

John Jones, hypothetical candidate, is running, and his political party decides they want to make an independent expenditure, that is, without communication with John Jones, in his behalf. They were previously limited in how much they could spend. Now they can spend hundreds of thousands of dollars running a negative ad campaign against John Jones' opponent, leaving John Jones then free to run positive ads and not have his fingerprints attached to negative campaigning.

Incidentally, four of the Justices suggested at that time that that doctrine ought to be able to carry over to making direct expenditures on behalf of the candidate, so that firewall may be following shortly.

So now we have a situation with the Supreme Court where we cannot limit how much a candidate can spend on behalf of himself or herself out of their own individual funds, and we cannot limit how much a political party, Democrat or Republican, can spend on behalf of a candidate as long as it is independent.

The third factor we have in today's elections are independent expenditures, whether it is the Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers, the AFL-CIO, the Christian Coalition, or whomever, that they can spend in behalf of a candidate as long as it is an independent expenditure. Once again, an outside group can come in, run hundreds of thousands of dollars of political advertising, as long as theoretically it is not done in coordination with the candidate. Once again, we can pass all the legislation we want affecting a candidate, but if we have independent expenditures it really does not make any point.

The fourth is one that both parties abuse, I feel, and that is soft money, the ability to funnel lots of money, unlimited amounts, in effect, to political party committees in States, effectively for organization. Soft money is becoming a bigger and bigger loophole.

A fifth element of great concern, both Presidential candidates in both parties are circumventing or getting around as much as they possibly can the present limitation on campaign financing. The only area, incidentally, where there is some public financing of campaigns is in Presidential campaigns. It is supposed to be limited, but both parties are getting around that as aggressively as possible.

Finally, the watchdog of campaigns, the Federal Elections Commission, is not adequately funded, and so in effect we have got a watchdog that has been defanged or the watchdog is not being given much of a leash to go do its job.

What we may ultimately have to consider in this country and I just suggest this for discussion purposes, is if there is ever going to be a serious limitation of money, if we are going to be able effectively to control how much individuals or individual groups put into campaigns, we may have to talk about a constitutional amendment that over-

comes the Supreme Court decisions. But until that happens, then I think the public is going to have to be prepared to take control of this process and demand that the Congress do the same thing.

I use the retail, parking lot test. A lot of people are concerned that political campaigns are turning into retail contests. Then use the retail principles to combat it. The parking lot test for me is when I am standing in a parking lot campaigning and somebody comes up and says, "BOB WISE, I don't think that this should be happening" or "Are you involved in this?" So that way political candidates, whether incumbents or challengers, soon get an idea of what the public will accept.

It may be that the public is going to have to say what it would not accept in campaigns. The public or perhaps outside groups are going to have to devise a voluntary code, and thus get some campaign reform and force Congress to act.

#### THE FACTS ABOUT THE CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOKE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, I also want to speak about the campaign finance reform bill that we defeated yesterday, as well as just campaign finance reform generally, because the one thing that has been said repeatedly is that it was a good thing that this bill was defeated because it would do nothing to limit campaign spending. That is simply factually untrue, and I am going to explain why that is untrue.

I will preface that by saying that I did not think it was a perfect bill. There were a lot of things about the bill I was not particularly happy with but at least it moved in the right direction, and I did vote for it.

As we could see, though, from yesterday's vote, Mr. Speaker, unfortunately it was soundly defeated in this House because apparently when it comes to campaign finance reform, people hide behind perfection being the utter enemy of the good, instead of making the incremental reforms that apparently are the only way that we can get anything accomplished with respect to reforming the institution itself or the way that candidates are supported and their campaigns are financed.

Let me tell my colleagues specifically why yesterday's bill, from bottom-up as opposed to top-down philosophy, would have limited spending. It did two things that would have had an immediate impact on reducing the number of dollars in congressional campaigns.

No. 1, it reduced the amount of money that could be contributed by a political action committee, that is, a special interest PAC. Most of them, as we know, Mr. Speaker, are located here

in Washington and represent Washington's values, lobbyists' values, special interests' values, as opposed to America's values.

It would have reduced the amount that those PACs could have spent from \$5,000 to \$2,500 or reduced the amount of money from PACs by 50 percent, reduced them in half. At least that is what it purported to do. Unfortunately, the devil is always in the details and who knows that it might have only spawned twice as many PACs with different hats.

But let us forget that for a second. Let us assume in fact it would have done what it was intended to do, and that was to reduce the amount of money that a PAC could give by 50 percent. That would have reduced by 50 percent all of the money that PACs contributed to congressional campaigns in the last cycle or in the next cycle. If the average amount that a candidate is receiving from a PAC is \$300,000 or \$400,000, it would have reduced it by half. Clearly, that has an immediate impact on reducing the amount of money that is being spent in political campaigns.

Second, the bill also provided that 51 percent of all contributions must come from individuals who live in the district that the candidate wants to have the honor of representing in the United States House of Representatives; 51 percent. That immediately would have also had the impact of reducing the total number of dollars spent on a political campaign.

Why? Because if 51 percent has to come from in-district, that means that in all of those districts where candidates are in fact raising more than 51 percent from out-of-district, which is in fact for those people who accept political action committee contributions, the majority of candidates, it would have also had the immediate impact of reducing the amount of money being spent in those campaigns, as well.

So as my colleagues can see, this bogey that is being thrown up that this did nothing to reduce the amount of money in political campaigns is absolutely false and it is false because, No. 1, the amount of money spent by PACs would have been reduced. No. 2, there would have been an overall reduction because of the 51 percent in-district requirement.

Now that is a consequence of otherwise good policies. I would go a step further and say this: If we are going to in fact make this body more representative of the districts of America, not of Washington's values but of America's values, then we have to completely eliminate the political action committee contributions.

□ 1330

The reason that we need to do that is that something very, very insidious happens when a person makes a contribution to a PAC. In other words, if you are a member of a labor union or if you work for a bank and you make a

contribution to a bank PAC, or let us say that you are an individual who makes a contribution to a particular other PAC, what happens is that the character of that contribution changes from being complex and subtle and intelligent to being stupid and narrow and ugly, with only one or two specific political agendas for that term of Congress.

#### ADMINISTRATION SHOULD ADVISE CONGRESS REGARDING CURRENT HAITI SITUATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I will not use the 5 minutes. Mr. Speaker, I took the well last evening because we had received a surprise from Haiti. We were getting ground reports that the 82d Airborne had arrived in that country, at least in company strength, and was very visible on Humvee vehicles with machine guns and battle gear going around the capital city and elsewhere in the country.

The people were puzzled about what was going on, so we asked for an explanation from the administration. Today is another day and today is another day we have had more silence from the administration on exactly what are our increased American troops doing in Haiti and what, in fact, is going on in Haiti.

Many people who do not follow what goes on in that friendly neighboring country just to the south of Florida, which is my district, are not aware that they have just had the equivalent of their O.J. Simpson trial there over the death of a respected man named Guy Mallory who was assassinated a few years ago, among many assassinations that have regrettably taken place in that country. That trial came out that they acquitted two suspects that they felt they had pretty good evidence. And now the President of the country has come along and said there was something, quote, suspicious about the verdict.

The judicial system does not work very well in Haiti. It is a country where passions tend to run very quickly and very intensely. We have now got people in the streets saying that this jury contained people who were enemies of the people. "Enemies of the people" in Haiti is code word and it usually precursus trouble.

We have got now a situation where we have got obviously a bad situation in the country and a lot of agitation and feeling going on. And apparently we have now sent the 82d Airborne, at least part of it. We do not know exactly what they are doing. We do not send the 82d Airborne just anywhere. They are a crack American outfit. We reserve them for our most difficult problems and hot spots. I would suggest that Bujumbura, Burundi, today is a place where the human rights viola-

tions and the black-on-black genocide is so atrocious that if there were a need to put our troops some place to make peace and stability and protect human rights, it might rise to a larger order of things to be looking at Bujumbura than Haiti.

But some have suggested that the reason that we have sent the 82d to Haiti is to perhaps try to keep the lid on things there because we know that the Clinton administration has claimed Haiti as a foreign policy success story, and I know that they are anxious to try and keep proving that right up to the election, at least in this country.

I think that the time has come for the Clinton administration to try and reduce the candor gap with the American people on so many issues. But when it comes to foreign policy and when it comes to committing our troops who are actually in harm's way in a situation as explosive as the one in Port-au-Prince and Haiti today, it seems that they ought to be discussing it with Members of Congress who have legitimate oversight and legitimate concerns about how our taxpayers' dollars are spent, and legitimate concerns about how our foreign policy is executed and when it is executed.

So I am still hopeful that the administration will take advantage of this and the White House will share with the American people and the news networks what exactly is going on in Haiti and why we have more soldiers there.

#### WHO REALLY SPEAKS FOR THE CHILDREN?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. WHITE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WHITE. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Today I want to spend just a few minutes on a subject that is very important to me that is the subject of children.

I have four children and, as luck would have it, I have one of them here on the floor with me today. My 10-year-old daughter Emily is visiting Washington, DC, with me this week, and she has a 12-year-old sister, a 7-year-old sister and a 4-year-old brother, in our household children are very important. I hope they are very important to every Member of this body because just about everything we do here will have an impact on our country's children.

Mr. Speaker, I am new to this body. I have been here only a year and a half, but I have noticed there is a significant difference between our two parties when we talk about children.

The Democrats tend to talk about Government programs, Government spending, and Government bureaucrats, and I recognize that is an approach that they have taken. They think that is what it takes to raise a child, and I have to tell you, Mr. Speaker, I disagree.

We have spent billions and billions and billions of dollars over the last 30

years on Government run welfare, and our problems have only gotten worse. I think it is time for Republicans and Democrats to call for a new approach or, Mr. Speaker, maybe it is a very old approach. This approach is called responsible parents. That is what it takes to raise a child in America today, responsible parents.

We should not be asking ourselves what should the Government do for children. What we should be asking is how can we help parents do more for their children? What children need is not more Government spending, it is compassion. It is help from their parents. That is something the Government cannot provide.

When we talk about children, Republicans begin with three principles: First, that the moral health of our Nation is at least as important as the economic health or the military health of our country. The fact is you cannot raise children in the proper environment when 12-year-olds are having babies, 15-year-olds are killing each other, 17-year-olds are dying of AIDS and 18-year-olds are graduating with diplomas that they cannot read. If we are going to take care of our children, we have to restore the moral health of our country.

Second, it is results, not rhetoric, that count. Anyone can sound compassionate. Anyone can say what people want to hear. But we have got to go out there and do things that will actually help our children.

Third, we really have to look ourselves in the mirror and admit to ourselves and to the American people that the system we have in place right now is a failure. We have spent billions and billions of dollars over the past 30 years on a system that has not worked, and it is time to try something new.

Mr. Speaker, 30 years ago the Government started out with the best intentions but instead of solving the problem the Government created a welfare trap in this country. We have trapped a generation of Americans on Government assistance. We have deprived them of hope, of opportunity, and in many cases we have destroyed the lives of many precious children.

Take a look at what is happening in our cities. You will see a generation that is fed on food stamps, but starved on nurturing and hope and parental care. You will see second graders who do not know their ABC's, fourth graders who cannot add or subtract. You will see sixth graders who do not know the number of inches in a foot because they have never seen a ruler.

Yet every year, as we have done for the past 30 years, the Government spends more money on programs because it thinks that is the compassionate way to help people. Instead of helping people, Government in expanding the welfare trap from one community to another, from one child to another, from one generation to another. The welfare trap and Government spending makes us think we have done