

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

of Representatives is going to be behind the States in taking action and way behind the American people as individuals.

When people talk about reforming the current system, they talk about something bold, they talk about actual reform. I do not believe there is a great deal of interest of people looking at incremental changes or marginal changes around the edges of what we have, rather we are talking about doing something fundamental because we need to have the confidence back in our system.

We need, in fact, to know that every piece of legislation we put out of this body has credibility so that the American people understand that it is their business being done and not the business of a special few who can give not just hundreds of thousands of dollars but the \$1,000, the \$2,000. The small percentage of people in this country that actually contribute to campaigns should be no less certain that the \$1,000 and \$2,000 contributions of individuals get some sort of access than they are about the hundreds of thousands or \$200,000 contributions that are made in so-called soft money, which a friend of mine likens to money put into a blender. It is run through the blender so when it comes out nobody is sure where it came from. We have a right to know where the money comes from. We have a right to have control over our system.

Sometime ago, months ago, I put on the floor of this House a bill, H.R. 2199, entitled "Clean Money, Clean Election Campaign Finance Reform." It is modeled after what happened in Maine when the people in Maine took a referendum and decided they wanted to own their system; they wanted to have control over their electoral process and they would publicly fund the campaigns in that State.

They understood that if they were going to have people come down and do their business, they wanted to make sure that they knew who they were and that they had decided, just like big corporations invest in the selection of people that run their corporations, as voters they had to invest in knowing who was coming here. We have to make sure it is not the people that are funded by tobacco companies or other huge corporations, or individuals that are so well off or so vested in the process that they are putting forth the money in thousand dollar increments.

The States know it. The State of Maine went out in a referendum and put in a system. The legislature in Vermont went out and put in place a similar system. In a dozen polls across this country, in States that are considered to be liberal or progressive, in States considered conservative, the people have spoken out that they think public financing of campaigns is the way to proceed.

USA Today acclaims the States are leading the way in cleaning up campaigns. They talk about the fact that

in Maine they have an even better idea than just putting limits in there, they are going to fund the campaigns so that they know that they own their own process.

The Boston Globe several weeks ago supported the concept. In Wisconsin, the Daily Tribune Wisconsin Rapids says public financing will give true reform. In St. Louis, the St. Louis Post Dispatch, in its editorial, says public financing is the answer.

The American people want their system back. This House fails to take a bold step on either side of the aisle. I think we have to understand that if the people are going to have confidence in this body they have to have confidence that we will do something, not just work around the margins and not proceed forward.

People want limited campaign seasons, not endless campaigns. They want to know their elected officials do not spend their life at fundraisers and on the phone asking for money. They want to know that the free air time is available to candidates because the spectrum that broadcasters get for free belongs to the American people. They want to make sure that there is an even and level playing field so that candidates, no matter what their personal wealth or no matter what their ability to get the attraction of large corporations or other big investors involved in their campaign, will have the ability, through good organization, through leadership abilities to go out and address the people and get elected.

A fair campaign that would attract candidates, that would get people involved in a process that we would know we as voters control is where this thing should be moving. The American people are there, certainly it is now finally being reflected in editorials, the AFL-CIO is willing to give the Beck decision or whatever else they want if we go to that system, and in fact the large donors and huge corporations the other day agreed and said they too are tired of giving money and they would go to that system.

Simply speaking, what we need to do is have a system like that that does not unilaterally disarm any party. That is what we need, is something everybody can coalesce behind.

CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

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

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I would first like to yield to my colleague from Georgia [Mr. LEWIS].

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, let me thank my friend for yielding to me.

As the gentleman knows, the days and years roll by and more money continues to flow into Washington, hundreds, thousands, millions of dollars into campaigns, into political parties, and the Speaker of the House, the Speaker of the House, of the people's House, continues to say that it is not

that it is too much money, it is not enough. He wants more money, unlimited amounts, to come into the House, into campaigns and to political parties.

Our present system is polluting the political process. It stinks. This is not the way to conduct the people's business, with hundreds, thousands and millions of dollars coming in. And the Speaker refuses to do anything; refuses to allow us to have a vote, a debate on campaign finance reform.

It is time, I think, my colleagues, that we say to the Speaker, "How long will you wait?" This is not in keeping with the democratic process. Let us have a vote. Let us have a clean debate on campaign finance reform. That must take place if we are going to restore a sense of faith and trust and confidence in the democratic process in America.

Mr. MEEHAN. I thank my colleague from Georgia, and let me just say that I woke up this morning and reads the headlines of the newspapers, and I think everyone in America has looked and seen that the Democrats have been trying to delay and procrastinate in the procedures and shut this place down, if need be, in order to get a vote on campaign finance reform.

Now, all of us have looked at the newspapers and on television over the last months and there has been a lot of attention on the problems with our campaign finance system; the fact that there is too much money involved in American politics; the fact that here we are at a critical time and trying to protect America's children from tobacco, and we find the tobacco companies gave millions of dollars in the last election cycle; and the only way we will do anything about this is by forcing a debate on campaign finance reform.

Now, it is interesting that at the same time the other body is taking up campaign finance reform and taking up a bill that is sponsored by Senators MCCAIN and FEINGOLD, that has the support of nearly every newspaper in America, nearly every public interest group that has been working on campaign finance reform in America, that we find that the Speaker of the House, at the same time this bill is being debated, has a headline in the New York Times which reads "Gingrich Asserts Campaign Bill Is Dead in the House."

Well, I am joining with a Republican Member, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. CHRIS SHAYS], and a number of Members of the House, at one o'clock, and we are going to have a press conference to announce that campaign finance reform is not dead in the House. As a matter of fact, we are going to introduce early next week a revised reform bill based on a scaled-back McCain-Feingold, Shays-Meehan bill.

Now, what does it do? No. 1, it bans soft money. The fund-raising controversies that we have heard about by and large have been soft money, the ability of someone to go into the Speaker's office or go into the White

House or anyplace else with a check for \$50,000 or \$100,000. That should be illegal.

We ought to have a vote on the floor of the House and let Members vote whether they think it should be illegal or not. Certainly 80 to 90 percent of the American public think it should be illegal. The Speaker thinks it ought to be legal. He thinks there is not enough money being spent on campaigns in America, and that is the opposite of the truth.

The evidence is overwhelming that the time has come for campaign finance reform. The Speaker says that we need more money involved in this process. The truth is money is corrupting American politics and everyone knows it. We are going to file a bill that will ban soft money, that will give better disclosure requirements, greater disclosure and better enforcement from the Federal Election Commission.

All of us here today believe that the Speaker's desire to vastly increase the amount of money in the current system would be a disaster for democracy. I am confident that the Members of this House are going to stand up to the Speaker and, if we need to do it, we will file a discharge petition and require that there be a vote on the floor of this House to ban soft money.

One person cannot stand in the way of campaign finance reform, and I believe that the membership of this House is ready to take on Speaker GINGRICH and require that there be a vote on campaign finance reform and a vote to abolish soft money.

FAST-TRACK TRADE NEGOTIATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, before I begin my remarks about trade, let me associate myself with the remarks of my colleagues who have spoken this afternoon on the issue of campaign reform.

The system in the country is broken. If we ever needed any more evidence of its dilapidated state, all we have to do is pick the morning papers up, listen to the morning radio, watch the evening news. It is zapping the energy, the integrity, the heart of the Democratic system in our country today.

□ 1300

The present system is a disaster. It needs to be scrapped. People spend too much time raising money, going after money, and not enough time focusing on the problems that face this country. I believe we are in a process of watching it die. And it will die, and it will come down.

As my friends and colleagues have said in these last 30 or 40 minutes, they on this side of the aisle, for the most

part, do not get it. The Speaker wants to spend more money. He wants to provide more access to the big boys and take away our ability to have a say in what happens in this very building.

So, Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to add those notes before I talk about fast track.

Fast track is probably, I could make a transition here, but I will not at this point. I will save that for another day because there is a transition to be made with respect to our trade policies and how this institution operates and how this city operates.

As the vote over NAFTA expansion gets closer, there are a lot of people who are calling for attention. Some are politicians. Some are CEO's. Some speak for farmers. Other stand for labor. Some hire consultants. Some go on TV. Even cartoon characters like Donald Duck and Mickey Mouse have lobbyists in this building and downtown looking after them.

All of these interests have a voice, and they are shouting to be heard. But some of the people with the most at stake in this debate have been silent, or are silent. They do not have a choice. They do not have a choice voice. I am talking about children. I want to talk a little about children before I get into the heart of the trade issue because I believe this gets to the heart of the trade issue.

As many as 11 million children today toil day after day in the fields and in the factories of Mexico. They pick tomatoes. They pick onions. They pick strawberries. They glue soles on shoes. They unload and load crates of produce that weigh more than they do.

Starting at 7 years of age, millions of Mexican children are kept out of school and are forced to work, often exposing them to the most dangerous pesticides and toxins. And we say, "well, is not child labor prohibited under NAFTA?" Sure it is. But the Mexican Government just looks the other way. And what is even worse, multinational corporations in this country, employers who go over and establish businesses in Mexico, and this Government of ours looks the other way as well.

According to the U.S. News and World Report, the three NAFTA governments have not filed a single complaint in Mexican child labor even though it is commonplace, not a single complaint. I am willing to bet that of all the experts touting NAFTA, of all the armchair economists, of all of those pushing fast track expansion today, none of them would want their kids, children, quitting elementary school to pick tomatoes laced with pesticides.

Are they really willing to sacrifice their education, the health and the future of poor Mexican children, at the altar of free trade? Child labor does not just affect lives in Mexico. It is putting downward pressure on the standards in the United States.

How does this work? We say to ourselves, "What has this got to do with

America? What has this got to do with our workers? What has this got to do with our industries?" Well, how can a tomato farmer in Florida who adheres to our labor and environmental standards compete with someone who pays children pennies an hour and who pollutes with impunity?

That is what our workers are up against, our business people are up against, companies that pollute with impunity with these toxins and pesticides, pesticides, by the way, that got into the strawberries, came into this country. One hundred seventy-nine children in Michigan were poisoned with strawberries that were contaminated, some very seriously, life-or-death situations, because those vegetables and those fruits are not checked.

We say, "Well, do they not inspect them when they come into the border?" 3.3 million trucks go across that border every year, 10,000 trucks a day. Do my colleagues know how many of them get inspected? One percent. They call it a wave line. The inspector stands there and waves them on through. The line stretches for miles, truckers honking their horns, and they just wave them on through.

It is not contaminated fruits and vegetables that get through into our market now. It is also what else is in the compartment of those trucks; like 70 percent of all the cocaine that comes into the United States comes from Mexico today. That is another story.

Let me get back to that tomato farmer. He or she cannot compete with what is coming in from Mexico today because in Mexico we have got kids that are 7, 8, 9 picking it for pennies, and we have got pesticides and toxins that are prohibited here being used.

That is why America's trade agreements must include strong, enforceable protection for workers and the environment. That is why we have been coming to the floor day after day, week after week, month after month, saying, Mr. President, colleagues on this side of the aisle, some of my own colleagues, these are the standards that we need to have as we move into this new century of ours. We will be setting the pattern in this fast track on what will be negotiated in trade for the next century.

We cannot stay with the policies that take us back to the conditions of the 19th century, and that is what the administration's policy basically does. It will move us down on wages, on working conditions, on health conditions to a 19th century standard. It will take us back in the past. We need to move people forward. We need to have Mexican workers and Chilean workers and their environments meet the standards that we have established here in the United States rather than our workers coming down to their standards.

Our trade agreement should harness the power of markets to lift standards abroad, not lower ours. And if we sacrifice our standards, we sacrifice not