

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