

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

property, private property abolition, heavy progressive taxes, inheritance tax, come from? It comes from the Communist Manifesto, written by Carl Marx and Engels.

What else do they have in this, in their plan? Centralization of credit in the hands of the state. No. 8: equal obligation of all do work, but control by unions, organized unions, right here in the Communist Manifesto.

Free education for all. That is not bad, but it is controlled in the hands of the state.

Let me read here. The gentleman from California, union, \$2,000. The gentleman from California, union, \$5,000. The gentleman from California, union, \$1,200. The gentleman from California, union; American, Federal, State and County, union, \$4,500; American Maritime, union, \$1,000; union, \$1,000; union, \$500; union, \$1,000; union, \$1,000; union, \$500; union, for the gentleman from California, \$5,000; union, \$2,000; union \$500; union, \$1,500; on and on and on, and pages from unions. Yet, do they want the union and the Beck decision put into campaign finance reform? Absolutely not. They want to do away with a normal progression.

What is a PAC, Mr. Speaker? A PAC is a group of businesses or organizations for a single purpose. They band together to fight against the power of the unions to direct money against them.

Yes, we want campaign finance reform, but we want fair reform. Include the Beck decision in campaign finance reform and we will support it.

REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP PREVENTS DEBATE ON CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

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

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the staff being around here on a Friday afternoon as we discuss these issues.

Mr. Speaker, the previous speaker talked about how he would like to know where we Democrats stand on some of these issues on campaign finance reform. We Democrats would like to know how everyone in this House stands on campaign finance reform, but until a bill is allowed to come to the House, we are not going to do anything.

The Democrats do not control the House right now, the Republican leadership controls that House. If they want to know how we stand on campaign finance reform, then let these issues come to the floor of the House. It is not our fault that there have not been votes on campaign finance reform, it is the fault of the Republican leadership that is now in control of this House.

That is why, for this past week or so, we have seen a series of motions to adjourn and motions to rise, these kinds

of procedural votes, trying to send a message to the Republican leadership: we have important work to do on campaign finance reform, and we have got to do a better job of bringing that issue to the floor of the House before we can move ahead on other matters.

Why do we care about campaign finance reform? What do we see as the problem under the current law? I brought a sample check here. Members are obviously going to be able to tell it is not a real check because it is signed by my friend, Ima Big Donor.

Ms. Big Donor decided she wanted to make a contribution to the political party of her choice, any old political party. She decided, like Mr. Ted Turner, that she had done well in the market in the last year, and she was going to donate extra money that she had to her political party. So she made out the check for \$1 billion, \$1 billion, enough to fund a thousand political House campaigns.

We might think, well, surely under current law the \$1 billion check would be illegal, since I as an individual can only give \$1,000 to a candidate. But no, under our current system of law, there is unlimited ability to donate money to the political parties, whether you are an individual, whether you are a union, or whether you are a corporation.

Why would someone like Mrs. Big Donor want to donate \$1 billion? Just check her check: for access, for access. Is that not what Mr. Tamraz testified to last week before the Senate committee?

□ 1245

Why would he give \$300,000? Why would he give \$600,000? For access. He is not a fool. It got him in the doors he wanted to get in. This is legal under our current system and it needs to be reformed.

I am one of those candidates that does not like to raise money. I do not think many candidates like to raise money. I think raising money makes us weird. Raising this kind of big money makes our democracy weird, and the American people want to change that system.

Until the Republican leadership lets campaign finance reform bills come to the House for discussion, we are not only not going to know how everyone wants to vote on these things, but the American people are not going to see the kind of changes and reform that they want.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Ms. DELAURO. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me, and I would just say that he is absolutely right, because the fact of the matter is, and what Democrats have been calling for for the last several weeks by asking for procedural votes, motions to adjourn, et cetera, was an effort to bring to the floor, because the Republican majority in this House, the Speaker of the House, Mr. GINGRICH, will not allow us to bring up the issue of campaign fi-

nance reform. The only tools that are available to the minority party are procedural votes. So the public understands what is going on here.

The fact of the matter is, on both sides of the aisle we need to have a thorough and a complete conversation and debate about campaign finance reform. They do not want to let us. And I will tell my colleagues why they do not want to let us. If we read Mr. GINGRICH in the paper today, the Speaker will support a bill that let the good times roll; open up the floodgates; allow all kinds of money to come into the system.

My colleagues, it is not the kind of reform the American people are looking for. What he says is that there is not enough money in politics; we need more money in politics. The Washington Post has said 8 in 10 Americans believe money has too much influence on who wins elections, but the Speaker says we need more money.

Our colleague on the other side of the aisle just a minute ago was talking about influence in the process. If we want to talk about influence, which the American public gets in a second, \$50 billion in a tax break to the tobacco industry, not just a few weeks ago, and guess who was the single biggest contributor to the Republican campaign in the last election? It does not take a rocket scientist to figure it out. The tobacco industry.

And, fortunately, in the Senate and in this body, we said no to that kind of a payoff. That is what we have to stop here, is to make sure that we have the opportunity to get the people in the process and get the specialists out of it.

Let me just say what even his colleague, the gentleman from Arkansas, has said about the Doolittle bill that the Speaker would support, would bring us back to the dark ages. Let us get out of the dark ages. Let us bring campaign finance reform into the light.

CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

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

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I stand today to address the same issue many of my colleagues on this side of the aisle have addressed to date, and that is simply campaign finance reform, and once again reiterate that all of the procedural steps that have been seen over the past several weeks are, in fact, the only way that the minority can try to shed some light and focus the attention on this particular issue.

It has been made clear to us and to the American people that there is no current intention of the leadership on the majority side of this House to bring that issue forward for deliberation, for debate and for a vote. And while we are talking about this issue, I want to broaden the discussion a little bit, because once again I feel that the House