

bipartisan bill. It is not about Democrats or Republicans. I recognize the fact that we cannot get a bill to the President without Republican support. That is why I went out and worked with the Republicans to get a bill that we could agree on, a bipartisan bill. But it has to limit how much money is spent. Otherwise, it is not real reform. I am delighted to have had this opportunity to speak out about my bipartisan bill and the really sorry state of affairs that we are faced with here on Reform Week, day 3, I guess. We are going to leave tomorrow, I guess, not doing anything in terms of any of the reforms that were advertised, including campaign finance reform.

Mr. FARR of California. I think history will show as we end this debate here that the Democratic caucus with bipartisan support in the past has passed campaign reform out of this House, in the 103d Congress, the 102d Congress, the 101st Congress, and the 100th Congress and in every one of those instances, that action has been thwarted by Republican actions either in the Senate or a veto by a Republican President. It is obvious that the campaign reform that we are talking about that the American public wants and has supported these number of years is about to be thwarted by actions in this House as well. It is a tragedy. It is a tragedy that Reform Week has diminished into this kind of strained effort to not have effective campaign reform. I thank the gentleman for coming down tonight and being in the well and sharing his thoughts with me as one of the leaders in campaign reform in America.

Mr. MEEHAN. I compliment the gentleman for having this hour on campaign finance reform.

---

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind all speakers that it is inappropriate to characterize possible action or inaction in the other body.

---

#### REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3820, CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM ACT OF 1996

Mr. SOLOMON (during consideration of the Special Order of the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. KINGSTON) from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-685) on the resolution (H. Res. 481) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3820) to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to reform the financing of Federal election campaigns, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

#### REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3734, PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY ACT OF 1996

Mr. GOSS (during consideration of the Special Order of the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. KINGSTON) from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-686) on the resolution (H. Res. 482) providing for further consideration of the bill (H.R. 3734) to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 201(a)(1) of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1997, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

---

#### MORE ON REFORM WEEK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the time and wanted to say first of all a couple of things about the, and I am not going to call it a debate, my friends from the other side of the aisle who would yield 1 minute and then go off on a tirade. I do not think that is quite a debate, but then again I am not from their districts.

But I want to point out one thing, Mr. Speaker. The Clinton administration came to office, and they have been in office for 3½ years. They enjoyed 2 years of majority rule in the Senate and in the House. During that period of time, campaign finance reform was not passed. I have heard that PHIL GRAMM was the problem.

Who controlled the Senate during that period of time? Obviously the Democrats did. If they are going to bring in partisan politics, then it certainly stands to reason it should have passed under their watch the first 2 years.

I know this, Mr. Speaker, because I worked with TILLIE FOWLER and PETER TORKILDSEN on a campaign finance bill that we introduced as a freshman class.

□ 2215

---

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. If the gentleman from Georgia would suspend, the Chair would remind all those assembled that it is inappropriate to discuss individual Members of the other body or action or inaction they may have taken with regard to legislation.

Mr. KINGSTON. I understand that, Mr. Speaker, and I appreciate that point.

Let the record be clear that the Senate and the House were controlled by Democrats for the 2-year period of time. The House Republicans have been working on campaign finance reform on a bipartisan basis for some time now, and one of the issues that we are trying to get bipartisan support on but

we cannot is the issue of soft money and the practice of unions and big union PACs to participate in elections and not even to have to report that money even though it is spent on behalf of a candidate. They can come into a district and spend under the label of soft money, an independent expenditure of money on ads, money directed toward the incumbent Republican, almost unlimited, and there is no check on that.

True campaign finance reform would account for all political money, not just the reportable money, and I hope that we do get some Democrats who are willing to stand up to the big union bosses. I know that they are raising \$35 million on behalf of Democrat candidates right now and Democrats are somewhat very reluctant to take on such a cash cow, but it would be great if they would.

Just to give Members some idea, AFL-CIO in 1994 spent \$804,000 on Democrat congressional candidates, 99 percent of their contributions. The American Federation of Teachers spent \$1,053,000; 99.3 percent of their total contributions went to Democrats. The American Trial Lawyers Association spent 94 percent of their campaign contributions on Democrat candidates, \$1,759,000. The Human Rights folks spent 96.5 percent of their money on Democrats. That is \$470,000. The Community Action Program spent 96 percent of their money on Democrats, \$42,000. The International Longshoreman's, \$300,000, which was 96 percent going to Democrats. The IUE, this is some other union, I am not sure which, \$204,000, 100 percent going to Democrats. The International Union of Bricklayers, \$143,000 going to Democrat candidates, 98.9 percent of their entire budget of contributions. The National Education Association, \$1,968,000; 99 percent of it going to Democrats. And one more, the UAW union PAC, \$1,914,000, 99 percent going to Democrat candidates. I would say if you want true campaign finance reform, this has to be included in the formula.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts wanted some time, and let me yield to him.

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I was just going to make the point that the bipartisan bill, which I have been working on with CHRIS SHAYS and with LINDA SMITH, would in fact limit, in fact the first provision is to abolish PAC money. The second fall-back provision because of constitutional problems is to limit PAC's to \$1,000 per primary, \$1,000 for general. And there are 21 Democrats on that particular bill so I think the characterization of Democrats is inaccurate.

Mr. KINGSTON. Reclaiming the time just a minute with the intent of yielding back to you for further explanation, does your bill also limit or eliminate independent expenditures, such as those that have been targeted