

amounts by individuals, and the story that unfolds is that that soft money was all about access. It was all about access to the White House; it was all about access to the Republican committee chairmen in the House, and the Republican committee chairmen in the Senate, and the leadership in the House and in the Senate. Letters went out and told people, if they gave \$10,000, they could have lunch with chairman of the Subcommittee on Telecommunications, Trade, and Consumer Protection, or the Committee on Labor, or the Committee on Ways and Means, or in the Senate one could have lunch or dinner or a private meeting, and for \$25,000 one could be in on strategy sessions.

The average American could not even dream of being in on one of those sessions. But that soft money then started to dictate, as we saw in the previous session, even before this election, lobbyists and powerful people sitting in the offices of the Republican leadership drafting legislation to weaken the Clean Air Act, to weaken the Clean Water Act, to weaken the health safety acts that protect our families and children against unhealthy food, to weaken the meat inspection act after people have died because of bad meat in the marketplace. But the lobbyists, they had access, because they gave \$10,000, they gave \$100,000. And the crescendo really came in campaign finance reform, or really about bad campaign practices, the crescendo came just about 1 month ago or 2 months ago when we did the Balanced Budget Tax Relief Act.

Members in this House voted on an act believing they were balancing the budget and providing tax relief. However, later we found out that the interests, the tobacco interests that gave the most money to the Republican Party, to the leadership, the individual Members of the Republican leadership, they were able to get a meeting that no other American could get. They were able to get a meeting where in the middle of the night, with no vote, no hearing, no discussion, and apparently, if we listen to the people, no authors, but an amendment got into that bill that provided \$50-, 5-0, \$50 billion in tax breaks for the tobacco companies that have been killing our citizens and lying about it for 50 years.

How did they do it? They did it because they gave hundreds of thousands of dollars to members of the leadership, to the Republican Party, to the Republican conventions, and the payoff day was the day that bill was passed.

Now, fortunately, because of Senator DURBIN over on the other side and Senator COLLINS and the gentlewoman from New York, Mrs. LOWEY, here, when they made us vote in the light of the day, it went away, because we shined democracy, we shined light, we shined the public perception. The press could see what was going on, and nobody would claim that amendment. But a few hundred thousand dollars got the amendment into the bill.

That is why we have been having procedural votes in this House, because we have to end this system that allows the people to sit in the galleries, but the special interests to sit in the office of the Speaker and the majority whip and design legislation; that allows the people to stand outside and petition us on the steps, but allows the special interests to sit down and have dinner and talk about how they can redesign the communications business and who gets access to this billion-dollar giveaway and that billion-dollar giveaway, and the networks will not be charged for using the public airways. That is what has to stop. That is what this week was about.

Finally, finally, after this week, we get some utterances from the other side that maybe they will allow a debate on campaign finance reform. They will not tell us when, they will not tell us how, and they are not even sure they will do it.

We deserve better, and the American people deserve better. The U.S. Senate today has started debate on campaign finance reform, and yet in the House we cannot even discuss it. We cannot even discuss it because of huge contributions to the Republican leadership.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair reminds all Members not to refer to individual Senators or to characterize Senate action or inaction.

ENERGY POLICY ACT

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, in 1992, Congress passed the Energy Policy Act which set Federal requirements on the use of alternative fuel vehicles such as ethanol-powered cars. This legislation required Federal, State, and city fleets to use vehicles that are cleaner and better for our environment. This act listed fuels and vehicle types that can be used by fleet managers to comply with this act.

Unfortunately, biodiesel was not one of the listed alternative fuels at the time because the industry was new, untested, unproven. However, today, that is not the case. As a result, I am introducing a bill, along with the gentlewoman from Missouri [Ms. MCCARTHY], to classify biodiesel as an alternative fuel under the Energy Policy Act of 1992.

Biodiesel is a renewable alternative fuel for diesel engines derived from soybeans. Once biodiesel is classified as an alternative fuel under this bill, it will be used immediately in conventional diesel engines with no engine modifications needed. A few examples of the type of vehicles using this B-20 mix are heavy-duty fleet vehicles such as city buses, boats, and trucks.

The diesel engines will use biodiesel in blends of 20 percent biodiesel and 80 percent petroleum diesel, which is the

most efficient, energy-efficient, and environmentally beneficial mix.

□ 1230

The use of biodiesel will help to save on capital expenditures as fleets will be able to modify and improve their existing vehicles, as opposed to purchasing completely new fleets.

The production, sale, and use of biodiesel will create a new market for our farmers, and, in turn, boost our economy. Because it runs cleaner than regular diesel fuel, the use of biodiesel also means that fewer emissions, as an example, particulate matter, hydrocarbons, and carbon monoxide, are released to our environment.

By granting alternative fuel status to biodiesel this bill will promote economic development and energy security. Biodiesel means jobs and tax revenues for processing a greater portion of our domestic soybean oil in the United States.

The emerging biodiesel market offers a stable, long-term market for efficiently produced domestic soybeans that will directly benefit American farmers. The use of domestic biodiesel also improves national energy security by displacing imported energy, such as foreign oil.

It is important to note that this legislation does not create a tax break or a new Federal mandate. This bill will simply allow the biodiesel industry to compete in the alternative fuel market, giving fleet vehicle managers more flexibility in complying with the mandates required at the Federal level.

The production, sale, and use of biodiesel is good for the environment, good for family farmers, good for the economy, and good for our energy security. As a Congressman from one of the largest agricultural producer States in the United States, creating new markets for our family farmers, helping the economy, and keeping our air clean is very important to me.

In a time that we are looking for answers to environmental concerns, new markets for family farmers and a boost for the economy and energy security, biodiesel makes sense for everyone.

THE HOUSE LEADERSHIP SHOULD SCHEDULE DEBATE AND A VOTE ON CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

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

Mr. ADAM SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to echo the comments of my colleagues and urge that this body bring up campaign finance reform and pass meaningful campaign finance reform in this session.

I think the biggest reason I want to see this happen is because of the lack of confidence that the public has in this body. There is a crisis in our democracy that I think too few people have noticed; that is, the majority of

the citizens of this democracy do not have trust and confidence in their government. That is essential in a democracy. The people are the government. If they do not trust us, we have a crisis that blocks our ability to stand up to almost any meaningful issue.

I have said before that it is impossible to lead if no one is willing to follow. We cannot step up to problems like health care, Social Security and Medicare reform, balancing the budget, or education. A lot of meaningful issues have taken longer and longer to deal with because the public does not trust its leaders.

There are a lot of reasons for that. Some of them are justified and some of them are not, admittedly. One reason for the distrust is the system by which we elect our Representatives, the system by which we finance campaigns. There is a perception and a reality out there that the campaigns are funded almost exclusively by people with a lot of money. If you do not have a lot of money to bring to the process, you have no access to the process, and that has turned people off. We are seeing lower and lower numbers of people participating in the system. We need to show them that we can change this system in order to get their confidence back, so we can govern again.

Ironically, I have heard a lot of my colleagues tell me that, gosh, when we go home for town meetings, when we talk to people, no one is talking about campaign finance reform. It is not really an issue they care about. It is not a so-called pocketbook issue. It does not directly affect their ability to get a job or feed their family or educate their children, so therefore, they really do not care about it.

But what I have heard when I go home on the weekend, and go out and talk to the people in my district, is the reason they do not care about it is because they do not think we are going to do anything about it.

We sort of have a self-fulfilling prophecy with Members of Congress saying, gosh, the public does not care, and not doing anything about it, so yes, the public does not care because they do not think anything is going to happen. They do not believe this body is ever going to step up to the plate and change it, because they think we are comfortable in the current system.

If we want them to care about it, we have to show them we are serious about it. That is the first point. The second point is, they do care about it on a deeper level. They care about it in the sense that they do not trust the system of government. We do not want a democracy where the people do not care about their system of government.

We cannot say we do not need to step up to an issue because apathy has overtaken it. We need an active and involved electorate in a democracy, if we are truly going to be able to represent the people. That means we need to pass campaign finance reform.

I rise specifically in support of House bill 1776, which is the updated version

of the Shays-Meehan bill. I do that because there are two very important aspects to that bill. First of all, it bans soft money. I do not believe that there is anything wrong with people participating in our election system. I, for one, do not believe that we should go to an exclusively publicly financed system. I think it is very important that the members of a community are personally involved in campaigns, that they support the candidates that they like and get involved in the process so they are more involved in it down the road. It is important that people contribute.

The only time we have a problem is when those contributions are so large from certain people as to drown out the rest. When someone has the ability to give \$100,000, \$200,000, \$300,000 to a system, I can readily understand how one of my constituents says, gosh, all I can do is afford to give \$50, and what difference does it make, if the politicians are going to get \$100,000, \$200,000, \$300,000 from somebody else?

Back in the 1970's we came up with a reform proposal to deal with this. We placed limits on the amount people could contribute: \$1,000 for an individual, \$5,000 for a group of individuals, what is known as a PAC. I think that is perfectly appropriate. Those are real limits that allow everybody to participate up to a certain point.

The problem is, with soft money those limits are meaningless. We see fundraisers every day around here for \$5,000, \$10,000, as much as \$25,000 or \$50,000 a person. I remember hearing a story from somebody about how many \$100,000 contributors Michael Dukakis had back in 1988, and I was stunned by this notion. I said, but there are limits, \$1,000 per person. How could any Presidential candidates have a \$100,000 contributor? The answer of course was it was soft money.

It was interesting to me. The person who was telling this made no distinction whatsoever between the soft money contribution and the individual contribution. There is a very good reason for that. Around the halls of Washington, DC, there is no distinction. Soft money has rendered limits meaningless. We need to ban soft money in order to make those 1970 reforms have some meaning.

I can understand the cynicism of the public in dealing with that issue. I urge that we support campaign finance reform. The other aspect of the bill that I like is putting some teeth in the Federal Elections Commission and actually enforcing the laws.

INCLUDE THE BECK DECISION IN CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM AND REPUBLICANS WILL SUPPORT IT

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

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot about campaign finance reform. There are a lot of us that would like to do it and have it brought before the floor. But do we think the Democrats would include the Beck decision, where the union bosses cooperatively hold hostage their workers to contribute to their campaigns and their finances?

The gentleman from Nevada, Mr. JOHN ENSIGN, in Las Vegas, NV, had \$1 million put against him just by the unions, coordinated by the DNC. The gentlewoman from Idaho, Mrs. HELEN CHENOWETH had \$1 million by the unions, coordinated by the DNC against one candidate. What about the gentlewoman from Idaho, Mrs. CHENOWETH, what about the gentleman from Arizona, Mr. J.D. HAYWORTH, \$1 million by the DNC?

Thirty percent of the workers in the unions are Republican. About another 10 percent are independent. So that is 40 percent of the population that is being forced with union wages to contribute, and then that money is being used against Republicans, against their will. But do the Democrats want the Beck decision in any campaign finance reform? Absolutely not, because it takes the power of the union bosses away.

Unions only represent about 6 percent of the work force in this entire Nation, 6 percent. Yet, they say they stand for the working person. Small business and business makes up about 94 percent of all the jobs in this country. They say they are for the working person, but union legislation, from strikebreaker on down, is there to combat and fight against and destroy small business.

My colleague, the gentleman from California, talks about campaign finance reform and its influence. Let me read this:

The proletariat will use all political supremacy wrested by the position of the ruling class to establish democracy.

Have we heard anything about class warfare on this floor by the gentleman from California? The proletariat will use political supremacy to centralize all instruments of production in the hands of the state. One, abolish all private property. Over 50 percent of California is owned by the government. Yet, the gentleman from California in the California Desert plan would have more and more and more lands put in there.

Heavy progressive income taxes. The unions supported the Democrats because they want big government. They want the power centralized in Washington. They use big government, which causes higher taxes, which causes people and small business to die every single day, and jobs. And the union bosses force this, but yet it is supported by the gentleman from California.

Second, abolishing the right of inheritance: the death tax. Where do these three things come from? Where does