. That jet belongs to the people of the United States. And it should be used in its official capacity.

My amendment, Mr. Chairman, really is quite simple. My amendment simply says, and let me read the amendment, “whoever solicits.” “Whoever.” So it could be the Democratic National Committee. It does not need to be the President or the Vice President who is doing this. It can be the Democratic National Committee.

Whoever solicits or receives anything in value in consideration for inviting a person with access to Air Force One, Marine One, Air Force Two, Marine Two, the White House, or the Vice President’s residence shall be fined under this title and imprisoned for not more than a year or both.

We could talk for the next hour about the Lincoln Bedroom. We could talk for the next hour in much more detail about the abuse, in my opinion, of Air Force One, Air Force 2, Marine One. And of course, Mr. Chairman we do not know the extent of the abuse because the Clinton administration will not release the manifest in total so that we can assess that.

At any rate, I cannot imagine anybody on this floor voting against this amendment. I am going to ask for a rollcall because I want to see somebody stand up and justify that we should go

ahead and sell Air Force One to the big donors in this country. I am going to test them.

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

□ 1915

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR), my Peace Corps friend.

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, I have a question of the author. Why did he exempt the legislative branch from this? The only branch that uses the aircraft he is intending is the executive branch. Why is the legislature exempt? When people are on CODELs or on missions with corporate members or interested American citizens who may be suggesting that if you come with me we perhaps can play a golf game somewhere. That is something of value. Your amendment says receives anything of value. It does not define it. It could be a baseball cap. It could be anything. And then it exempts Congress. It exempts the legislative branch. Why does he not include the legislative branch in here if it is as strong as he thinks it should be?

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

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

Mr. McINNIS. Obviously we do not exempt Congress. Congress may not be included here, but the gentleman has every right.

Mr. FARR of California. Why not include Congress?

Mr. McINNIS. If the gentleman wants to handle the two-way conversation strictly on his side that is one point, but let me respond to the question that he has asked.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is not prevented in any way whatsoever from offering his own amendment to put the congressional or the legislative body in there, number one. Number two, I have never ridden on Air Force One as he knows. I do not know many Republicans that have.

Mr. FARR of California. Reclaiming my time, I think this amendment, it says receives anything of value, and it only applies to the executive department. We are here talking about congressional campaign finance reform, applying to this House of Congress. These amendments, and I might support this amendment, but I think it is diverting the attention, it is trying to say that the problem is all in the executive branch and that there are no problems here in Congress and that we do not need to spend time debating it.

I think this amendment is exactly what is going on here. People want to not pay any attention as to what the problems are in this Congress. If the gentleman was sincere about trying to stop solicitations using Federal property including aircraft, it would apply to the legislative branch as well.

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

The gentleman makes a nice speech, and I dare him to vote "no" on this

thing. I do not think he will because I know he thinks it is right. It is the right thing to do. Number two, I would recommend that the gentleman read the rules. Under congressional rule we are not allowed, I cannot call one of my big donors and say some, "Come on, we're going to go on a congressional CODEL." That is against the rules. That is already in place.

Number three to his point, this does not only apply to the executive branch as he has just stated in his comments. Let me read it for you.

Whoever, whether it is the Democratic National Committee, whether it is AL GORE, whether it is the chairman of the Democratic National Committee, whether it is a State chairman of the Democratic Party, whoever solicits or receives anything of value in consideration of providing a person with access to Air Force One, et cetera, et cetera. The legislative branch is covered. It is in our rules.

If he will take a look at any of the CODELs he has been on, my bet is he has never been on a CODEL where he has had a big donor to his race or anybody's race on that airplane, with the exception maybe one Member contributing to another Member, he has never been on a plane under those kind of circumstances.

He is going to vote for this. Who would not? It makes sense. The article appeared on Tax Day. That is what is ironic about this. I read the article on Tuesday, April 15.

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

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Of course people are going to vote for this amendment. But the sad thing is the gentleman who is offering this amendment is not going to vote for the bill. We are faced with 55 amendments, most of them intended to embarrass or imply that a problem just exists on one side when the bottom line is we know we have problems on both sides of the aisle and we have got to deal with them.

I would just rise again to say what I have said before, I really believe that some on the other side of the aisle need to be willing to do a little more investigating but a lot on my side of the aisle need to do more about reforming the system.

We do ban soft money. Once we ban the unlimited sums from individuals, corporations, labor unions and other interest groups, once we ban that, we take away a gigantic incentive to call someone from any government property or to reward someone with any government activity, plane, boat, house, you name it. A \$5,000 PAC contribution is not something that most people would probably seek a reward for or take the time of important people. But when one is seeking to raise soft money, \$100,000, \$200,000, \$300,000, a half a million, a million or more, it does become somewhat of a distraction.

The Meehan-Shays substitute bans soft money. It recognizes those sham

issue ads as what they are, campaign ads, and then they come under the campaign laws. People have a voice but under the campaign law. We codify back. We have FEC disclosure enforcement. We ban the franking 6 months to an election. And we make it clear in our legislation that you cannot raise foreign money and you cannot raise money on government property. We already make that clear.

This legislation reinforces it and seeks to suggest it happens on one side of the aisle, and I am sure my colleague believes that most does. But the bottom line is that we have got to keep together a unity between Republicans and Democrats who want campaign finance reform and not get baited into getting in arguments over which side does it and which side does not.

I agree with the gentleman from California (Mr. FAZIO), campaign finance reform is important. The focus that I have and I hope others have is on a bipartisan basis to eliminate many of the abuses we see.

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

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

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Connecticut for putting this all in context, and that is, that we are all here trying to come up with improvements in the existing system. We know that abuses, if that is what we want to call them, occur on both sides of the aisle and have done so historically.

As we are talking about the alleged misuse of Air Force One, I noted that in the newspaper today, the story was congressional use of corporate aircraft, in this case the tobacco industry. If we want to focus on the problems of Congress, and I think that is what we are here to do, we ought to really begin to look internally and look at our own approach to political activity. I think there are probably a number of other amendments that could be concocted and offered on this bill if we simply wanted to change the subject. I do not want to change the subject. I want to pass Shays-Meehan. I want people on both sides of the aisle to focus on what can be done to improve this system without offering extraneous, politically-inspired amendments that change the subject.

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

Of course the gentleman from California, I find it a little ironic. He is criticizing the Republicans on tobacco money. Between 1987 and 1997 he took \$75,800 from tobacco companies.

The second thing I want to point out, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) is very clear in saying that I am not going to vote for his bill. The gentleman from Connecticut is not going to vote for my bill. The bill I am on is the Doolittle bill. I think that is the bill that is going to bring us campaign reform. But he is not going to vote for it. He is going to oppose it.

I do not think he should stand up here and say that I am not voting for his bill and make it look like I am against reform. His bill is like wildflower mixed with a bunch of thistle in it. It is not a good bill. Mine is.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. MILLER of Florida). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS) to the amendment in the nature of a substitute 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.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote, and pending that, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

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

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

It is now in order to consider the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. PAXON).

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

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. HEFLEY). The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

Add at the end the following new title:

TITLE ____—UNION DISCLOSURE

SEC. ____—01. UNION DISCLOSURE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 201(b) of the Labor Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 (29 U.S.C. 431(b)) is amended—

(1) by striking “and” at the end of paragraph (5); and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(7) an itemization of amounts spent by the labor organization for—

“(A) contract negotiation and administration;

“(B) organizing activities;

“(C) strike activities;

“(D) political activities;

“(E) lobbying and promotional activities; and

“(F) market recovery and job targeting programs; and

“(8) all transactions involving a single source or payee for each of the activities described in subparagraphs (A) through (F) of paragraph (7) in which the aggregate cost exceeds \$10,000.”.

(b) COMPUTER NETWORK ACCESS.—Section 201(c) of the Labor Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 (29 U.S.C. 431(c)) is amended by inserting “including availability of such reports via a public Internet site or another publicly accessible computer network” after “its members.”.

(c) REPORTING BY SECRETARY.—Section 205(a) of the Labor Management Reporting

and Disclosure Act of 1959 (29 U.S.C. 435(a)) is amended by inserting after “and the Secretary” the following: “shall make the reports and documents filed pursuant to section 201(b) available via a public Internet site or another public accessible computer network. The Secretary”.

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

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to control the 5 minutes as an opponent.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. PAXON).

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

Mr. Chairman, disclosure is the key to real reform. We have put forth many amendments to do precisely that. Mine this evening focuses on the largest player in American politics, the organized labor bosses. Together in the last cycle they controlled over \$300 million spent on American politics according to Rutgers University. According to a former top official of the Teamsters Union, in fact, that number was over \$400 million. Yet much of the information regarding their expenditure, where it comes from and how it is expended, goes undisclosed.

Currently the Department of Labor requires some limited reporting but it is spotty, it is disorganized, no two unions in fact report the same information in the same way. It is done purposefully, it is done so that the American voter and taxpayer and citizen cannot know how much they are spending.

My amendment does three things simply. First, it amends the LM-2 form submitted by the unions currently with the Department of Labor. Two, it requires functional accounting for uniform categories of spending for the previous year which is not now required. And, number three, of course, it requires the posting on the Internet of all this information.

Mr. Chairman, this is logical. We have a player spending hundreds of millions of dollars. Put it on the Internet. Let the American people see what is being spent, how it is being raised. That is all we are asking. It is called disclosure. How can anybody oppose full disclosure?

As a matter of fact, this Congress has already helped. We appropriated last year half a million dollars to the Department of Labor to set up such a database. This Congress wants to have that information to the American people, and I am certain whether it is union members or the American people, they would love to have it. This amendment just simply allows us to get that information out there.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, let us let the light of day shine on the Amer-

ican political system. Let us put this information out there once and for all. It is an amendment we should all be able to agree on and move forward with.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER).

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Chairman, by the time we are done debating campaign finance, it will probably be the longest debate the House has seen in a long time. Throughout this debate, one particular theme has resounded again and again, disclosure. We take it as self-evident that the American people should be able to know who is spending money to impact elections and to whom they are giving it. For if we have full disclosure, then the voters can take that knowledge with them into the voting box.

However, up to this point the issue of disclosure has focused primarily on campaign spending by special interest groups or corporations. No one has yet tried to stand up and help those workers that provide a substantial amount of their monthly income to the unions that represent them.

That is why I support this amendment. Union members have very limited means to find out how their dues are spent. They just have to hope it is being spent wisely. This amendment would remedy that requirement of unions and require them in an annual disclosure form that they already complete to specify how they spend money on different activities. As dues-paying members, union workers have a right to know how much money their union spent on such functions as contract negotiations or strike activities. This disclosure would empower both those workers currently in unions and those that are considering joining unions.

Let me clear up one misconception. This amendment would not impact those smaller unions. It would only affect those unions with annual receipts over \$200,000.

In the 1996 election cycle, unions used over \$35 million to run issue ads in congressional districts against Republicans; \$35 million. This despite the fact that over 25 percent of union members are Republicans.

How can we give these members and the American people a voice? One answer is disclosure. The American people and even more importantly union members themselves have a right to know how much money the unions are spending on different activities. That is what this amendment will do, allow people as well as union members who are directly impacted by the spending to see how unions are allocating their money and how much they are spending on these political activities. This is good policy and should be a fundamental part of any campaign finance reform. I ask my colleagues to support this amendment.

□ 1930

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, I would point out to the gentleman from Florida, there is not a better way to get

disclosure than to vote for the Shays-Meehan bill, which provides disclosure on issue advocacy.

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

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Paxon amendment. The Paxon amendment is an assault. It is an assault on the rights of working men and women in this country. It says that working men and women will be disenfranchised.

Let me just say this, that union members, in fact, know where and how their money is being spent. They make the decisions as to what is being done. This would require only labor unions to report on political activities, not the big money interests, the special interests, not the multimillion dollar corporations, only labor unions. The fact of the matter is, is that corporations outspent labor unions 11 to 1 in the 1996 election.

If we take a look at today's Washington Post, we will also find out that there was the tobacco industry that provided more subsidized travel than any other industry to the Republican Party. They made their corporate jets available to Republican lawmakers and GOP committees for dozens of flights in the past year.

We want to be equitable in this effort. As my colleague from Massachusetts pointed out, Shays-Meehan, in fact, does deal with disclosure. This is an amendment that discourages American workers from participating in the national political process. It is an effort to cut them off. It silences their voices, leaving decent pay, a safe workplace, secure retirements vulnerable to their opponents. It is the American families who will suffer with the result of this amendment.

Shays-Meehan does not pose such a threat. It protects the voices of America's working men and women. Vote against the Paxon amendment and support Shays-Meehan.

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. FAZIO).

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, I am strongly opposed to this amendment because it does not treat all those who use Treasury funds of any kind equally and equitably under the law. This particular amendment is targeted at the Republican Party's bugaboo, always said to be big labor.

But, in fact, what it really does is try to impose a burdensome and inefficient and difficult system of accounting on one of the many players in the political system in this country, one that, by the way, was outspent by business and corporations 11 to 1 in the last election cycle in 1996.

Shays-Meehan goes after all of the various parts of the political equation in campaign finance reform equitably and evenhandedly. It bans soft money. It goes after those who misuse issue advocacy for political purposes, intrusive purposes in a political campaign. But it

does so in ways that make corporations and unions live under the same law.

There are other improvements in this bill that frankly will be somewhat opposed by people in the labor movement because, for example, internal communications are going to be required to be disclosed in a more timely way. But it also imposes the same requirements on corporate internal communications.

So what we have in the bill that we have been debating is an evenhanded and fair-minded approach. This amendment is an effort to take a shot at a political opponent, and it is offered by one who does not oppose reform in the first place.

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire of the Chair how much time is remaining on each side?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. HEFLEY). The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN) has 1¼ minutes remaining. The gentleman from New York (Mr. PAXON) has 45 seconds remaining.

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL).

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague for yielding to me. I would support the content of my friend from New York's amendment if it was applied to the National Labor Relations Act. But, it is way beyond campaign finance reform. For example, it requires disclosure that I happen to support—how much of a union's money goes to a strike versus how much goes to organizing. I would like to see that part of the law. I would like to see the laborers of this country know where their dues are spent. But it is not campaign finance reform. And, by putting it into this bill, it breaks the coalition that is essential for Shays-Meehan to become the law of this country. I strongly oppose this amendment for that reason. We must be about our business today. Our business is campaign finance reform.

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS).

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, under Meehan-Shays, we require disclosure by both unions and corporations. Current law requires only a very narrow disclosure by unions and corporations of money spent on internal or in-kind activities.

Under current law, unions do not have to disclose money spent on voter registration drives or get-out-the-vote drives aimed at their members, nor do corporations. Under our bill, they would.

Under current law, unions and corporations do not have to disclose money spent on setting up or administering their PACs. Under our bill, they would.

Under current law, unions and corporations do not have to disclose money spent on a communication to their members urging the election or defeat of a candidate. So, for instance, if a union has a two-page ad urging a

vote for a candidate in a 16-page newsletter, it would not have to be disclosed. Under our bill, any communication to members for the purpose of influencing an election would have to be disclosed.

Our bill significantly expands the disclosure requirements on unions and corporations by their internal activities. Further, disclosure under current law is on a quarterly basis; under our bill, it is on a monthly basis, and within 24 hours in the last 20 days of the election on the Internet.

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

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, I appreciate the gentleman from California agreeing with the intent of this measure, to try to bring about full disclosure in the American political system. We think this is the right place. We are debating campaign finance reform. \$300 million to \$400 million spent by the union bosses taken involuntarily from the members' pockets, should that not be part of the disclosure? Of course it should be. Should it not be presented on the Internet so the American people can determine how it is spent? Of course it should be should.

This is the amendment that goes to the heart of campaign finance reform. Anybody who believes in reform has to support this motion. I urge my colleagues to support it. We are going to have a chance to do that in a recorded vote.

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 New York (Mr. PAXON) to the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS).

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

Mr. PAXON. 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 New York (Mr. PAXON) to the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) will be postponed.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. MILLER). It is now in order to consider the amendment by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY).

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Chairman, first of all, I have two amendments at the desk. Amendment No. 33, I am going to give the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) and this body a present by withdrawing that amendment, because I believe the amendment by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS) covered that, so I will withdraw number 33.

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

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer Amendment No. 34 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. HEFLEY to the amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 13 offered by Mr. SHAYS:

Add at the end the following new title:

TITLE—PROHIBITING USE OF AIR FORCE ONE FOR POLITICAL FUNDRAISING

SEC. 01. PROHIBITING USE OF AIR FORCE ONE FOR POLITICAL FUNDRAISING.

Title III of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 431 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“PROHIBITING USE OF AIR FORCE ONE FOR POLITICAL FUNDRAISING

“SEC. 323. (a) In General.—It shall be unlawful for any persons to provide or offer to provide transportation on Air Force One in exchange for any money or other thing of value in support of any political party or the campaign for electoral office of any candidate, without regard to whether or not the money or thing of value involved is otherwise treated as a contribution under this title.

“(b) AIR FORCE ONE DEFINED.—In subsection (a), the term ‘Air Force One’ means the airplane operated by the Air Force which has been specially configured to carry out the mission of transporting the President.”

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

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to claim the 5 minutes in opposition.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) will be recognized for 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY).

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

Mr. Chairman, this amendment, again, I think, is about common sense. It reads: If the President, Vice President, or the head of any executive department uses Air Force One for transportation for any travel which includes a fund-raising event for the benefit of any political committee or party, such political committee shall reimburse the Federal Government for the actual costs incurred as a result of the use of Air Force One.

In plain English, this simply means that if you are going to use Air Force One and part of that is for political purposes, then you pay the cost of it. It is estimated that the cost is about \$36,000 an hour to operate Air Force One.

This amendment will apply to whoever holds the office. So we have had a lot of partisan back and forth here this afternoon or this evening, but this amendment applies to whomever holds

the office regardless of party affiliation. However, the current administration's blatant abuse of this practice compared to past White House occupants gives the Congress strong reason to accept this amendment.

Currently, the amount that is reimbursed to the taxpayers for use of Air Force One is based on a secret formula created by the Clinton Administration and the Democratic National Committee. The formula supposedly calculates what percentage of the trip is for political purposes and what percentage is for official purposes.

This amendment stipulates that any excursion that includes any fund-raising activity must be reimbursed for the entire trip. No formula. No ambiguity. If the President wants to fly to Ohio to pitch his child care initiative, that is fine. He can use Air Force One to do that. But if while he is there he wants to drop by, as he did recently, to raise \$850 thousand in one evening for the DNC, then under this amendment, the DNC would have to reimburse the taxpayers.

This is not a partisan amendment. But I will conclude with some of the figures that signify the amendment is particularly relevant under this administration. Under Presidents Reagan and Bush, reimbursement payments were made a total of 60 times in a 12-year period. Under the Clinton administration, prior to the 1996 election, 145 such payments were made in only 4 years.

I urge adoption of the amendment and reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. FAZIO).

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the author of the amendment if he would explain to me what is different from existing laws. As I understand it, we have always required that every President, going back as far as I can remember, reimburse part of the cost of any trip that involves any kind of political activity while he is on an official trip.

What the gentleman seems to be saying is that any political activity automatically makes the entire trip a political trip, even if there is a great deal of official duty and activity taking place.

Would the gentleman give me some sort of an answer?

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, that is correct. The gentleman understands it exactly.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Reclaiming my time, then, what the gentleman is saying is that the approach that has been the time-honored bipartisan approach which has given both Republican and Democratic Presidents the opportunity and flexibility to include various kinds of activities in their schedule when they travel around the country, would no longer be allowed.

I am sure that the Secret Service and others who worry about the security of

the President would have serious concerns. What this amendment really would purport to do, I believe, is to eliminate the President's ability to be involved in, at any affordable sense, any kind of political activity around the country.

I would assert that maybe in the current environment where the White House is held by a Democrat this would be a very attractive amendment to people on the Republican side of this aisle. But I think people ought to be thinking of the long-term implications of what we are doing here.

I realize that those who do not support Shays-Meehan are simply trying to roll hand grenades here on to the floor to complicate the passage of real campaign finance reform. But in this instance, among others, what we are really doing is something that I think your own party leaders, if the Republicans were to retake the White House, would find totally unworkable and impossible to live with. What I hope my colleagues will do is think long-term and put aside the momentary political advantage.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to yield 1½ minutes to my colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR).

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I have a question. The language in here says that it includes any fund-raising event for the benefit of any political committee of a national political party. If the President was to fly to the gentleman's district to do a campaign event for him, this would not apply because his campaign is not a national political committee?

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I cannot tell him for sure about that.

Mr. FARR of California. Well, that is exactly what it says.

Mr. HEFLEY. I am not arguing with the gentleman. I said I cannot tell him for sure whether that is or not. I assume it might be.

Mr. FARR of California. The other question is why does it only apply to Air Force One? Why does it not apply to Members of Congress?

Mr. HEFLEY. I listened to the gentleman's comments about that on a prior bill, and it seemed to me to be kind of foolish questions in that Congress does not control any airplanes. The administration controls airplanes. Congress does not control airlines.

If the gentleman wants to reclaim his time, I will respond later.

Mr. FARR of California. I would like to reclaim my time. Because the gentleman flies home every weekend on the taxpayers' money, he may be home on the taxpayers' money doing a political campaign event. That is his transportation to his district.

□ 1945

So if the President goes to your district and does a political event, he is

penalized; the payment for all of that is paid for by your amendment. But if you do it on the taxpayer's dime every weekend, you do not have to pay for it. So you are exempting Congress from this. It is a double standard again. It is again bashing the White House, because this bill is about Congressional campaign finance reform, and I do not know whether the gentleman is even intending to vote for the bill.

I think these are dilatory amendments, I think you are exempting Congress, and I think it is wrong.

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

Mr. Chairman, I have a feeling that this amendment will pass because Members do not want to vote against an amendment that sounds good, but I am trying to think that some day we may have someone else in the White House, and I would put myself in that position and say I think this is bad law.

I think it is a politically good amendment. I think it is bad law. I think the President should have to reimburse for the first class passage, but I do not think we want to encourage a President to go commercial. Obviously they cannot. I think it will inhibit the ability of the President to get around and speak as a President chooses to speak.

I am sure this is good politics, but I think this does harm to the bill. I am not suggesting that it is a killer amendment, but I wish it was not being introduced, because I think its intention is simply to make the bill less palatable to Members on either side of the aisle.

The bottom line is, a President of the United States should have the ability to travel around the country, and it is regrettable that they have to have so much communication material, it is regrettable they need to fly on a government plane, but the fact is they do. Like my colleague from California points out, we get sent home and we get to do a lot of things back home for political purposes, and our flight back home is paid for.

So I have tremendous respect for the gentleman who is introducing this amendment, but I do regret that he has introduced it.

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

Mr. Chairman, let me very quickly say in closing in response to the concern of the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR), it is my understanding that we can rent government cars, we can lease government cars as Members of Congress for official business. I did that at one time. I have not done it in years. At one time I did that. It was also my understanding when I did that that I could not go to Salida, Colorado, and hold town meetings in the morning in that government car, and then in the evening hold a fund-raiser for my campaign. I am still in the government car, and I could not reimburse the government for the percentage of time for that government car. I do not know whether that rule has changed or not.

But if you cannot do that with a government car, but you can do it with Air Force One, I think the double standard that you keep referring to here is in application today. I think this would help in that double standard.

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 Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY) to the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS).

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

Mr. HEFLEY. 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 Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY) 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 the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Kentucky (Mrs. NORTHUP).

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

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

TITLE—PROHIBITING USE OF WALKING AROUND MONEY
SEC. .01. PROHIBITING CAMPAIGNS FROM PROVIDING CURRENCY TO INDIVIDUALS FOR PURPOSES OF ENCOURAGING TURNOUT ON DATE OF ELECTION.

Title III of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 431 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“PROHIBITING USE OF CURRENCY TO PROMOTE ELECTION DAY TURNOUT

“SEC. 323. It shall be unlawful for any political committee to provide currency to any person for purposes of carrying out activities on the date of an election to encourage or assist individuals to appear at the polling place for election.”.

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

Is there a Member seeking to control the time in opposition?

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN) will be recognized for 5 minutes in opposition.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Kentucky (Mrs. NORTHUP).

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

Mr. Chairman, I have opposed the Shays-Meehan bill for a couple of reasons. First of all, I believe that it chills free speech, that it has the effect of trying to keep people who want to influence public policy from having their voice heard.

Furthermore, I feel that it has the effect of encouraging people to have their voice heard in elections by contributing to organizations that are, in a sense, “blind organizations,” organizations that the public will not know who they are, what they stand for, who contributes, or how much, and that that is a worse campaign finance system than what we have.

I do not believe you can call this reform; I just believe you can call it change. In my opinion, it is a worse change, a change for the worse.

However, if we are going to do anything in changing campaign finance, we ought to close the abuses that exist today, that are widespread and blatantly wrong, and that is the ability to spend cash, what is commonly referred to as “walking-around money,” that is used for vote buying. This is done in many different parts of the country, and it is done with the use of cash.

All my amendment would do would be to require that any money used for getting out the vote, that it be done in the form of a check, so that it would be visible and we would know to whom the money was paid.

Obviously we all believe that if somebody is going to drive a van for the day and go down to the local nursing home in order to provide transportation to the polls, that that is a good thing to do and that would be a good expenditure of campaign funds. This is just to make sure that people cannot get the money in unrecorded amounts and to unrecorded people.

It is part of the premise of this bill that we would have visibility, that the voters, that the public, that the people in this country would have visibility about who is spending money on campaigns and how they are spending it. So I would be surprised to find anybody that supports Shays-Meehan opposed to disclosure of this kind.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I wish that the authors of amendments who get up to say they are against Shays-Meehan would find another vehicle to drag down debate. We have been debating this bill for quite some time now, and the author of the amendment says that she is against it, but here is an amendment anyways.

This could be an amendment that we could all agree upon. I would ask the gentlewoman if somebody is working on a get-out-the-vote effort and wants to buy coffee for people at a polling station, and, let us say, the coffee stand will not accept a check, how does one get around those types of expenditures, small disbursements like that?

The gentlewoman may know that under the FEC law now, there are certain amounts of money, under \$200, that are made available. It is required under the FEC that receipts get kept, and clearly they should be kept. But what does one do about that election day activity, with voter apathy and voter turnout going down dramatically, about these type of efforts to get people out to vote? Could the gentlewoman's amendment in some way accommodate these types of efforts?

Mrs. NORTHUP. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEEHAN. I yield to the gentlewoman from Kentucky.

Mrs. NORTHUP. Mr. Chairman, I am surprised to hear the gentleman asking that and asking if one could buy donuts. Actually in Kentucky, where we have a more similar bill to Shays-Meehan than anywhere else, you cannot buy donuts.

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I am not asking the gentlewoman whether or not one can buy donuts. I am asking whether or not under the gentlewoman's amendment, would one be able in any way to get cash, if cash was required to go buy a cup of coffee or donuts for poll workers? I am not asking whether one can buy donuts. Let us keep it professional.

Mrs. NORTHUP. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, whoever uses the money has to be given the money in the form of a check, so that if you are going to haul voters, for example, a check would be written to you. You could then not give voters or anybody else cash. Obviously if you wanted to fill up your van with gas, you could turn that in as an expense and the campaign can reimburse you.

This is just to make sure that you cannot have what goes on, like \$300 cash to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN), and then the gentleman gives out \$50, \$25, \$10, \$5, and it does not have to be recorded. The end receiver of the money is not on record.

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, so when a campaign worker goes out and is trying to get people to go to the polls, the campaign or the party would give a check and the person would go, presumably, to a bank to cash the check. What if somebody did not have a bank account? Just so I am clear. We could support the amendment, but if somebody did not have a bank account or checking account, what would they do?

Mrs. NORTHUP. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, they would cash it wherever they cashed any other check. If they have a welfare check, they have to cash it somewhere. If they have a paycheck, they have to cash it somewhere. They can get a money order. You can give them a money order. That is legal. All you could not do is give a check to somebody and have them then pay cash around to unrecorded people.

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, would the gentle-

woman have a de minimis amount of money that would be acceptable for donuts or something like that? Is there some amount there where we could reach an agreement? The amendment sounds like a good idea.

Mrs. NORTHUP. Mr. Chairman, it says specifically here that anything that encourages or assists individuals to appear at the polling place is not forbidden. All you could not do is give somebody cash. In other words, on the campaign form the final receiver of money is written there, because it has to be given to them by money order, check, whatever.

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, this sounds like an amendment that we could support. But these amendments, sometimes we need to go through the process to make sure. We have a situation where voter turnout in this country is an embarrassment, and I would not want to see us support any kind of an effort that would try to reduce activity at polling places, getting people to the polls.

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

Mr. Chairman, I understand the concern of the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN) and I appreciate the gentleman rethinking or willing to reevaluate this. I want to assure the gentleman and the other supporters of the bill that we were very careful to draft this in every way possible so that there would not be any dampening effect on encouraging people to vote; only in making sure that there is not cash out on the street floating around that can be exchanged for votes. That is what we are trying to get to.

We think that the easiest way to try to address that is to make sure that anybody that receives money would have to be paid and recorded on the campaign files.

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. NORTHUP. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, I like what the gentlewoman just said, but I do not think that is what the language put in here says. It says "provide currency to any person for purposes of carrying out activities on the date of an election to encourage or assist individuals to appear at the polling place for an election."

I think what the gentlewoman said is to give money directly to anybody to go to a polling place, but this is any activities.

Mrs. NORTHUP. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, it is currency. You cannot provide currency. I think the gentleman is missing that word. It does not say you cannot provide donuts. You cannot provide currency.

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, if the gentlewoman will yield further, it says "for carrying out activities on the date of the election." Is not "activities" broader than just going to the polls, driving somebody? I am try-

ing to think of the League of Women Voters issues. We are trying to get people to the polls. Those are activities. All of that is related to the election day.

Mrs. NORTHUP. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, but you can provide a check to somebody that is driving somebody. You can provide a check to somebody to buy donuts. You can give a check to somebody to buy gas. What you cannot do is give somebody \$200.

□ 2000

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, I agree with that. Why does not the gentlewoman just say that?

Mrs. NORTHUP. Mr. Chairman, it says that. "One cannot provide currency."

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS).

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I reluctantly oppose this amendment, and I am surprised that the gentlewoman from Kentucky who talks about rules and regulations has come up with the biggest rule and regulation. We are basically saying that everything would have to be in a check.

Not everybody in my district has a checking account. Some people drive to the polls, they have money, they take it and they go to the gas station and give money to the gas station attendant.

This has, I think, serious unintended consequences. It probably is going to pass because it has a good name to it, but it really is regulation beyond my comprehension, and I think a bit foolish.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Kentucky (Mrs. NORTHUP) to the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS).

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

Mrs. NORTHUP. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 442, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Kentucky will be postponed.

SEQUENTIAL VOTES POSTPONED IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 442, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed in the following order: amendment offered Mr. WICKER of Mississippi; amendment offered by Mr. STEARNS of Florida; amendment, as modified, offered by Mr. PICKERING of Mississippi; amendment offered by Mr. DELAY of Texas; amendment offered by Mr. MCINNIS of Colorado; amendment offered by Mr. PAXON of New York; amendment offered by Mr. HEFLEY of Colorado; amendment offered by Mrs. NORTHUP of Kentucky.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 59 OFFERED BY MR. WICKER TO THE AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. SHAYS

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the Amendment No. 59 offered by the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) to the amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 13 offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 59 offered by Mr. WICKER to the amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 13 offered by Mr. SHAYS: Add at the end the following new title:

TITLE—PROHIBITING USE OF WHITE HOUSE MEANS AND ACCOMMODATIONS FOR POLITICAL FUNDRAISING

SEC. 01. PROHIBITING USE OF WHITE HOUSE MEALS AND ACCOMMODATIONS FOR POLITICAL FUNDRAISING

(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 29 of title 18 United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“§612. Prohibiting use of meals and accommodations at White House for political fundraising.

“(a) It shall be unlawful for any person to provide or offer to provide any means of accommodations at the White House in exchange for any money or other thing of value, or as a reward for the provision of any money or other thing of value, in support of any political party or the campaign for electoral office of any candidate.

“(b) Any person who violates this section shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than three years, or both.

“(c) For purposes of this section, any official residence or retreat of the President (including private residential areas and the grounds of such a residence or retreat) shall be treated as part of the White House.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 29 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“612. Prohibiting use of meals and accommodations at White House or political fundraising.”.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 391, noes 4, not voting 39, as follows:

[Roll No. 301]

AYES—391

Abercrombie	Barton	Bonior
Aderholt	Bass	Bono
Allen	Bateman	Borski
Andrews	Becerra	Boswell
Archer	Bentsen	Boucher
Armey	Bereuter	Boyd
Bachus	Berry	Brady (PA)
Baesler	Bilbray	Brady (TX)
Baldacci	Bishop	Brown (CA)
Ballenger	Bliley	Brown (FL)
Barcia	Blumenauer	Brown (OH)
Barr	Blunt	Bryant
Barrett (NE)	Boehlert	Bunning
Barrett (WI)	Boehner	Burr
Bartlett	Bonilla	Burton

Buyer	Gutknecht	Miller (CA)
Callahan	Hall (OH)	Miller (FL)
Calvert	Hall (TX)	Minge
Camp	Hamilton	Mink
Campbell	Hansen	Mollohan
Canady	Harman	Moran (KS)
Cannon	Hastert	Moran (VA)
Capps	Hastings (WA)	Morella
Cardin	Hayworth	Myrick
Carson	Hefley	Nadler
Castle	Herger	Neal
Chabot	Hill	Nethercutt
Chambliss	Hilleary	Neumann
Chenoweth	Hinchey	Ney
Christensen	Hinojosa	Northup
Clay	Hobson	Nussle
Clayton	Hoekstra	Oberstar
Clement	Holden	Obey
Clyburn	Hooley	Olver
Coburn	Horn	Owens
Collins	Hostettler	Oxley
Combest	Houghton	Packard
Condit	Hoyer	Pallone
Conyers	Hulshof	Pappas
Cook	Hunter	Parker
Cooksey	Hutchinson	Pascrell
Costello	Hyde	Pastor
Cox	Inglis	Paul
Coyne	Istook	Paxon
Cramer	Jackson (IL)	Payne
Crane	Jackson-Lee	Pease
Crapo	(TX)	Pelosi
Cubin	Jenkins	Peterson (MN)
Cummings	Johnson (CT)	Peterson (PA)
Cunningham	Johnson (WI)	Petri
Davis (FL)	Jones	Pickett
Davis (IL)	Kaptur	Pitts
Davis (VA)	Kasich	Pombo
Deal	Kelly	Pomeroy
DeFazio	Kennedy (MA)	Porter
DeGette	Kennedy (RI)	Portman
DeLauro	Kennelly	Price (NC)
DeLay	Kildee	Pryce (OH)
Deutsch	Kilpatrick	Quinn
Diaz-Balart	Kim	Radanovich
Dickey	Kind (WI)	Rahall
Dicks	King (NY)	Ramstad
Dingell	Kingston	Rangel
Doggett	Klink	Redmond
Dooley	Klug	Regula
Doollittle	Knollenberg	Reyes
Doyle	Kolbe	Riley
Dreier	Kucinich	Rivers
Duncan	LaFalce	Rodriguez
Dunn	LaHood	Roemer
Edwards	Lampson	Rogan
Ehlers	Lantos	Rogers
Emerson	Largent	Rohrabacher
Engel	Latham	Ros-Lehtinen
English	LaTourette	Rothman
Ensign	Lazio	Roukema
Eshoo	Leach	Royce
Etheridge	Lee	Rush
Evans	Levin	Ryun
Everett	Lewis (CA)	Sabo
Ewing	Lewis (KY)	Salmon
Farr	Linder	Sanchez
Fattah	Livingston	Sanders
Fawell	LoBiondo	Sandlin
Fazio	Lofgren	Sanford
Filner	Lowey	Sawyer
Foley	Lucas	Saxton
Forbes	Luther	Scarborough
Fossella	Maloney (CT)	Schaefer, Dan
Fowler	Manton	Schaffer, Bob
Fox	Manzullo	Schumer
Frank (MA)	Markay	Scott
Franks (NJ)	Mascara	Sensenbrenner
Frelinghuysen	Matsui	Serrano
Furse	McCarthy (MO)	Sessions
Gallegly	McCarthy (NY)	Shadegg
Ganske	McCollum	Shaw
Gedjenson	McCrery	Shays
Gekas	McDermott	Sherman
Gibbons	McGovern	Shimkus
Gilchrest	McHale	Shuster
Gillmor	McHugh	Sisisky
Gilman	McInnis	Skaggs
Goode	McIntosh	Skeen
Goodlatte	McIntyre	Skelton
Goodling	McKeon	Slaughter
Gordon	McKinney	Smith (MI)
Goss	McNulty	Smith (NJ)
Graham	Meehan	Smith (OR)
Granger	Meek (FL)	Smith (TX)
Green	Meeks (NY)	Smith, Adam
Greenwood	Menendez	Smith, Linda
Gutierrez	Metcalf	Snowbarger
	Mica	Snyder

Solomon	Taylor (NC)	Watts (OK)
Souder	Thomas	Waxman
Spence	Thornberry	Weldon (FL)
Spratt	Thune	Weldon (PA)
Stabenow	Thurman	Weller
Stark	Tiahrt	Weygand
Stearns	Tierney	White
Stenholm	Turner	Whitfield
Strickland	Upton	Wicker
Stump	Velazquez	Wilson
Stupak	Vento	Wise
Sununu	Visclosky	Wolf
Talent	Walsh	Woolsey
Tanner	Wamp	Wynn
Tauscher	Waters	Young (AK)
Tauzin	Watkins	Young (FL)
Taylor (MS)	Watt (NC)	

NOES—4

Hastings (FL)	Murtha
Kanjorski	Wexler

NOT VOTING—39

Ackerman	Hilliard	Norwood
Baker	Jefferson	Ortiz
Berman	John	Pickering
Bilirakis	Johnson, E. B.	Poshard
Blagojevich	Johnson, Sam	Riggs
Coble	Klecza	Roybal-Allard
Danner	Lewis (GA)	Stokes
Dixon	Lipinski	Thompson
Ehrlich	Maloney (NY)	Torres
Ford	Martinez	Towns
Frost	McDade	Trafficant
Gephardt	Millender-	Yates
Gonzalez	McDonald	
Hefner	Moakley	

□ 2022

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois and Mr. BASS changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, during roll call vote number 301 on the Wicker Amendment I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted yes.

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. BARR of Georgia). The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote 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) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STEARNS to the amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 13 offered by Mr. SHAYS: Amend section 506 to read as follows (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

SEC. 506. BAN ON CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS BY NONCITIZENS.

Section 319 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 441e) is amended to read as follows:

“CONTRIBUTIONS AND DONATIONS BY NONCITIZENS

“SEC. 319. (a) PROHIBITION.—It shall be unlawful for—

“(1) a noncitizen, directly or indirectly, to make—

“(A) a donation of money or other thing of value, or to promise expressly or impliedly to make a donation, in connection with a Federal, State, or local election to a political committee or a candidate for Federal office, or

“(B) a contribution or donation to a committee of a political party; or

“(2) a person to solicit, accept, or receive a contribution or donation described in paragraph (1) from a noncitizen.

“(b) TREATMENT OF NATIONALS OF THE UNITED STATES.—For purposes of subsection (a), a ‘noncitizen’ of the United States does not include a national of the United States (as defined in section 101(a)(22) of the Immigration and Nationality Act).”.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 267, noes 131, not voting 36, as follows:

[Roll No. 302]

AYES—267

Aderholt	Emerson	Klecza
Archer	English	Klink
Armey	Etheridge	Klug
Bachus	Evans	Knollenberg
Baesler	Everett	Kolbe
Baldacci	Ewing	Kucinich
Ballenger	Fawell	LaHood
Barcia	Foley	Lantos
Barr	Forbes	Largent
Barrett (NE)	Fossella	Latham
Bartlett	Fowler	LaTourette
Barton	Fox	Lazio
Bass	Franks (NJ)	Leach
Bateman	Frelinghuysen	Levin
Bereuter	Galleghy	Lewis (KY)
Berry	Ganske	Linder
Bliley	Gejdenson	Livingston
Blunt	Gekas	LoBiondo
Boehner	Gibbons	Lucas
Bonilla	Gilchrest	Luther
Bono	Gillmor	Maloney (CT)
Boswell	Gilman	Manzullo
Boucher	Goode	Markley
Boyd	Goodlatte	Mascara
Brady (TX)	Goodling	McCollum
Brown (OH)	Gordon	McCrery
Bryant	Goss	McHugh
Bunning	Graham	McInnis
Burr	Granger	McIntosh
Burton	Greenwood	McIntyre
Buyer	Gutknecht	McKeon
Callahan	Hamilton	Metcalf
Calvert	Hansen	Mica
Camp	Harman	Miller (FL)
Canady	Hastert	Moran (KS)
Cannon	Hastings (WA)	Myrick
Capps	Hayworth	Nethercutt
Castle	Hefley	Neumann
Chabot	Herger	Ney
Chambliss	Hill	Northup
Christensen	Hilleary	Nussle
Clement	Hinchey	Obey
Coburn	Hobson	Oxley
Collins	Hoekstra	Packard
Combust	Holden	Pappas
Cook	Hoolley	Parker
Cooksey	Horn	Paxon
Costello	Hostettler	Pease
Cox	Hulshof	Peterson (MN)
Coyne	Hunter	Peterson (PA)
Cramer	Hutchinson	Petri
Crane	Hyde	Pickett
Cubin	Inglis	Pitts
Cunningham	Istook	Pomeroy
Davis (VA)	Jenkins	Portman
Deal	Johnson (WI)	Price (NC)
DeFazio	Johnson, Sam	Pryce (OH)
DeLauro	Jones	Quinn
Deutsch	Kaptur	Radanovich
Dickey	Kasich	Rahall
Dooley	Kelly	Ramstad
Doyle	Kennedy (MA)	Redmond
Dreier	Kennelly	Regula
Duncan	Kildee	Riley
Dunn	Kim	Roemer
Ehlers	Kingston	Rogan

Rogers
Rohrabacher
Rothman
Roukema
Royce
Rush
Ryun
Sanders
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Scarborough
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Schumer
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadeegg
Shaw
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Sisisky

Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Adam
Smith, Linda
Snowbarger
Snyder
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stearns
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin

Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Turner
Upton
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—131

Abercrombie
Allen
Andrews
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Bentsen
Berman
Bilbray
Bishop
Blumenauer
Boehlert
Bonior
Borski
Brady (PA)
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Campbell
Cardin
Carson
Chenoweth
Clay
Clayton
Clyburn
Condit
Conyers
Crapo
Cummings
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doolittle
Edwards
Engel
Ensign
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Fazio

Filner
Frank (MA)
Furse
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hastings (FL)
Hinojosa
Houghton
Hoyer
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Kanjorski
Kennedy (RI)
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
LaFalce
Lampson
Lee
Lewis (CA)
Lofgren
Lowey
Manton
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McGovern
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Miller (CA)
Minge
Mink
Mollohan

Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Oliver
Owens
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pelosi
Pombo
Porter
Rangel
Reyes
Rivers
Rodriguez
Ros-Lehtinen
Sabo
Salmon
Sanchez
Scott
Serrano
Shays
Skaggs
Smith (MI)
Stark
Stenholm
Talent
Thornberry
Tierney
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Wexler
Weygand
Woolsey
Wynn

NOT VOTING—36

Ackerman
Baker
Bilirakis
Blagojevich
Coble
Danner
Dixon
Ehrlich
Ford
Frost
Gephardt
Gonzalez
Hefner

Hilliard
Jefferson
John
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Maloney (NY)
Martinez
McDade
Millender-
McDonald
Moakley
Norwood
Ortiz

Pickering
Poshard
Riggs
Roybal-Allard
Saxton
Stokes
Thompson
Torres
Towns
Traficant
Yates

□ 2032

Mr. PORTER and Mr. HOUGHTON changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”
Mr. SANFORD changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. PICKERING. Mr. Chairman, on roll calls nos. 301 and 302, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yes.”

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PICKERING, AS MODIFIED, TO THE AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. SHAYS

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. BARR of Georgia). The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment, as modified, offered by the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. PICKERING) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 344, noes 56, not voting 34, as follows:

[Roll No. 303]

AYES—344

Abercrombie	Clayton	Gejdenson
Aderholt	Clement	Gekas
Allen	Coburn	Gibbons
Andrews	Collins	Gilchrest
Archer	Combust	Gillmor
Armey	Condit	Gilman
Bachus	Cook	Goode
Baesler	Cooksey	Goodlatte
Baldacci	Costello	Goodling
Ballenger	Cox	Gordon
Barcia	Coyne	Goss
Barr	Cramer	Graham
Barrett (NE)	Crane	Granger
Barrett (WI)	Crapo	Green
Bartlett	Cubin	Greenwood
Barton	Cummings	Gutknecht
Bass	Cunningham	Hall (OH)
Bateman	Davis (FL)	Hall (TX)
Bentsen	Davis (IL)	Hamilton
Bereuter	Deal	Hansen
Berman	DeFazio	Harman
Berry	DeGette	Hastert
Bilbray	Delahunt	Hastings (WA)
Bishop	DeLauro	Hayworth
Bliley	DeLay	Hefley
Blumenauer	Deutsch	Herger
Boehlert	Dickey	Hill
Boehner	Dicks	Hilleary
Bonilla	Dingell	Hinchey
Bonior	Doggett	Hinojosa
Bono	Dooley	Hobson
Borski	Doyle	Hoekstra
Boswell	Dreier	Holden
Boucher	Duncan	Hoolley
Boyd	Dunn	Horn
Brady (PA)	Edwards	Hostettler
Brady (TX)	Ehlers	Houghton
Brown (CA)	Emerson	Hoyer
Brown (OH)	English	Hulshof
Bryant	Eshoo	Hunter
Bunning	Etheridge	Hutchinson
Burr	Evans	Hyde
Burton	Everett	Inglis
Callahan	Ewing	Istook
Calvert	Fattah	Jenkins
Camp	Fawell	Johnson (CT)
Campbell	Filner	Johnson (WI)
Canady	Foley	Johnson, Sam
Cannon	Forbes	Jones
Capps	Fossella	Kaptur
Cardin	Fowler	Kasich
Castle	Fox	Kelly
Chabot	Franks (NJ)	Kennedy (MA)
Chambliss	Frelinghuysen	Kennelly
Chenoweth	Furse	Kildee
Christensen	Galleghy	Kim
Clay	Ganske	Kind (WI)

□ 2041

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. BARR of Georgia). The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 360, noes 36, not voting 38, as follows:

[Roll No. 304]

AYES—360

Kingston
Klecza
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lowey
Lucas
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Manton
Manzullo
Markey
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McGovern
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Minge
Moran (KS)
Morella
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Northup
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Owens

NOES—56

Becerra
Blunt
Brown (FL)
Buyer
Carson
Clyburn
Conyers
Davis (VA)
Diaz-Balart
Doolittle
Engel
Ensign
Farr
Fazio
Frank (MA)
Gutierrez
Hastings (FL)
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)

NOT VOTING—34

Ackerman
Baker
Bilirakis
Blagojevich
Coble
Danner
Dixon
Ehrlich
Ford
Frost
Gephardt
Gonzalez

Shuster
Sisisky
Skeen
Skeltan
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Adam
Smith, Linda
Snowbarger
Snyder
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Talent
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Turner
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Weygand
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Young (FL)

Neal
Paul
Payne
Pombo
Radanovich
Ros-Lehtinen
Sabo
Sanchez
Scott
Skaggs
Stark
Waters
Weldon (FL)
Wexler
Wilson
Wynn
Young (AK)

Norwood
Ortiz
Poshard
Riggs
Roybal-Allard
Stokes
Thompson
Torres
Towns
Traficant
Yates

Abercrombie
Aderholt
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Berry
Bilbray
Bishop
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (TX)
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen

Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Emerson
English
Ensign
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Filner
Foley
Forbes
Fossella
Fowler
Fox
Frank (MA)

Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kim
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Klecza
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Manton
Manzullo
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McGovern
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Minge
Moran (KS)
Morella
Myrick
Neal

Allen
Becerra
Borski
Brady (PA)
Clay
Conyers
Engel
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Furse
Hastings (FL)

Ackerman
Baker
Bilirakis
Blagojevich
Coble
Danner
Dixon
Ehrlich
Ford
Frost
Gephardt
Gonzalez
Hefner

Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Northup
Nussle
Oberstar
Olver
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pappas
Parker
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Paxon
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Rangel
Redmond
Regula
Reyes
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Royce
Rush
Ryun
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Schumer
Sensenbrenner
Serrano

NOES—36

Jackson-Lee (TX)
Kanjorski
Kucinich
Lee
McDermott
Meek (FL)
Miller (CA)
Mink
Mollohan
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler

NOT VOTING—38

Hilliard
Jefferson
John
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Martinez
McDade
Meehan
Millender-Donald
Moakley

□ 2048

Mr. MORAN of Virginia changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

Abercrombie	Allen	Bachus
Aderholt	Andrews	Baessler

□ 2104

Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. BARR of Georgia). The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY) to the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 222, noes 177, not voting 35, as follows:

[Roll No. 307]

AYES—222

Baldacci	Gutknecht	Obey
Barcia	Hall (OH)	Olver
Barrett (NE)	Hall (TX)	Owens
Barrett (WI)	Hamilton	Pallone
Bass	Harman	Pappas
Becerra	Hastings (FL)	Pascrell
Bentsen	Hinche	Pastor
Bereuter	Hinojosa	Paul
Berman	Hobson	Payne
Berry	Holden	Pease
Bilbray	Hooley	Pelosi
Bishop	Horn	Peterson (MN)
Blumenauer	Houghton	Petri
Blunt	Hoyer	Pickett
Boehlert	Hunter	Pomeroy
Bonior	Hutchinson	Porter
Borski	Hyde	Price (NC)
Boswell	Jackson (IL)	Quinn
Boucher	Jackson-Lee	Rahall
Boyd	(TX)	Ramstad
Brady (PA)	Johnson (CT)	Rangel
Brown (CA)	Johnson (WI)	Redmond
Brown (FL)	Johnson, E. B.	Regula
Brown (OH)	Kanjorski	Reyes
Campbell	Kaptur	Rivers
Capps	Kelly	Rodriguez
Cardin	Kennedy (MA)	Roemer
Carson	Kennedy (RI)	Ros-Lehtinen
Castle	Kildee	Rothman
Clay	Kilpatrick	Roukema
Clayton	Kim	Rush
Clement	Kind (WI)	Sabo
Clyburn	King (NY)	Sanchez
Coburn	Klecza	Sanders
Condit	Klink	Sandlin
Conyers	Kucinich	Sanford
Costello	LaFalce	Sawyer
Coyne	LaHood	Saxton
Cramer	Lampson	Schumer
Cummings	Lantos	Scott
Davis (FL)	LaTourette	Serrano
Davis (IL)	Lazio	Shays
DeFazio	Leach	Sherman
DeGette	Lee	Shimkus
Delahunt	Levin	Sisisky
DeLauro	LoBiondo	Skaggs
Deutsch	Lofgren	Skelton
Diaz-Balart	Lowe	Slaughter
Dicks	Luther	Smith (MI)
Dingell	Maloney (CT)	Smith (NJ)
Doggett	Manton	Smith, Adam
Dooley	Mascara	Snyder
Doyle	Matsui	Spratt
Edwards	McCarthy (MO)	Stabenow
Ehlers	McCarthy (NY)	Stark
Engel	McCrery	Stenholm
English	McDermott	Strickland
Ensign	McGovern	Stupak
Eshoo	McHale	Tanner
Etheridge	McHugh	Tauscher
Evans	McIntyre	Thurman
Farr	McKinney	Tierney
Fattah	McNulty	Turner
Fazio	Meehan	Velazquez
Filner	Meek (FL)	Vento
Foley	Meeks (NY)	Visclosky
Forbes	Menendez	Walsh
Fox	Metcalf	Wamp
Frank (MA)	Miller (CA)	Waters
Franks (NJ)	Minge	Watt (NC)
Frelinghuysen	Mink	Waxman
Furse	Mollohan	Weldon (PA)
Gallely	Moran (KS)	Weller
Ganske	Moran (VA)	Wexler
Gejdenson	Morella	Weygand
Gillmor	Murtha	White
Gilman	Nadler	Wilson
Gordon	Neal	Wise
Green	Neumann	Woolsey
Greenwood	Ney	Wynn
Gutierrez	Oberstar	

NOT VOTING—36

Ackerman	Hilliard	Norwood
Baker	Jefferson	Ortiz
Bilirakis	John	Poshard
Blagojevich	Kennelly	Riggs
Coble	Lewis (GA)	Roybal-Allard
Danner	Lipinski	Stokes
Dixon	Maloney (NY)	Thompson
Ehrlich	Markey	Torres
Ford	Martinez	Towns
Frost	McDade	Trafficant
Gephardt	Millender-	Yates
Gonzalez	McDonald	
Hefner	Moakley	

Petri	Schaefer, Dan	Stump
Pickering	Schaffer, Bob	Sununu
Pickett	Schumer	Tanner
Pitts	Sensenbrenner	Tauzin
Pombo	Sessions	Taylor (MS)
Price (NC)	Shadeegg	Taylor (NC)
Pryce (OH)	Shaw	Thomas
Quinn	Shimkus	Thune
Radanovich	Shuster	Thurman
Ramstad	Sisisky	Tiahrt
Redmond	Skeen	Turner
Riley	Smith (MI)	Upton
Rogan	Smith (NJ)	Walsh
Rogers	Smith (OR)	Wamp
Rohrabacher	Smith (TX)	Watkins
Ros-Lehtinen	Smith, Linda	Weldon (PA)
Rothman	Snowbarger	Weller
Roukema	Solomon	White
Royce	Souder	Whitfield
Ryun	Spence	Wicker
Salmon	Stabenow	Wilson
Sanford	Stearns	Wolf
Saxton	Stenholm	Young (AK)
Scarborough	Strickland	Young (FL)

NOES—177

Abercrombie	Ganske	Murtha
Allen	Gillmor	Nadler
Andrews	Gilman	Neal
Bachus	Gordon	Oberstar
Baessler	Granger	Obey
Baldacci	Gutierrez	Olver
Barcia	Hamilton	Owens
Barrett (WI)	Harman	Pallone
Barton	Hastings (FL)	Pascrell
Becerra	Hinojosa	Pastor
Bentsen	Holden	Payne
Berman	Hooley	Pelosi
Bliley	Houghton	Peterson (MN)
Blumenauer	Hoyer	Pomeroy
Boehlert	Jackson (IL)	Porter
Bonilla	Jackson-Lee	Portman
Bonior	(TX)	Rahall
Borski	Johnson (CT)	Rangel
Boswell	Johnson (WI)	Regula
Boucher	Johnson, E. B.	Reyes
Boyd	Johnson, Sam	Rivers
Brady (PA)	Kanjorski	Rodriguez
Brown (CA)	Kennedy (MA)	Roemer
Brown (FL)	Kennedy (RI)	Rush
Brown (OH)	Kilpatrick	Sabo
Capps	Kim	Sanchez
Cardin	Kind (WI)	Sanders
Carson	King (NY)	Sandlin
Castle	Klink	Sawyer
Clay	Kucinich	Scott
Clayton	LaFalce	Serrano
Clyburn	Lantos	Shays
Condit	Latham	Sherman
Conyers	Leach	Skaggs
Cummings	Lee	Skelton
Davis (FL)	Levin	Slaughter
Davis (IL)	Lewis (CA)	Smith, Adam
DeFazio	Lofgren	Snyder
DeGette	Lowe	Spratt
Delahunt	Luther	Stark
DeLauro	Maloney (CT)	Stupak
Deutsch	Maloney (NY)	Talent
Dicks	Manton	Tauscher
Dingell	Matsui	Thornberry
Doggett	McCarthy (MO)	Tierney
Dooley	McCarthy (NY)	Velazquez
Doolittle	McDermott	Vento
Doyle	McGovern	Visclosky
Edwards	McHale	Waters
Engel	McIntosh	Watt (NC)
Ensign	McNulty	Watts (OK)
Eshoo	Meehan	Waxman
Evans	Meek (FL)	Weldon (FL)
Farr	Meeks (NY)	Wexler
Fattah	Menendez	Weygand
Fazio	Miller (CA)	Wise
Filner	Minge	Woolsey
Forbes	Mink	Wynn
Frank (MA)	Mollohan	
Furse	Moran (VA)	

NOT VOTING—35

Ackerman	Gephardt	Martinez
Baker	Gonzalez	McDade
Bilirakis	Hefner	Millender-
Blagojevich	Hilliard	McDonald
Coble	Jefferson	Moakley
Danner	John	Norwood
Dixon	Kennelly	Ortiz
Ehrlich	Lewis (GA)	Poshard
Ford	Lipinski	Riggs
Frost	Markey	Roybal-Allard

Stokes
ThompsonTorres
TownsTraficant
YatesLazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lucas
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Mascara
McCollum
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
Mica
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Minge
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Northup
Nussle
Obey
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pappas
Parker
Pascrell
Paul
Paxon
Pease
Peterson (MN)Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Redmond
Regula
Riley
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Royce
Ryun
Sabo
Salmon
Sanders
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Schumer
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Sisisky
Skeen
Skeltton
Smith (MI)Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Adam
Smith, Linda
Snowbarger
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Talent
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Turner
Upton
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Weygand
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)Riggs
Roybal-Allard
StokesThompson
Towns
Traficant

Yates

□ 2112

Messrs. ENSIGN, KLINK, and DOYLE changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Kentucky (Mrs. NORTHUP) to the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 284, noes 114, not voting 36, as follows:

[Roll No. 308]

AYES—284

Aderholt	Costello	Goss
Archer	Cox	Graham
Armey	Coyne	Granger
Bachus	Cramer	Green
Baesler	Crane	Greenwood
Baldacci	Crapo	Gutknecht
Ballenger	Cubin	Hall (TX)
Barcia	Cunningham	Hamilton
Barr	Davis (VA)	Hansen
Barrett (NE)	Deal	Harman
Barrett (WI)	DeFazio	Hastert
Bartlett	DeGette	Hastings (WA)
Barton	DeLauro	Hayworth
Bass	DeLay	Hefley
Bateman	Deutsch	Herger
Bereuter	Diaz-Balart	Hill
Berry	Dickey	Hilleary
Bilbray	Dicks	Hobson
Bishop	Doolittle	Hoekstra
Bliley	Dreier	Hooley
Blumenauer	Duncan	Horn
Blunt	Dunn	Hostettler
Boehner	Ehlers	Houghton
Bonilla	Emerson	Hulshof
Bono	English	Hunter
Boswell	Ensign	Hutchinson
Boucher	Etheridge	Hyde
Brady (TX)	Everett	Inglis
Bryant	Ewing	Istook
Bunning	Fawell	Jenkins
Burr	Foley	Johnson (CT)
Burton	Forbes	Johnson (WI)
Buyer	Fossella	Johnson, Sam
Callahan	Fowler	Jones
Calvert	Fox	Kasich
Camp	Franks (NJ)	Kelly
Campbell	Frelinghuysen	Kildee
Canady	Gallely	Kim
Cannon	Ganske	Kind (WI)
Castle	Gejdenson	Kingston
Chabot	Gekas	Klecza
Chambliss	Gibbons	Klug
Chenoweth	Gilchrest	Knollenberg
Christensen	Gillmor	Kolbe
Collins	Gilman	LaHood
Combest	Goode	Lampson
Condit	Goodlatte	Largent
Cook	Goodling	Latham
Cooksey	Gordon	LaTourette

Abercrombie
Allen
Andrews
Becerra
Bentsen
Berman
Boehlert
Bonior
Borski
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Capps
Cardin
Carson
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Conyers
Cummings
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Delahunt
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Filner
Frank (MA)

Ackerman
Baker
Bilirakis
Blagojevich
Coble
Coburn
Danner
Dixon
Ehrlich
Ford

NOES—114

Furse
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hastings (FL)
Hinche
Hinojosa
Holden
Hoyer
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Johnson, E. B.
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kilpatrick
King (NY)
Klink
Kucinich
LaFalce
Lantos
Lee
Levin
Lofgren
Lowey
Manton
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McGovern
McHale
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Metcalf

NOT VOTING—36

Frost
Gephardt
Gonzalez
Hefner
Hilliard
Jefferson
John
Kennelly
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski

Mink
Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Olver
Owens
Pastor
Payne
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rivers
Rothman
Rush
Sanchez
Sandlin
Sawyer
Scott
Serrano
Shays
Skaggs
Slaughter
Snyder
Stark
Tanner
Tierney
Torres
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Wexler
Woolsey
Wynn

□ 2120

Mr. BERRY and Mr. DICKS changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Chairman, I was unavoidably detained on rollcall vote 301, the Wicker amendment. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye".

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, for the purposes of taking up a rule, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

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

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4193, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1999

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 105-637) on the resolution (H. Res. 504) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4193) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H. Con. Res 301.

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

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BARRETT Of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained in my district earlier today, and I missed four votes. If I had been here, I would have voted the following: On rollcall No. 297, H.R. 3874, I would have voted "aye". On rollcall No. 298, H. Con. Res. 208, I would have voted "aye". On rollcall 299, H. Con. Res. 392, I would have voted "aye". On rollcall 300, H. Con. Res. 301, I would have voted "aye".