

have. We have a bill the Democrats and Republicans have worked on in a bipartisan and bicameral way.

This bill is McCain-Feingold in the United States Senate, where Democrats and Republicans have been working together in that body. In fact, they, even when it came to a vote, got a majority of the Members of the other body to vote for the bill. Unfortunately, under Senate rules, they need a 60-vote majority to get by the filibuster.

In the House of Representatives, we have a golden opportunity. I have felt over the period of the last months more and more Members are willing to take on a special interest, fight for bipartisan campaign finance reform. The number of Members on both sides of the aisle committed to the Shays-Meehan bill has been growing every day.

I might add that it seems that every time the leadership on the other side of the aisle puts up another obstacle to passing true meaningful bipartisan campaign finance reform, it seems that we get more Members supporting our effort.

So I am not sure that the strategy to complicate the matter, the strategy to delay and procrastinate and capitulate, frankly, I do not think that it is working. In fact, more Members are supporting the Shays-Meehan bill today than have at any point in time over the last several years.

They have joined with editorial boards all across America, the Los Angeles Times, New York Times, U.S.A. Today, the Christian Science Monitor. They have joined with the League of Women Voters and Common Cause and Public Citizen and people in public interest groups who have been fighting to find a way to reduce the influence of money in American politics.

Critical to our proposal is making soft money illegal. I do not know how we could have spent millions of dollars over the last several months conducting investigations and having hearings, politically charged hearings about the abuses of soft money in the last Presidential election, and now we have an opportunity to have a bill that bans soft money, and the leadership is procrastinating, delaying, promising a vote, no vote, pulling rules.

Time and time again, you will hear opponents of reform argue that soft money is not a problem. Let us be clear. When they are defending soft money, they are really defending big money. That is where the American public clearly disagrees.

The soft money loophole allows corporations and labor unions to bypass Federal election laws and tap into their treasury accounts to funnel millions of dollars into the parties, money that is then spent to influence Federal elections.

The fact is that, as long as soft money is allowed, our campaign finance system will be the type of system that invites corruption. That is why we are trying to change this system.

The sham ads, issue ads, opponents of campaign finance reform tell us that we must protect free speech. But when they say free speech, they mean big money. The fact is that the Shays-Meehan bill does not ban any type of communication. It merely reigns in those campaign advertisements that have been masquerading as so-called issue advocacy.

According to the United States Supreme Court, communications that expressly advocate the election or defeat of a clearly identified candidate can be subject to regulation.

The question is not whether the Federal Government should regulate campaign advertisement. It already does. The real question is whether or not the current test adequately identifies campaigns advertisements. The answer is simple. No, it does not. The Shays-Meehan bill will give us an opportunity to make these corrections.

CHINESE OCCUPATION OF TIBET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SCARBOROUGH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week we had a rally on the Capitol talking about freedom in Tibet, and there were a lot of people talking about the need to pray for the people in Tibet. I believe, though, that we need to worry about the people of America and America losing its way, turning its back on the very things that Thomas Jefferson and our founders believed in regarding freedom in this country and in this world, for the country that has been called the last great hope for a dying world has turned its back on freedom loving friends across the globe for 30 pieces of silver.

It seems Americans are confused by facts or more concerned about 9,000 points on the Dow Jones than what is going on. Nine thousand is a number that has mesmerized politicians in Washington. Nine thousand is a number that has mesmerized the wizards of Wall Street and those on Madison Avenue.

But when we are talking about Tibet, I think we need to talk about some numbers that at least, to me, and at least to the freedom-loving people of this country should be more important than the 9,000 number when talking about the Dow.

I am concerned about the number 50. That is the number of years Tibet will have illegally been occupied by China in the next few years. I am concerned about the number 1.2 million. That is how many Tibetans, one-fifth of the country's population, have died since 1959 because of the Chinese occupation.

I am concerned with the number 2,000. There are more than 2,000 political prisoners right now in Tibet. I am concerned about the number 130,000. That is how many Tibetans are in exile.

Right now, there are 250,000 Chinese troops occupying Tibet. At least 6,000

people were sentenced to death in 1997. Right now, 60, the count is 60 million for the number of people that this brutal regime has killed since its inception in 1949.

□ 1945

And yet we have politician after politician and corporate leader after corporate leader falling all over themselves to embrace China and, in doing so, crushing the human rights of those people in Tibet.

Freedom is what I believe America is about. Thomas Jefferson's view of America was an America with a free marketplace of ideas, where people could come together and talk about and debate and export liberty and freedom across the globe. And yet in America today we remain strangely silent because of our preoccupation with the Dow Jones over 9,000 points and our preoccupation over China as the next exporting market. And, meanwhile, we import from China and other places in east Asia, basically getting cheap consumer goods based on little more than what we in America would term slave labor.

It is very frightening. It does not remind me of the America that Thomas Jefferson and the founders talked about when they wrote,

We hold these truths to be self-evident; that all men are endowed with certain inalienable rights by their creator, and among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Now, if our founders believed that God gave those rights to all men, are those rights that Jefferson wrote about, that the creator endowed us with, are those rights exclusive only to those people that are not good trading partners? Or if we have a good trading partner, do we turn our back on Jefferson's vision and our founders' vision of America in this world? Regrettably, over the last few years, I am afraid the answer is, yes, we have turned our backs. It is not the America that Jefferson believed in, it is not the America that leaders have believed in, it is not the America that I believe in.

So many people at the rally seemed concerned that they could not make a difference; that there was nothing they could do to break down the walls of resistance from the White House or from this Congress or from Wall Street or from Madison Avenue. But I am reminded of a quote that Bobby Kennedy made some 32, 33 years ago. And, of course, Senator Robert Kennedy was shot down about 30 years ago last week. But he believed that one person could make a difference. Just like he said in Johannesburg, one person could make a difference in breaking down the walls of oppression. I believe that to be the case in Tibet.

CONGRESS NEEDS TO ACT CREDIBLY WITH REGARD TO PROMISES TO REFORM CAMPAIGN FINANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SUNUNU). Under a previous order of the

House, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I have been in this chamber 11 years and I have seen days that are very satisfying and days that are not. I, obviously, am very proud to be a Republican Member of this Congress and am proud that in 1994 that Republicans had an opportunity to lead this Congress, to help get our country's financial house in order, to save our trust funds, and to move from a caretaking society to a caring society, where people have their hopes and dreams more likely to occur.

I was also proud to be part of a 1994 Congress that took office in 1995 that was able to move forward with congressional accountability, getting Congress under all the laws that we had exempted ourselves from. Congress had exempted itself from the civil rights law, it had exempted itself from fair pay, the 40-hour workweek, time and a half. The private sector had to do it, Congress did not.

Congress had exempted itself from OSHA, the Occupational Safety and Health Act, which basically meant that the Congress did not have to abide by safety procedures for its employees. A Member of Congress could not be sued by an employee for sexual harassment. We exempted ourselves from things that the private sector came under. We did until the 104th Congress, the last Congress, in which we passed congressional accountability.

But we did not stop there. And we did it, candidly, on a bipartisan basis, which is the best way to get reform through. We did not just try to ram it through. We worked with colleagues on both sides of the aisle and got wide support for it. We did the same thing with gift ban and lobby disclosure. We banned, frankly, all gifts, something that was long needed certainly to bring them under control, because Members could receive unlimited gifts of meals and wine and so on. They did not even come under the gift ban. They could get \$100 at a clip, \$250, during the course of a year. We wanted to bring it down to what the Senate had, but the Speaker wanted to ban all gifts, and I concurred in that.

We also, for the first time since 1946, we also amended our lobby laws to really get people who are lobbyists to register and to report who they try to influence and how much they spend. And it has made a significant difference in identifying who really is trying to influence this place. These were reforms that happened under the 104th Congress and, to its credit, on a bipartisan basis.

But we did not deal with campaign finance reform. I guess three out of four is pretty good, but it was my hope and my expectation that a reform-minded Congress would deal with campaign finance reform; and that we would reform our laws, the unlimited soft money that has contributed to the political parties, the over \$260 million

that was given collectively to both parties that was not used for party building, was not used for registration, but was used to influence directly individual races, circumventing the campaign law, unlimited sums by individuals, corporations, labor unions and other interest groups.

I was hoping that we would deal with sham issue ads, the truly campaign ads, call them that and place them under the campaign laws, freedom of speech, under the rules that everyone else has to abide by; that we would codify Beck and make sure that nonunion members do not have to pay political costs to a union for a political activity they do not agree with; improve FEC disclosure enforcement; deal with the abuse in franking and require that foreign money and fund-raising on government property stop. Because right now it is illegal to do that for campaign money, but it is not illegal to do it for soft money. So we need to make sure people know that, one, we ban soft money, but if there is money that is not under hard money, that foreigners cannot do it and they cannot raise this money in government buildings.

It had been my hope and expectation we would deal with this issue last year, but we did not. There was a promise we would deal with it in February and, at the latest in March, but we did not; and then a promise we would deal with it in May, and we have not. And so promises are becoming empty words. It is important that my side of the aisle live up to its agreement, live up to its agreement to deal with campaign finance reform.

I fault my colleagues on the other side for not wanting to deal with the abuses in the White House, I fault my colleagues on this side of the aisle for not wanting to reform the system. We need to do both. We need to hold the abuses of the White House accountable, and we need to reform the system. We need to do both to be truly credible. And I hope and pray that in the days and weeks to come we do that.

TOMORROW'S CAPITOL HILL ROBOTICS INVITATIONAL PROMISES TO BE A REAL TREAT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, if you think ball-playing robots invading Congress sounds like a science fiction script, then think again, and set your alarm clock for early tomorrow morning, when you and I will kick off an unprecedented head-to-head national robotics competition on Capitol Hill. It will truly be an exciting time in the halls of Congress tomorrow.

A dozen high school teams from across the country, including students from Plymouth North and Quincy and North Quincy High School, many of whom are in the gallery here tonight, will cheer on their robots' attempts to

pivot around mechanical competitors scoring points by heaving large balls into 8-foot goals.

Last summer, when I attended the Rumble at the Rock in America's hometown, Plymouth, Massachusetts, a regional robotics competition held at Plymouth Rock, I expected something between a chess club demonstration and a science fair. What I saw left me stunned and truly impressed.

These competitions create an intense thirst for achievement that is usually reserved for the NCAA or NBA finals, proving again what sports promoters and parents have long known: We can create demand for excellence among the kids themselves.

Tomorrow's Capitol Hill robotics invitational is designed to underscore the work of a unique foundation, called FIRST, which is headed by Andrew Allen, a former astronaut who served as commander of the Space Shuttle Columbia. The acronym FIRST stands for, and I am quoting, For Inspirational and Recognition of Science and Technology.

Over 20,000 students on 200 teams participated in regional contests leading to FIRST's national finals earlier this year at the Epcot Center in Florida. Televised by ESPN, and with a crowd of more than 12,000 screaming from the sidelines, it had all the excitement of a national student athletic championship.

Each team is issued an identical trunkful of raw materials and a \$425 credit to purchase additional supplies, then has 6 weeks to collaboratively design and construct a robot capable of competing in a designated event. The participating students have built remote control robots capable of picking up and maneuvering 20-inch rubber balls around a small 6-sided playing field to score goals while competing against other robots.

These projects combine technical sophistication, practical know-how and old-fashioned teamwork. A key to FIRST's success is breaking down the classroom door by partnering with corporate sponsors like Boston Edison and Gillette, and through mentoring from corporate R&D shops and academic engineering departments.

As the Quincy and Plymouth students discussed earlier today with senior officials at the Department of Education, these projects are national educational models combining on-the-job training with competitive adrenaline. How else can you explain that morning during a New England storm this past winter when members of the Plymouth North robotics team trudged through the snow to attend school, even though classes were canceled? Or the many Sunday evenings when Mike Bastoni, its devoted robotics teacher, has to shoo students out of the computer lab at 10 o'clock at night?

It is no accident that these kids emerge with a keen sense of their own potential and with the tools to succeed in a rapidly changing technologically