

from the executive director of the National Association of Police Officers writes, "Representing over 3,500 police unions and associations and 175,000 sworn law enforcement officers, we ask it not be devastated."

Mr. Speaker, as we begin this debate, I ask that Members look seriously upon the fallacies of H.R. 728. Let us not play politics with crime, and let us put forth and keep the 100,000 police on the street program.

REAL REFORM IS SAY "NO" TO PAC'S

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from California [Mr. HORN] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago America listened during the State of the Union Address as President Clinton stated his support for campaign finance reform. He said to Congress that "We have a lot more to do before people really trust the way things work around here. * * * I ask you to just stop taking the lobbyist perks. Just stop." He also added that "we should also curb the role of big money in elections by capping the costs of campaigns and limiting the influence of the PAC's."

The President's speech reminded me of a speech I heard 2 years ago. In his 1993 State of the Union Address, President Clinton said, "I'm asking Congress to enact real campaign finance reform. Let's reduce the power of special interests and increase the participation of the people."

I remember who the first two Republicans were to give him a standing ovation on those remarks, the then-whip, current Speaker, and myself.

Regrettably, the President let America down over the last 2 years. While Americans demanded reform, and while a bipartisan group in Congress worked to enact real reform, the President did nothing. Oh, yes, he said, "Let's cut it for the President, let's cut it for the Senate, but, by the way, leave it alone in the case of the House, \$5,000 in the primary, \$5,000 in the general from PAC's. For a total of \$10,000."

Reformers in the last Congress, from both parties, advocated reform that would limit, and even ban, political action committees. While we worked, the President stood silently on the sidelines and allowed his party's congressional leaders to block the bipartisan campaign finance reform bill. The so-called Synar-Livingston bill would not eliminate PAC's, but it would have reduced the amount they could give from \$5,000 in an election to \$1,000, the same limit as the maximum for an individual contributor.

Some of those congressional leaders are gone now, sent home or relegated to the minority by the voters last November. With this change in Congress, I hope we are also getting a change in the President's views. With the President's support, we can enact legislation

that will carry out his goals, and the goals of many of us in both parties.

Let me repeat his goals: "Reduce the power of special interests and increase the participation of the people."

I ask my fellow Representatives, what better way is there to reduce the power of special interests than to get rid of political action committees, commonly known as PAC's? And what better way is there to increase the participation of the people than to require that a majority of a candidate's money comes from the people who live in the district that the candidate seeks to represent?

Those are the changes that I support. Those are the changes that many in this Chamber support. I hope the President's words will be followed up with action, action that indicates that he supports these goals too.

Campaign finance reform is a serious issue, and a vital one. But recently there has been far too much noise around what I consider a side note. The President attacked Congress for accepting gifts from lobbyists. He focused his criticism on the \$10 lunch, and on the \$50 golf outing. I do not play golf, so I do not know much about that. But I ask my fellow Representatives, what difference does rejecting a \$10 lunch make if you still accept the \$10,000 campaign check from the same special interest? I tell you that \$10 lunches are not the reason special interest groups have so much influence in Washington these days; \$10,000 campaign checks are the reason.

In the days following the President's address, there have been a number of statements from Members of Congress supporting the President's "Just say no to lobbyists" idea. I want to take a moment to look at those claims of support.

By my count, 32 Members have now taken the "say no to lobbyists" pledge. I heartily salute six of them, three Republicans and three Democrats, for truly saying "no." These six reject not only the \$10 lunch and the \$50 golf game. They also reject the most lucrative gift of all: The \$10,000 campaign check. As in my case, they do not accept PAC money. So, to my six friends, I salute you.

But my reason for standing before you today is not only to salute that bipartisan group of six. The American people deserve to know that a Member who pledges to say "no" to lobbyists is truly saying "no." In an effort to let the voters know which members truly say "no," I want to point out one fact: The 26 other Members who claim to say "no" to lobbyists are in fact still saying "yes" to the biggest gift of all. According to the Federal Election Commission's December 22, 1994, report, these 26 Members accepted an average of \$275,000—and a median of \$224,000—from PAC's. How much of a difference does a declined \$10 lunch make, relative to a quarter of a million dollars from special interest PAC's?

Again, I am not up here to make a partisan statement. Of the 26 members that I refer to, 6 are Republicans.

I am up here, Mr. Speaker, to try to shed a little light on the serious issue of reform. Banning \$10 lunches, whatever symbolic value such a change may have, is not reform—it is not reform because the same lobbyist who cannot buy you lunch can still hand you a \$10,000 campaign check. I say we all must truly reject lobbyists' influence by rejecting all PAC money. The influence of PAC's is a national scandal. The elimination of PAC's will be a long overdue reform.

FURTHER OPPOSITION TO LAW ENFORCEMENT BLOCK GRANTS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from California [Mr. FILNER] is recognized during morning business for 3 minutes.

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, I am here to join with my colleagues and following the leadership of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. STUPAK] in rising in opposition to H.R. 728, the so-called Law Enforcement Block Grants Act.

What H.R. 728 does is reduce our commitment to putting 100,000 new police officers on the streets of this Nation, and it eliminates, yes, it eliminates the emphasis that has proved so important in cities all across this Nation, and that is the emphasis on community oriented policing.

Every national police organization virtually opposes H.R. 728 and the concepts included therein. They know that community policing works. They know that H.R. 728 provides no guarantees that a single penny of these new block grants will actually go to the police forces of our Nation.

I represent a good part of the city of San Diego, the sixth largest city in this Nation, a city that has many urban problems, where crime is considered the No. 1 concern.

We in San Diego have pioneered the concept of community oriented policing over the last decade. I served on the San Diego City Council for 5 years before I came to Congress and have direct experience with the walking teams, the neighborhood concepts that we have instituted.

I represent neighborhoods that have traditionally been hostile to police forces because of certain history and certain behavior and certain attitudes. Yet those same neighborhoods literally gave standing ovations to the cops that now serve their neighborhoods. They know that community policing works, because it allows those police officers to get to know the neighborhoods that they actually patrol and allows the people in those neighborhoods to get to know them.

You will not find the officers on the walking patrols in San Diego sitting behind desks or processing mail. They are out there on the streets, in the schools, in the neighborhoods, in the

parks, knowing those who are residents, knowing the children, knowing the merchants, and actually being effective in the fight against crime.

We have seen partnerships form, as community and police forces work together to fight crime. In San Diego in every major category of crime we have seen a reduction of at least 10 percent in the last year alone.

Community policing works. We should not allow it to go as H.R. 728 provides. Let us make sure that our comprehensive fight that we have mandated in the crime bill last year proceeds. Let us not move backward. Let us oppose the cut to community policing.

Let us defeat H.R. 728.

WELCOME TO PARKER TRAVIS GERRO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BARTON] is recognized during morning business for 3 minutes.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, last December my sister, the only sister that I have, had a bouncing baby boy born on December 18, 1994. It is her first child and just a delightful young man.

I would like to read into the RECORD an announcement of Parker Travis Gerro's birth. I want to point out to my colleagues that the poet is not myself but my sister.

WELCOME TO PARKER TRAVIS GERRO

On December 18, '94
A precious life began;
A Texas-style Republican,
Was born to Mike and Jan.
The Gerro's are ecstatic;
Uncle Joe Barton, too.
A new Conservative in Arlington
Is a baby dream come true.

Mr. Speaker, we are delighted to have this young man in the world today. We hope his life is happy, healthy, and productive.

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

Mr. BARTON of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, let me join in welcoming a new conservative Republican in Parker. We want to make sure he grows up so he can have the fruits of a great nation.

FOREIGN POLICY ESTABLISHMENT TRYING TO DERAIL NEXT STEP OF CONTRACT WITH AMERICA

Mr. Speaker, the foreign policy establishment has gone into high gear trying to derail the next step of the Republican Contract With America, and that is going to be debated this week.

We say that no U.S. troops will be under foreign military command.

Our bill ends the Clinton policy of sticking American soldiers into every trouble spot around the world, and in 40 years of sticking the American taxpayers with most of the costs of the U.N. operations. Last November the American people said they wanted a change in foreign policy. We in the new

Republican majority are listening to the people, not the liberal foreign policy elite.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

IN SUPPORT OF DR. FOSTER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I take the floor today to proudly say I support Dr. Foster, and I am anxiously awaiting the first moderate Republican who does not live in Tennessee to join me.

I think what has happened to Dr. Foster is absolutely scandalous. There has been more distortion of the truth and more churning around this than I have seen in a very, very long time.

Let us talk about what is going on today. Today we see Vice President GORE going to Tennessee to visit Dr. Foster's program, the I Have a Future Program. The I Have a Future Program is targeted at teens, at teens who are highly vulnerable, and the fact that they might become pregnant. And guess what, it has had a long, long track record, and it is working and working very well.

It has worked so well that George Bush gave Dr. Foster one of his points of light for this program. Not only that, he was part of Lamar Alexander's advisory team. Now those are both Republicans the last time I looked, and they were both aware of this program and thought it was a great program.

But when you look at America and America's problems, if we have a future, we have to have a national program dealing with teen pregnancy.

□ 1250

We have thrown a lot of words at it. We have done a lot of finger waiving at it, we have done the Federal nanny role. We have done all sorts of things, but we have not had very many programs that work.

I think this administration is to be complimented for finding a gentleman who has bipartisan support, a gentleman who has a program that works and wants to put him in the national level so we can learn from that and tackle it.

If America has a future, babies having babies is not the way to go. That is the way to end up as a Third World, developing nation because many, many of the boxes are already colored in when babies have babies, and so many sad cases.

I think we should salute him.

Let me talk of some of the things that you have heard thrown around that I think are on the verge of being ridiculous. The latest has been that Dr. Foster sterilized some very, very critically mentally retarded patients in the 1970's and wrote about it. Well, first of

all he wrote about it. He is not trying to hide it.

And second, over 60,000 severely mentally ill people were sterilized from the turn of the century into the late 1970's when we found new and better ways to do this.

Why did the medical practice do it? Why did they do it? It sounds so cruel and so awful by 1995 standards. Well, because at that time there was a sanitation reason, that young women who were severely mentally handicapped had no idea how to deal with their monthly period, and it was a terrific sanitation problem. Plus, the chances of their becoming pregnant because they had no idea what this was all about was also a critical problem.

The entire medical community was doing this as a means of handling it. Thank goodness we now have medication; we have much better ways that seem more humane to us.

But, yes, he did it, yes, he admits he did it. The entire medical profession was doing it at that time. And he wrote about it. And I am sure he wished he did not have to do it, and now he has the tools to do it, so no one has to do it.

Now we are going to hang a man on this? For crying out loud, everything in everyone's profession changes from time to time because of advances.

So I think that is the latest one that comes forward that everybody gets very upset about for no reason except they just want to get rid of Dr. Foster.

The other issue we have heard about is, when he was first asked about abortion, he did not give the same number he gave a little later. He said less than a dozen, and it turned out to be 39.

This is a man in his sixties who has been in practice for a very long time. If he was making a living by doing abortions, he would have starved to death by now. No one could accuse him of doing these lightly; 39 is not a large number.

But the other thing, as a woman, that troubles me is no one ever asked what were these cases like? Was the woman's life in danger? Had this been a rape or incest case? Just as no one asked about the cases of the severely mentally retarded, what condition they were in, why the medical profession thought that was the only choice to go forward? No, all we are hearing is that this man cannot go forward, this is terrible the administration has done it again, on and on and on.

I hope that we say a woman does have a right to choose, and that means nothing if the doctor does not have to listen, and that we as Americans are mature enough to get on with their nomination and get on with fighting teen pregnancy.

IN OPPOSITION TO H.R. 728

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Oregon [Ms. FURSE] for 3 minutes.