SENATE—*Monday, August 3, 1987*

(Legislative day of Tuesday, June 23, 1987)

The Senate met at 12 noon, on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the Honorable THOMAS A. DASCHLE, a Senator from the State of South Dakota.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Richard C. Halverson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Let us pray:

He that dwelleth in the secret place of the most High shall abide under the shadow of the Almighty. I will say of the Lord, He is my refuge and my fortress: my God; in Him will I trust.—Psalm 91: 1-2.

Most High God, thank You for the profound assurance given us by the psalmist. In the light of this promise, earnestly I beseech You on behalf of the Senators, their staffs, and their families today. As we begin this week, with its predictable delays, diversions, frustrations, and tensions—grant to leadership and Members a very special sense of Your presence. Remind them of Your provision, Your awareness of their situation, Your promise to sustain, to strengthen, to support, to satisfy human need in the midst of controversy and conflict. Make the words of the psalmist relevant to the unfolding drama of these hours of pressure. In spite of us, if necessary, infuse this place with Your love, Your peace. In the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore [Mr. STENNIS].

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, August 3, 1987.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, section 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable THOMAS A. DASCHLE, a Senator from the State of South Dakota, to perform the duties of the Chair.

JOHN C. STENNIS,
President pro tempore.

Mr. DASCHLE thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the standing order the majority leader is recognized.

AGENDA

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I hope a little later to ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to take up the catastrophic illness legislation. If we can do that I suppose that could be disposed of today or certainly today and tomorrow, and I think it would be well if that item could be disposed of before we go out on the August break.

If there is objection to going to that, I shall ask for the regular order which will bring back the campaign financing reform bill. That legislation could be interrupted and would be during the afternoon if we can have ready the FSLIC conference report.

Also, I would hope to dispose of the Greenspan nomination during the afternoon.

So all in all, I should think that we should have some rollcall votes today, possibly about midafternoon or later, and I have discussed these briefly with the distinguished Republican leader and I hope that we might be able to make progress accordingly.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may reserve the remainder of my time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE REPUBLICAN LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the standing order the Republican leader is recognized.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, let me indicate to the majority leader that I think there will be an objection to the catastrophic illness bill. I understand there are a number of Members on both sides who are concerned about certain provisions but I will confirm that if the majority leader will let me know if he intends to make that request. I will have one of those who object on the floor.

I have asked staff to prepare a list of legislative matters which have been cleared on this side. I know some may not have been cleared on that side. But I will simply hand that list to the majority leader. There may be some things we cannot agree on. On drug testing, Calendar No. 97, I do not think we will agree to that.

Calendar No. 219, NTIA authorization; Coast Guard authorization; airport and airways authorization; NOAA authorization; and improving commodity distribution I guess would be cleared by tomorrow. We have already mentioned the FSLIC conference report, and then there is a bill by Senator WEICKER dealing with the *Titanic* that I will give to the majority leader.

Any of those we could agree on.

Mr. BYRD. Very well. I thank the distinguished Republican leader.

If the Republican leader will yield, I would like to begin at the bottom of the calendar and indicate certain measures that perhaps we could agree to do by unanimous consent: Calendar Order Nos. 280, 277, 272, 271, 269, 268, 261, 249; we could do those by unanimous consent and get them off the calendar.

There are some, among which I believe the distinguished Republican leader made some reference, that are linked to other calendar numbers and on which there may be some jurisdictional problems and maybe an amendment on which our staff is trying to work out time agreements.

I would assure the Republican leader that the staff on this side will be continuing to discuss with the staff on that side and our own staffs any effort to work out time agreements regarding some of these measures.

I note there are several measures that have been reported out of the Rules Committee, for example, Calendar Order Nos. 265, 266, 267, 275, and 276, which have been reported out of the Rules Committee on which there are holds on the Republican side of the aisle. I would hope those holds can be lifted.

I find it difficult to understand why all the holds are being placed on Rules Committee resolutions.

Mr. President, I ask that the time I have consumed be taken out of my time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD. Perhaps the distinguished Republican leader would wish to respond.

Mr. DOLE. I cannot respond to the last request, but I will check the other calendar items the majority leader mentioned and see if we can dispose of those by unanimous consent. I will try to check into the reason for the holds on various resolutions from the Rules Committee.

Mr. BYRD. Yes. I noted one hold on a resolution that provides for the

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

printing of the pamphlet entitled "The Constitution of the United States of America." I wondered why anyone would want to hold that up.

Anyhow, I thank the distinguished Republican leader.

Mr. DOLE. I think there is some problem there, but I will try to find out precisely.

INTERNATIONAL SPECIAL OLYMPICS DAY

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, today I want to pay tribute to the thousands of mentally disabled individuals in our Nation who are competing in the International Special Olympics this week.

Earlier this year, Congress enacted, and the President signed legislation, declaring the week of August 2 through August 8, 1987 as "International Special Olympics Week"; and today, August 3, as "International Special Olympics Day." We are celebrating this week what began as an experiment in the 1960's, and which has grown in the hearts and minds of those involved to equal the International Olympics. This week culminates a year in which more than 1 million athletes competed, in 16 official sports, in 19,000 grassroots programs, in every State of this Nation, and more than 70 countries around the world.

The Special Olympics Program, while testing physical fitness, has the ultimate goal of promoting the psychological and social development of the mentally handicapped. It strengthens their confidence, instills pride, and lets all of us know what they can honestly do if given the chance.

Yesterday, more than 4,000 mentally disabled individuals marched proudly into Notre Dame's Football Stadium. Their chins were held high, their faces showed confidence, their walk was determined. There was a sense of achievement that I think many of us would like to have. Even before the events began, I think it was obvious that the program has already achieved its goal.

While I honor the participants, I want to take a moment to acknowledge the work of Eunice and Sargent Shriver and the 500,000 volunteers who helped put the Special Olympics Program together this year. What began on the Shriver farm in Maryland 20 years ago has become a symbol to us all of what mentally disabled individuals can do. For myself, and I believe for all of us here, I would like to thank the Shrivers for their leadership and their dedication.

BICENTENNIAL MINUTE

AUGUST 3, 1944: HARRY S. TRUMAN RESIGNS AS TRUMAN COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, on August 3, 1944, 43 years ago today, Senator Harry S. Truman resigned as chairman, and member, of the Special Senate Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program. He took this action after receiving the Democratic Party's Vice Presidential nomination. His letter of resignation tells us a great deal about his sense of political propriety, and about the success of his committee.

He said:

> It is one of the regrets of my lifetime that this had to be done. But frankly, under the present circumstances, I am of the opinion that any statement, hearing, or report for which I would be responsible would be considered by many to have been motivated by political considerations.

The Missouri Senator concluded:

> The accomplishments of the commit4ee in the past largely have been due to the fact that all its members, Democrats and Republicans alike, were able to work together in harmony without partisanship.

It was Harry Truman's work on the special commit4ee that first brought him to national prominence. In early 1941, months before United States entry into World War II, he called for the creation of a Senate committee to examine military inefficiency and curruption. He initiated a personal investigation of wasteful practices at Fort Leonard Wood, MO, and ended up driving 30,000 miles visiting military bases in the South and East. Truman's hard work and enthusiasm helped convince the Senate to form the special investigative committee in March 1941, and to name him its chairman.

Senator Truman effectively led his committee in improving national defense by documenting widespread mismanagement. Despite the controversial nature of its investigations, the committee always produced unanimous reports. As chairman, Truman demonstrated dedication, integrity, and leadership ability. These qualities, in addition to his unassuming nature, made Truman one of the Senate's most admired and respected Members.

GERMANY IS NOT A PART OF THE INF TALKS

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, the obstacles to an agreement on intermediate-range nuclear forces in Europe—or "INF"—have been falling one by one. Most recently, Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev accepted an American proposal which makes good sense. Global "double-zero" will make an agreement easier to verify, and will truly rid the world of an entire class of nuclear weapons.

Soon after this development, the United States negotiators informed their Soviet counterparts that we would accept their proposal that all missiles covered by the INF agreement should be destroyed—not converted to other uses.

This is the way a negotiation should be. Now, with most of the disagreements on major principles ironed out, the way should be cleared for the negotiating teams to hammer out the all-important details. Let us not forget that this Senate is going to insist on the most effective verification regime possible.

With each new burst of optimism, I have cautioned that we should keep our feet on the ground. There is still much work to be done.

Unfortunately, instead of getting down to business on details, the Soviets are harping on 72 Pershing-1 missiles owned by the Federal Republic of Germany. Their dogged public pursuit of this issue can only be designed to cause dissension in NATO.

It will not work. The United States cannot break a long-standing pattern of cooperation with one of its closest allies; it cannot negotiate away what belongs to Germany. Neither should the Soviets expect us to stand idly by while they agitate for a concession which may appear to have originated in Bonn.

It is time to drop the issue of the German missiles, and get on with negotiating the details of an INF agreement—especially on verification. I hope that such an effort will be successful. But I know that the Soviets should not try to make us choose between an agreement and an ally.

Mr. President, I reserve the balance of my time.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a period for morning business not to extend beyond 12:30 p.m. today, and that Senators may speak therein up to 5 minutes each.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AGRICULTURE EXPORTS

Mr. BOSCHWITZ. Mr. President, I wish to rise quite briefly to discuss agriculture exports and the most recent weekly roundup from the USDA showing that the situation in agriculture exports has indeed improved. For wheat, for the year that just concluded, a total of 22,300,000 tons were exported last year, in 1985-1986 year. This year, it was 24.5 million tons, an increase of about 10 percent. And that is the equivalent of about 900 billion bushels.

Corn also has gone up very nicely and grain sorghum. Soybeans is down just a little bit, though new orders are

about 3 times what they were at this point last year. So that there is apparently going to be a nice pickup there, too. Rice and cotton. Much has been said about rice and cotton. Indeed, they are up quite spectacularly particularly cotton. And then wheat, which began the new marketing year on the 1st of June, shows some really good signs of perking up.

Mr. President, wheat shows an increase of about 50 percent in this new marketing year that began on the 1st of June. Indeed, new orders are almost double what they were at this time last year.

I ask unanimous consent that a table with these figures be printed in the RECORD and also an article from the Journal of Commerce, dated July 27, 1987.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The 1985-86 data for corn and grain sorghum have been adjusted to include shipments reported during the month of September, so a meaningful comparison can be made. Data are measured in thousand units (metric tons/bales).

Commodity	Year beginning	Accumulated exports		Outstanding sales	
		1985-86	1986-87	1985-86	1986-87
Wheat	June 1	22,314	24,558		
Corn	Sept. 1	29,153	32,600	2,923	5,488
Grain sorghum	Sept. 1	3,936	4,141	875	931
Soybeans	Sept. 1	18,956	17,882	847	2,290
Rice	Aug. 1	1,521	2,247	271	436
Cotton	Aug. 1	1,756	5,826	176	839
		1986-87	1987-88	1986-87	1987-88
New marketing year: Wheat	June 1	2,440	3,352	4,927	8,019

[From the Journal of Commerce, Monday July 27, 1987]

U.S. GRAIN SALES LOOK UP

CHAMPAIGN, ILL.—Farmers in the United States, who have been through "six rough years," are beginning to regain important export markets for commodities like corn, the president of the U.S. Feed Grains Council said.

"We feel good to be able to start reporting that we've bottomed out and things are turning up," said Darwin Stolte, whose organization helps find customers for U.S. grain. "That's the encouraging signal."

Mr. Stolte said the value of U.S. agricultural exports, an important factor in a healthy farm economy, fell from $44 billion in 1979-80 to $26 billion in 1985-86.

And, in about the same period, the export volume of feed grains dropped from 71.6 million metric tons to 36 million tons, he said.

But Mr. Stolte said U.S. sales of feed grain abroad should increase by a total of 14 million tons this year and next year, partly because of a federal farm program that has lowered prices to competitive levels on the world markets.

World trade in feed grain will increase 7 million tons in that same two-year period, Mr. Stolte said.

"What those two numbers tell you is . . . We're starting to see recovery in the world marketplace," he said.

In addition, he said it shows that the 1985 federal farm bill is working.

"We're getting back a lot of that trade that we lost in previous years simply because we're being competitive," Mr. Stolte said.

That, he said, has persuaded some countries, like Australia and Canada, to reduce the acreage of crops that were growing to sell on foreign markets in competition with the United States.

Aggressive marketing of U.S. farm products also is helping to reverse the export slump, Mr. Stolte said.

Other factors are the lower value of the dollar, which makes our products less expensive abroad, and higher petroleum prices, which improve the buying power of oil-producing nations, he said.

He also said some nations like Egypt and Turkey are improving their economies and spending more money on food.

At the same time, Mr. Stolte said U.S. farmers are reducing their production, which will help get rid of the huge grain surplus that has depressed farm prices.

He praised a recent proposal by the Reagan administration that all nations end all export and internal subsidies on grain sales and production and open their doors to free world trade.

He said that was "a daring first step toward a more rational trading system for agricultural commodities," but he cautioned against the United States unilaterally dropping its farm subsidies.

Mr. Stolte answered questions at a news conference before a scheduled speech to a Champaign Chamber of Commerce dinner sponsored by its agricultural committee.

Mr. BOSCHWITZ. Mr. President, I conclude by saying that, as is mentioned in this article, it is the farm bill of 1985 that has given some new life to exports and has currently ended the downward spiral of the farm situation. So we are more optimistic now as we look to the future in rural America and certainly the farm export figures would back this up.

I yield the floor.

THE NATIONAL PRICE OF R&D CONCENTRATION IN THE MILITARY

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President a scholar named Jay Storsky has made an impressively documented study of the effect of the heavy concentration of much of America's science and technology on military weapons research. Storsky is a research fellow at the Berkeley Roundtable on the International Economy. He has written a report of his study in the fall 1986 issue of the World Policy Journal. This scholar concludes that the dominance of the military in American research in many areas is already adversely affecting the scientific and commercial progress of this country in some important respects. Many of our best and brightest scientists are being diverted to military research that has little or no relation to building a stronger economy. In fact Mr. Storsky concludes that the way the Defense Department presently conducts its research could have at least two major adverse consequences for America's leadership in science and technology. First as the current military technology requirements grow more over specialized and unrelated to economic competition the billions of dollars the Government spends on military R&D pull available scientific personnel and resources away from research that could benefit our civilian sector. Second, as the Defense Department sees military technology lagging behind commercial technology, it has pushed American commercial firms into its own Pentagon R&D sector to boost the military performance. Storsky argues "it would be ironic if this effort ended up undermining not only the technical superiority of the Pentagon's weaponry but the very organizational habits that enabled America's civilian high-tech sectors to be so innovative and commercially successful in the first place."

Mr. President, the arithmetic of the DOD big government invasion of America's economic technology is impressive. Roughly a third of this country's spending on R&D is defense related. It's worse. According to a 1983 National Science Foundation report between 70 and 80 percent of the funding for the real cutting edge technologies is military. That's the lasers, advanced material and artificial intelligence. A 1985 NSF report showed that about three quarters of all federally funded R&D is presently linked to military programs up from 50 percent in the late 1970's. And a 1985 article in Physics Today reports that only 2 percent of the DOD R&D money is for basic research and less than 20 percent goes for R&D of basic technologies most likely to produce commercial spin offs that could enhance U.S. competitiveness in world markets.

Storsky offers a vivid example of how the dominance of military technology in the United States and the absence of military technology in Japan handicaps our country in its competition with the Japanese. He cites the different treatment of research with respect to lasers in the two countries. For America with our emphatic priority for the strategic defense initiative [SDI] or star wars—nearly all of SDI's x-ray laser research aims at extremely high-powered application—specific uses—in fact typically powered by a nuclear explosion.

Now how about the Japanese? In a June 1986 article in High Technology Kerry Fineran points out that the Japanese Government is funding private commercial research into lasers for immediate nonmilitary purposes. That is carbon dioxide and solid state lasers designed for industrial uses, such as welding and semiconductor diode lasers that can power compact

disc players and fiber optics communications equipment.

Mr. President, our country has many great military advantages—including our relatively sheltered geographic location, our large and skilled population, our rich national resources, our immensely productive free economic system. But in this era of military technology our scientific excellence is crucial. How tragic it would be for our national security and our survival as a great nation if we permitted the diversion and perversion of this scientific excellence for short-term fleeting military advantage.

THE KUWAIT REFLAGGING FIASCO

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, now let's get this straight. The United States is providing armed escorts to ships flying American flags that don't belong to us, which are carrying oil that is not going to us, for countries that won't escort their own ships. We are taking risks for an oil-producing nation that tried to blackmail us and bring us to our knees economically. American lives will be in jeopardy because this same country refuses to allow us to base minesweepers in their ports to protect their ships and their oil from mines.

Speaking of mines, the United States, the greatest sea power in the world has a grand total of three 40-year-old active duty minesweepers—all based on the east coast. Minesweepers, after all, are not glamorous budget items.

Meanwhile, overhead in the Persian Gulf, the Saudi's will not allow the aircraft we sold them to protect our ships. Nor will they allow us to station our aircraft in their country to protect our ships. Our aircraft are subject to attack from Iranian United States-made Hawk missiles which may be operational only because we sold them the spare parts in the covert Iran arms-for-hostage deal.

Our good friend, the People's Republic of China, to whom we are selling arms, has supplied Iran with missiles which could attack our ships. Our friends the Swedes have provided the fast patrol boats for Iranian hit and run missions. The Iranians are flying one of the most advanced fighters in the world—the F-14 with its Phoenix missile system because we imprudently sold them to the Shah.

So who do we have to thank when our first ship gets hit or goes down? There are so many choices to pick from.

MALCOLM BALDRIGE

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, our Nation has suffered a great loss because of the death of Secretary of Commerce, Malcolm Baldrige. He was so well liked and so well respected by all who knew him. He was kind and considerate to others, but he was very intelligent and could be bluntly decisive when forming and expressing his opinions about things.

Mac Baldrige was a real leader, too. He was persuasive. He had the ability, the self-confidence, and the skill to influence others; to make them think like he did because they were convinced he was right.

He had that effect on me, Mr. President. I remember hearing him discuss his concern that our Nation's businesses were at a disadvantage in their effort to compete with foreign businesses because of some of our own laws and our regulations.

One example was the antitrust law, section 7 of the Clayton Act to be specific, which is being interpreted and applied b9 some courts to prevent the merger of businesses and companies engaged in similar activities.

It was his opinion that this law ought to be modernized; that it ought to be brought up to date, and that the effect of foreign competition ought to be considered when we were determining whether or not a merger would result in anticompetitive or monopolistic business power.

I hope that when we get around to changing that law, Mr. President, we remember who it was who so forcefully urged that we consider the practical effect that this law was having on our failure to compete more effectively in the international and even the domestic marketplace.

For many of us, Malcolm Baldrige was also a good friend and he will truly be missed very greatly.

Our thoughts and prayers go out to his fine family.

At this time I cannot help but feel that all of us have been blessed to have had the benefit of his wisdom, his personality, and his force in our Government. I wish that we had more men like him.

I yield the floor, Mr. President.

THE COMMUNITY EFFORTS OF MR. JAMES C. BECKETT

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I rise today to salute the community oriented efforts of one of my constituents, Mr. James C. Beckett, of Cynthiana, KY. All too often here in Washington we tend to think and believe that we have a monopoly on the best solutions to the many problems troubling our States, cities, and small communities. We sometimes think that these solutions can only be realized through our broad, national approaches to these problems. Mr. Beckett, however, reminds me that there is an important message that should not be missed as we address the business of the Senate.

The message is quite simple, and it is not new. But it deserves restating from time to time as a reminder to national policymakers. The message is this: The best solutions in this country often come from those that have the problems. Although there are many vital programs which have been developed at the Federal level and which we should continue to strongly support, it is still true that the most successful communities in this country are those with people interested in seeking their own solutions and helping themselves and those around them.

Mr. Beckett is such a person. He is a leather craftsman in Cynthiana, KY and, among other things, he is especially concerned with the many difficult problems confronting the youth in this country. In particular, Mr. Beckett has been supportive of the many people and programs designed to help young people to "say no" to drugs.

Mr. President, I recognize this leather craftsman from Cynthiana today for his special efforts to find a way in which he could personally contribute to a solution to the drug problems facing young people in his community. Mr. Beckett contributed his most valuable resources—his hands and his experience—and has crafted a large number of jacket zipper tabs with the words "Say" and "No" inscribed on them. Together with the Cynthiana Downtown Merchants Association, several programs have been planned this fall for the youth of Harrison County, KY relating to this problem, and Mr. Beckett hopes to distribute the tabs to every child in the county. His efforts are part of a larger plan of the Cynthiana community to send this vital message to its young people.

Mr. President, I bring these actions to the attention of the Senate as an example of the necessary ingredients of potentially successful solutions. I believe the efforts of Mr. Beckett and the citizens of Harrison County in helping themselves to help their young people are as valuable as any broad solution that could have been crafted at the national level. I therefore commend Mr. Beckett for his actions and intentions, and hope that he will serve as a role model for many others in his community and beyond.

FUTURE UNITED STATES ASSISTANCE TO PAKISTAN

(Note: In the RECORD of Friday, July 31, 1987, during the remarks of Mr. GLENN, one of the exhibits requested to be printed in the RECORD was omitted, that is, an article from the London Sunday Times of July 26, 1987. In the permanent RECORD the article will be included in the middle column of page 21882, as follows:)

[From the London Sunday Times, July 26, 1987]

A-BOMB PLOT IS LINKED TO EMBASSY

(By Mark Hosenball and James Adams)

Pakistan's embassy in London was directly involved in an unsuccessful attempt to buy special steel used in the production of nuclear weapons, according to American intelligence officials investigating a suspected plot in the United States to export nuclear bomb materials illegally to Pakistan.

The allegation casts further doubt on denials by the Pakistani government that it knows nothing about secret efforts by businessmen in Canada and London to obtain the special, high-grade steel for export to Pakistan.

Last week, The Sunday Times revealed that Mohammed Iqbal Fareed, 55, a Canadian national with business interests in London, had been identified as a suspect in the plot.

Between April and August 1985, American intelligence sources say, Abdul Jamil, an official at the Pakistan embassy in Lowndes Square, London, contacted the London sales office of Carpenter Steel, a Pennsylvania company which makes a super-hard metal called maraging steel.

Jamil indicated that the Pakistani government was interested in acquiring 50,000 pounds of the metal.

Because of its use in the production of nuclear weapons, the steel cannot be exported from the United States without a special export permit and, according to American officials, Carpenter Steel sought assurance from the Pakistanis that the material would not be used in their nuclear weapons programme.

The deal never went through because the American commerce department ordered Carpenter Steel to cancel it.

Jamil said he was merely . . . an accounts officer and that he knew nothing about weapons technology. He said that in February 1985, the embassy had contacted Carpenter's office in Worcestershire asking for details on a "few types of steel". Jamil said: "They sent us details of stainless steel they produced. But they also told us about maraging steel."

Jamil said that in April that year a representative from the company visited the embassy to follow up the inquiry. "I asked our defense procurement people in Pakistan if we needed any maraging steel, which I understand is used for making missile parts and rifle barrels."

Jamil said he was mystified by the allegations. He said a small order for stainless and maraging steel was placed. When the company said there would be problems over export licenses for the latter, he told them to forget about it.

The Americans have long suspected that Pakistan is actively pursuing a nuclear weapons programme. The new wave of allegations came two weeks ago after American Customs agents in Philadelphia arrested Arshad Pervez, a Toronto businessman, and charged him with attempting to obtain 50,000 tons of maraging steel from Carpenter Steel and illegally export it to Pakistan. Pervez is being held without bail in an American prison.

American officials now believe that after the Pakistani embassy in London failed to acquire the steel through a direct approach to the American manufacturer, the Pakistani government activated a clandestine network of front companies set up for the express purpose of secretly obtaining nuclear bomb materials from the West.

The latest revelations are expected to fuel demands in Congress for a curb on American aid to Pakistan.

TRIBUTE TO MRS. MABEL AMOS

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I am proud to rise, today to pay tribute to a dear friend, Mrs. Mabel Amos, of Montgomery, AL, who provided many, many years of outstanding service to my home State of Alabama. Mrs. Amos began her public service in 1931, when she was appointed to the Revenue Department by Gov. Benjamin Meek Miller. In 1939 she was appointed by Gov. Frank Dixon as an assistant in his office, and he later named her recording secretary. From 1939 to 1966 she worked under six different Governors as recording secretary, serving until 1966, when she ran and was elected to the office of secreta2y of state. Mrs Amos then served for two terms as secretary of state.

Though Mrs. Amos retired from public service in 1975, she was the honoree of a surprise dinner that was held on January 29 of this year. Former Governors, Supreme Court Justices, appellate court judges, State senators and representatives, and many others who have loved and admired her throughout the many years of her public service attended, toasted, and roasted her. The next day the mayor of Montgomery issued a proclamation which declared January 30, 1987, as Mabel Amos Day.

Mrs. Amos richly deserves all praise and thanks which could ever come her way. She has worked through many years to help make Alabama what it is today. And throughout her service to our State she has won the respect of all.

Mr. President, I have finally received a copy of the proclamation which was made by the mayor of Montgomery, as well as an editorial that was made on television and a document entitled "Saluting the Record of Mabel S. Amos." I ask unanimous consent that these documents, as well as a letter that I wrote to Mrs. Amos that was read at the dinner, be included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I hope that each of my colleagues has an opportunity to see what an outstanding service Mrs. Mabel S. Amos has provided to my State and our Nation.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SALUTING THE RECORD OF MABEL S. AMOS

Recently, the many friends of Mabel S. Amos from across the State of Alabama gave her a "Surprise Dinner Party", honoring her for her many years of dedicated public service.

She was roasted, toasted, and generally discussed by former governors, supreme court judges, as well as appellate court judges, senators and representatives of the Legislature, preachers, dignitaries and many, many others who worked with her over the past forty-four years.

Mabel Amos came to Montgomery from Conecuh County during the depth of the Deep Depression in 1931. Governor Benjamin Meek Miller gave her a job as a state employee and assigned her to the Revenue Department. She was among a limited number that the Governor personally appointed and she served throughout his administration. She later worked for the Alabama Legislature during a number of sessions where she made many valuable contacts.

In 1939, Governor Frank M. Dixon appointed her as an assistant in his office, later naming her as Recording Secretary, where she served for the next twenty-eight years, being appointed, at the beginning of their terms, by the following:

Governor Frank M. Dixon, 1939-1943;
Governor Chauncey Sparks, 1943-1947;
Governor James E. Folsom, 1947-1951;
Governor S. Gordon Persons, 1951-1955;
Governor James E. Folsom, 1955-1959;
Governor John M. Patterson, 1959-1963; and
Governor George C. Wallace, 1963-1967.

In 1966, Mabel S. Amos while she was still serving as Recording Secretary to Wallace, took a leave of absence to run for the office of Secretary of State. She did not receive a clear majority of the votes but had such a commanding lead her two opponents withdrew thereby relieving her of a run-off.

During her term, she made such an enviable record trying to discharge the duties and responsibilities pertaining to the election laws under the provisions of the newly enacted Voting Rights Act. She was therefore re-elected for another four year term without Democratic opposition.

Under the present law, the Secretary of State cannot run for re-election but for one additional term.

Mable S. Amos retired at the end of her second term in 1975.

A TRIBUTE TO MABEL AMOS

January 30, 1987.

If Alabama politics is your thing, you should have been with me last night. I can honestly say I have never seen, under one roof, such a gathering of prominent political figures from Alabama's past and present. And they all came . . . some from considerable distance . . . to pay tribute to one of the great ladies of state government and state politics—Mabel Amos.

If you don't know Mabel, that's your loss. From the Brooklyn community of Conecuh County, Mabel came to Montgomery in 1931 to become a state employee. In 1939 Gov. Frank Dixon appointed her as his recording secretary. For the next 28 years governor's came and governor's went, but Mabel Amos stayed put. She became as much a fixture at the Capitol as the Jefferson Davis Star. After Dixon's term expired, she served as recording secretary for Govs. Chauncey Sparks, Jim Folsom, Gordon Persons, Jim Folsom a second time, John Patterson and George Wallace.

One of those governors, John Patterson, recalled last night that when he took office he contemplated putting one of his friends in Mabel's job. Very quickly he was told by a host of lawmakers that if he replaced Mabel he could forget his legislative program. Mabel stayed.

Patterson was but one of a roomful of active and no-longer active politicians and state officials who paid tribute to this lady. Former Gov. Albert Brewer, so rarely seen in these parts, was the master of ceremonies

. . . there were judges and retired judges . . . almost forgotten cabinet members of the past . . . legislators . . . and in a nice touch, also present were the daughters of Govs. Persons, Folsom and Wallace. There were people in that room who had been bitter political enemies, but they sat side by side last night because of one common denominator—their 2espect and love for Mabel Amos.

It was truly a remarkable gathering for a remarkable lady.

And that's the way we see it tonight.

BOB INGRAM,
Editorial Director.

PROCLAMATION

Whereas, Mrs. Mable Sanders Amos has been and continues to be a respected citizen of the City of Montgomery; and

Whereas, Mrs. Mable has served eight governors of the State of Alabama by being the personal secretary to Governor Frank Dixon and Recording Secretary for Governor Frank Dixon, Governor Chauncy Sparks, Governor James Folsom, Governor Gordon Persons, Governor John Patterson, Governor George Wallace, Governor Lurleen Wallace and Governor Albert Brewer; and

Whereas, Mrs. Mable has dedicated her life to her beloved State of Alabama and has served with distinction, advancing steadily in her career to positions of more and more responsibility, always demonstrating her willingness to place her concern for the public good ahead of her personal interests; and

Whereas, throughout her career, Mrs. Mable has earned the admiration and high regard of those with whom she has come into contact, and the affection of a host of friends; and

Whereas, Mrs. Mable retired from public life in 1975 after forty three years of public service including eight years as Secretary of State for the State of Alabama; and

Whereas, it is fitting and proper that Mrs. Mable be honored by her friends and admirers by a dinner given in her honor at the Montgomery Country Club on January 29, 1987;

Now, Therefore, I, Emory Folmar, Mayor of the City of Montgomery, Alabama, do hereby proclaim January 30, 1987, as Mable Amos Day in the City of Montgomery as an expression of appreciation for the years of dedicated service to the people of the State of Alabama.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, DC, January 22, 1987.

Mrs. MABEL SANDERS AMOS,
Montgomery, AL.

MY DEAR MABEL: I certainly do wish that I could take part in the "Roast" which is being held in your honor. Yet, though I am unable to attend, I would like to take this opportunity to thank you on behalf of every citizen of Alabama for the tremendous service that you have provided. We are all in your debt for your work as Recording Secretary to the Governor, and for the leadership you provided as Secretary of State.

In this history of our state, many people have offered their efforts and their involvement. Many have dedicated their labors and their time to accomplish the various achievements which have been realized in the past. However, I know of very few individuals who have matched the contributions you have made. Though some may think that you did not pursue the profession for which you were trained in college—that of being a teacher—they are gravely mistaken. Not only have countless people learned from your devoted service to the public and to our state, but you have also helped to teach six different governors the way to govern. From 1939 through 1965, as they came and left, there was one constant in Montgome; Mabel Amos was in charge.

You should feel very proud for all that you have done. Moreover, throughout your work, you have maintained the highest standards of honesty and integrity—qualities which have endeared your name to people everywhere. I commend you for your efforts.

In the future, I know that you will enjoy every happiness and that your life will be full with continued friendship.

With kindest personal regards, I am

Sincerely,

HOWELL HEFLIN.

TRIBUTE TO KENNETH L. ADELMAN

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, yesterday I became aware that the Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency [ACDA], Kenneth L. Adelman, has decided to retire from that position to return to a career in the private arena. His departure from ACDA will be a great loss for that agency, our Government's arms control efforts, and the Nation. He has been an outstanding spokesman for President Reagan's administration and policies.

Mr. Adelman has done a superb job of managing the Nation's arms control agenda. Although I originally opposed his nomination, I realized my opposition was a mistake after he had occupied the directorship of ACDA for only a short period of time. In short, he quickly gathered up the leadership reins at ACDA and, for the past 4 years, has managed the agency and a broad variety of arms control issues in a highly professional manner. My opposition rested primarily on my concern that it was unwise, with major U.S. arms control initiatives in progress in early 1983, to replace Eugene Rostow, a highly experienced and able diplomat, as ACDA Director. Ken Adelman simply proved me wrong. He has been a forceful advocate for arms control—for the elimination of chemical weapons and the sharp reduction of nuclear weapons.

He also has educated our allies and the American people on the fundamental importance of keeping arms control within a mature perspective. That perspective says that arms control efforts are important, but should not be allowed to obscure the necessity of maintaining our national security and a world balance of power that deters aggression.

Mr. President, I commend Kenneth Adelman for his superb record as Director of ACDA. I strongly believe that, long after his resignation becomes effective, he will continue to contribute his intelligence, articulateness, and vigor to the important cause of national leadership—not only on arms control issues, but also in many other areas. I know that most of our distinguished colleagues share my respect for his fine record of public service and wish him well in his future endeavors.

IMPORTS OF COTTON SHEETING FROM THE SOVIET UNION

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, more disquieting news regarding Soviet imports of cotton sheeting has recently been brought to my attention. I am amazed that the administration has taken unilateral action which allows the Soviet Union to import into this country more than 4 million square yards of cotton sheeting over the next 12 months. This action takes place at a time when the most recent Department of Commerce textile and apparel trade statistics are alarming.

For January through May, the textile and apparel trade deficit increased by 22 percent over the same period last year to a new recordbreaking $9.6 billion. This represents a $1.7 billion increase. At this rate, the textile and apparel trade deficit for 1987 will reach an unbelievable $23 billion.

In light of these statistics, I find it hard to believe that this administration would pursue a course so beneficial to our greatest adversary. Every year we spend billions of dollars to strengthen ou2 military defense. The major reason we spend these vast amounts is to protect the citizens of this Nation from the Soviet threat of domination. Yet, the administration, through this policy of opening our market to the Soviets, is making them stronger at our expense. For every new textile job created in the Soviet Union as a result of this policy, an American worker loses his or her job.

In summary, it is unsound policy to make the Soviets stronger at our expense. Stated simply, exporting textile jobs to the Soviet Union by virtue of this unilateral action makes no sense whatsoever. The best approach the administration can take is to stop any further shipments of textile and apparel imports immediately. At a minimum, a prohibition must be imposed at the end of the 12 month period to prevent a potential flood of these products from inundating the United States and displacing even more textile and apparel jobs.

Before concluding, I would like to bring to the attention of this body that the Finance Committee last week reported S. 549, the Textile and Apparel Trade Act of 1987. In light of unilateral action by the administration favorable to the Soviet Union and the most recent devastating Commerce Department statistics, reporting of this bill could not be more timely. I

urge swift consideration of this vital legislation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of a letter regarding imports of Soviet Cotton Sheeting sent by me to Ambassador Clayton Yeutter, the United States Trade Representative, on July 30, 1987, and testimony given by me last week before the Senate Finance Committee regarding S. 549, the Textile and Apparel Trade Act of 1987, be included in the RECORD following these remarks.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, DC, July 30, 1987.

Ambassador CLAYTON YEUTTER,
The United States Trade Representative, Executive Office of the President, Washington, DC.

DEAR AMBASSADOR YEUTTER: I have recently been informed that the Administration has decided to allow the Soviet Union to import over 4 million square yards of cotton sheeting into the United States in the next 12 months. It is extremely disturbing to me that the Administration has agreed to allow such a vast amount of cotton sheeting to enter our domestic market.

As you know, textile and apparel imports are gravely threatening the continued existence of these domestic industries. Recent Department of Commerce statistics show for the first five months of 1987, the textile and apparel trade deficit increased by 22 percent over the same period last year to a new record-breaking $9.6 billion. At this rate, the textile and apparel trade deficit for 1987 will reach an unbelievable $23 billion.

I do not understand how the Administration can allow a new textile supplier to enter our domestic market when current textile imports are costing us thousands of jobs. Some believe that the Soviet Union, our greatest adversary, could become a major textile and apparel supplier. This must not be allowed to happen. The Soviets will exploit and take advantage of this opportunity to ship additional textiles and apparel into the United States.

I believe that the best approach the Adminstration can take is to stop any further shipments of textile and apparel imports from the Soviet Union. I urgently request that this action be taken at the end of the 12-month period, if not sooner, to prevent a potential flood of these products from inundating the United States and displacing even more textile and apparel jobs.

With kindest regards and best wishes,

Sincerely,

STROM THURMOND.

TESTIMONY BY SENATOR STROM THURMOND BEFORE THE SENATE FINANCE COMMITTEE

Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the distinguished Members of this Committee for giving me the opportunity to testify in favor of S. 549, the Textile and Apparel Trade Act of 1987. It is most appropriate that this Committee hold hearings on this vital legislation so soon after passage of major trade legislation by the Senate.

Passage of the major trade bill is a step in the right direction toward solving the trade problems facing this Nation. But an important part of solving our trade problems includes passage of the Textile bill. Over two million jobs in the textile and apparel industry, more than the steel and the automobile industries combined, are at stake. Without passage of this bill, we simply are exporting these jobs to foreign competitors, making them stronger at our expense.

As this Committee begins consideration of S. 549, I believe you will find the most recent textile and apparel trade statistics alarming. Although we heard many, many statistics quoted during the Senate's consideration of the trade bill, I am compelled to quote the most recent ones relating to textile and apparel trade released by the Commerce Department. Figures released by Commerce show that for January through May, the textile and apparel trade deficit increased by 22 percent over the same period last year to a new record-breaking $9.6 billion—a $1.7 billion increase over last year. At this rate, the textile and apparel trade deficit for 1987 will reach an unbelievable $23 billion!

As dismal as these statistics are, there is more bad news for the textile industry. Measured in square yards, textile and apparel imports reached a record level for the first five months of this year. From January through May, textile and apparel imports totaled a massive 5.5 billion square yards, a 5 percent increase over the same period last year.

The most astonishing fact is that these record levels were reached in spite of the Administration claims that they have negotiated tighter bilateral agreements with foreign importers. The truth is that the Administration has taken no effective action to assure the more than 2 million Americans employed in this industry that their jobs are secure. Unless Congress takes prompt action to stop the flood of textile and apparel imports, the devastation will drive this domestic industry to extinction. Some two million Americans employed in this industry could suffer the tragedy of losing their jobs.

Further dismal statistics make it clear that this possibility is becoming a reality. Over 1000 textile and apparel plants have closed since 1980. Some 300,000 textile and apparel jobs have been lost to imports in the last several years. Incredibly, one-half of all textile and apparel goods sold in the United States are made abroad.

Along with these statistics, a recent study by the Office of Technology Assessment (OTA) warrants serious consideration by the members of this committee. OTA was created in 1972 as an analytical arm of Congress. Its basic function is to help legislative policymakers anticipate and plan for the consequences of technological change and to examine its impact on our citizens. OTA provides Congress with independent and timely reports in many areas—one being the U.S. Textile and Apparel Industry.

OTA recently issued a report entitled the U.S. Textile and Apparel Industry: A Revolution in Progress. Its conclusions are most disturbing. This report concludes that "despite the optimism made possible by technical progress, U.S. textile and apparel firms are in danger * * * in spite of these remarkable advances, the industry is gravely threatened."

The OTA report draws the following conclusion:

"* * * if penetration of U.S. apparel markets were to continue at the pace of the past decade, domestic sales of U.S. apparel firms would approach zero by the Year 2000, while two-thirds of the U.S. textile market would be served by [foreign] imports."

With this dangerous trend in mind, it is irresponsible for us as elected officials to stand by and fail to act when fellow Americans face such a bleak future. The livelihood of some two million American families depends on the textile mill, most of which are located in small towns across this Country. When a textile mill shuts down, its closing is a disruptive, shocking, and awesome experience. To some, the pain can compare to the loss of a loved one. The adverse economic impact of a community resulting from the closing of a mill can be devastating. A plant closing causes permanent scars. The disappointment, disillusionment, and frustration is lasting.

During consideration of the major trade bill, some argued that a global market approach will create new jobs in this country. The implication is that these new jobs will be filled by displaced textile and apparel workers. This is simply not the truth. New jobs in the utilities field, the health industry, or with legal or consulting firms offer no comfort to out-of-work textile employees. Their training and skills learned on the job are not transferable to these other industries. If foreign imports put a textile or apparel worker in the unemployment line, there is no guarantee that he or she will find work elsewhere.

Before closing, I would like to briefly comment on several provisions included in S. 1420, the major Senate trade bill. Regarding that legislation, it was often described as a "generic" bill, one which provides no special protection to any particular industry. My review shows this is simply not the case. This bill provides protection and support for several domestic industries. One provision, somewhat similar to the textile bill, limits imports of lamb. This section mandates the imposition of lamb quotas which would prevent lamb imports from rising above 28.5 million pounds per year. This provision will protect the lamb industry from the prospect of greatly increased imports.

Another provision helps the domestic steel industry. It requires the United States Trade Representative to seek bilateral agreements which restrain imports of welded steel fence panels, wire fabric, and welded steel wire mesh for concrete reinforcement. Still, another provision helps the telecommunications industry by directing that negotiations be undertaken to require foreign countries to open their markets to U.S. telecommunications goods and services.

Yet another provision extends unemployment benefits under the trade Adjustment Assistance Program to oil and gas workers who lost their jobs due to foreign imports.

There are other provisions included in the major trade bill which time does not permit me to discuss. After a review of these "special interest" provisions, I want to make it clear that they may be worthwhile and needed to help many domestic industries. In view of these provisions included in the Senate trade bill, the argument that the "Textile and Apparel Trade Act of 1987" does not merit support because it provides assistance to a specific industry, lacks substance.

In closing, I urge you to look at this legislation with an open mind. A vote against it is a vote in favor of exporting some 2 million textile and apparel jobs to foreign countries. It is not right to turn our back on these dedicated Americans.

Again, I appreciate the opportunity to testify regarding this vital legislation.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, has morning business closed?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I indicated last weekend that it would be my hope to be able to proceed to the consideration of the catastrophic illness legislation today. Senator BENTSEN is on the floor. As chairman of the Committee on Finance, he has reported out the bill, S. 1127, a bill to provide for Medicare catastrophic illness coverage, and for other purposes.

I have discussed taking up this measure with the distinguished Republican leader upon more than one occasion. He has made a bona fide, conscientious, sincere, and dedicated effort to get consent on his side for us to take it up. He has had some problems in that regard, but I do know for a fact that the Republican leader has made these efforts. I do not believe the Republican leader ought to do all the objecting himself on that side.

I am going to ask unanimous consent shortly to take up the Bentsen bill.

Before doing that, I should call attention also to a nomination on the Executive Calendar, the nomination being Calendar No. 212, M. Peter McPherson, of Virginia, to be Deputy Secretary of the Treasury, vice Richard G. Darman, resigned.

I understand there is a problem with that nomination, that a point of order can be made against it.

Mr. BENTSEN, again, is chairman of the Committee on Finance having reported the nomination, and he is on the floor and prepared to proceed to make that point of order.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT REQUEST—MC PHERSON NOMINATION

If it is agreeable to all concerned, I shall ask unanimous consent at this point to go into executive session to take up the nomination of M. Peter McPherson, of Virginia, to be Deputy Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. President, I do make that request.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. President, I object. I make the point of order that the nomination is not properly before the Senate because it was reported by a committee when it was not authorized to meet.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The point of order is well taken.

MEDICARE CATASTROPHIC ILLNESS COVERAGE ACT

Mr. DOLE. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I am happy to yield.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I am now advised that Senator WALLOP, who was to make the objection to proceeding to consider the Medicare catastrophic illness coverage bill, cannot be present until 1 o'clock, but I will make it on his behalf so I do not hold up the majority leader and the chairman of the Finance Committee.

Let me indicate that I have suggested that we ought to go on to the bill and then if there is determined opposition, we can talk about that. But there are about seven or eight on this side, and I understand there are not any on the other side, who are concerned about one or two provisions, who feel it is in their interest and in the interest of getting better provisions, not to proceed to the bill.

I think perhaps there is still some dialog going on, and basically we can work it out and can settle it this week. There are a couple of controversial provisions, one on prescription drugs and one on the tax. I assume they will be resolved once we get to the bill.

On behalf of Senator WALLOP, I would interpose that objection when the majority leader makes the request.

Mr. BENTSEN. If the majority leader will yield, Mr. President, catastrophic illness under the Medicare program coverage is long overdue. The House approved its bill on July 22. It is now up to the Senate. We should not be having this kind of delay because of some ideological maneuvering that may be taking place. Delaying action has a very direct impact upon the elderly and disabled who are most vulnerable. They are the ones incurring the highest health care costs. If we do not act, in 1988 we are going to see 10 percent of the elderly and disabled spend $1 out of $5 of their income on health and it is these individuals who often have to make the choice between paying for needed health care or buying basic food and shelter.

I understand there are a couple of controversial provisions associated with this bill. What we have done with the Senate bill is to create a basic premium to cover a portion of the cost of the benefit, and a progressive supplemental premium, in effect, to offset the balance of any new costs. The disabled and those above 65 will be reducing the law of averages for the individual. The elderly and disabled will be sharing responsibility of the financing of these benefits with their peers. I think it is a good approach that the committee has followed. Here you have a bill reported out of the Committee on Finance unanimously, 20 to 0. So there is excellent support for it.

There has been a lot of time to prepare for debate on this bill. The President addressed the issue first in his State of the Union Address in January of 1986 and again this year. We followed his proposal immediately in the Finance Committee. The minority leader is a distinguished member of that committee and has been very supportive in participating in the effort to develop and consider this bill. The distinguished Senator from Minnesota, now on the floor, took an active and very constructive role in the consideration of this major measure.

Mr. President, we had our first hearings in January after the President's address. We moved very promptly on this initiative.

The Bentsen bill has been reported out now—it was reported out on May 29—over 2 months ago. The House passed its bill earlier, as I stated. We had the report language filed a week ago and I advised committee staff to be particularly responsive to any members of the committee or any Members of the Senate who had any questions concerning this piece of legislation so that all could move on with it.

Now, the problem we run into in the Finance Committee is, as soon as we get back here after the August recess, we are going to have reconciliation on our hands, including the problem of trying to raise additional funds. That is going to be a pressing responsibility for us and the effort will be all-engulfing. So we have, I think, in effect a window here where we could move on this bill and clear this item from one agenda in September.

Full consideration of this bill has occurred in committee. The Senate ought to be prepared to debate and move on with the issue. If Members think that all of a sudden any problems they might have with S. 1127 are going to go away during the recess, I think they are wrong. Instead, problems are going to be accentuated. I think we will find the pressures have increased, and I think we will find the staffs will be diligent and hard at work in coming up with amendments to the bill. All the interest groups, whether associated with industry or representing consumers or the elderly, all will get very much more involved beyond what lobbying they have already done. All of these groups and organizations have been given ample opportunity to testify and present their cases before the House and before the Senate. I strongly urge that we now move forward with the committee reported bill.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Texas, the chairman of the Finance Committee, has made a strong case for proceeding with the measure, indicating it was reported out of the committee by a vote of 20 to 0 with strong bipartisan support. As I understand, it was voted out of the committee in May.

Did the Senator say "in May"?

Mr. BENTSEN. It was voted out of the House on July 22.

Mr. BYRD. And out of the Senate Finance Committee?

Mr. BENTSEN. I do not have that exact date.

Mr. BYRD. In any event, it has been on the calendar now for some days, I guess a week.

Mr. BENTSEN. The majority leader is right. We reported the bill out over 2 months ago, on May 29.

Mr. BYRD. May 29. And it has been on the calendar for about a week. I emphasize the point that the chairman made, that being we have a little window here. During the time that the conferees are going to be working on the debt limit extension, there is a window during which the Senate can be working on this measure and it would be well, as the distinguished Republican leader and I said heretofore, that this measure be passed before the Senate and the House go out for the break.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent—and Senators may reserve the right to object—that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar Order No. 260, S. 1127, the catastrophic illness legislation.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. DURENBERGER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and I do not intend to object, I have listened to the majority leader's description of his efforts to bring this matter before us. I have listened, of course, with interest to my colleague, the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, describe the path of the catastrophic insurance bill through the Finance Committee.

I suggest that they are both right. From my standpoint, I began this process in 1979 when I first came to the Senate. At that time it was the Senator from Texas and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. DOLE] who were talking to us about the need for catastrophic in Medicare.

President Reagan, I believe, in his State of the Union Message in January 1986 instructed the Secretary of HHS to take some action. I, Mr. President, was fortunate enough to be the Senate's appointee to the Catastrophic Insurance Commission and we spent from January 1986 until November 1986 looking at the entire area of catastrophic but making some specific recommendations in the area of Medicare. Those recommendations, as everyone recalls, were the subject of some small amount of debate in January and February of this year within the administration. That debate was resolved by mid-February in favor of the legislation basically which the Finance Committee has reported out as of May 29.

Now, in addition to the catastrophic part of this bill, the House has chosen to add drug benefits in part B financed out of the catastrophic arrangement, and to some degree there appears to be a debate behind the scenes on the Senate side as to the appropriateness of the benefit, as to the manner in which the benefit might be financed, whether or not it might be done differently.

But that aside, it strikes me the time has come for this body to deal with catastrophic insurance in Medicare. I hope that those of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, whether it is the Democratic side or the Republican side, who might seek to delay the consideration of this bill, because of their concerns not about the catastrophic but their concerns about the potential for a drug amendment here on the floor or something else, resolve those concerns as quickly as possible. Perhaps they might even come to the floor and discuss this issue as soon as possible so that those of us who have spent much of our lives in the Senate trying to come to the day when we could vote on a catastrophic bill might be permitted to do so.

So I encourage those of my colleagues who might be concerned about that potential, which is benefit expansion, but who care a lot about catastrophic, permit those of us who do care about catastrophic to proceed with this bill.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I just simply say that there are no objections on this side to proceeding. It is cleared on this side of the aisle. And I make the request.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me indicate to the majority leader that I am not opposed to proceeding. Neither is the ranking member on the Health Subcommittee. There are I think six or seven on this side who have indicated an objection.

It would be my hope that perhaps the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. DURENBERGER] might be able to visit with those Members yet today—I would be perfectly willing to sit in on that meeting—to see if there is not some way to get the bill on the floor and then we can maybe negotiate any differences. Amendments are going to happen on every piece of legislation. It is no different than any other legislation. We do have a few days in which to accomplish this, which would be certainly helpful to the distinguished chairman of the Finance Committee, Senator BENTSEN, as well as other members of that committee who are going to be tied up with reconciliation.

And so I would on behalf of the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WALLOP] object but on the hopes that we would still have an opportunity maybe, if we can work it out, to try this later today or the first thing tomorrow.

Mr. BENTSEN. If I may say, I would be delighted to be available for any conference so I might assist in trying to resolve some of these differences, if we can. I understand that one of the major issues apparently is the prescription drug amendment that might be forthcoming. But that has been known for a long time and we ought to be prepared to debate it.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I thank all Senators. I thank, in particular, the Republican leader for the efforts he has made to bring this measure up. I am encouraged by his statement that he will continue to meet with Senators on his side in an effort to remove the objection and get the measure before the Senate. Once it is before the Senate, as we have seen happen so often. Senators get together and resolve their differences.

I also thank Mr. DURENBERGER for his support of the legislation and for his efforts to mediate the differences among other Senators.

Mr. President, for the moment we have made our effort, and we hope that it can be renewed later.

At this time, Mr. President, I ask for regular order.

SENATORIAL ELECTION CAMPAIGN ACT

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2) to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to provide for a voluntary system of spending limits and partial public financing of Senate general election campaigns, to limit contributions by multicandidate political committees, and for other purposes.

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. BOREN, the chief author of the bill and the chief author of the amendment, which represents the latest compromise proposal, is on his way to the floor.

TEN-MINUTE RECESS

Mr. BYRD. I understand that Mr. BOREN will be here in probably 5 or 10 minutes. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess for 10 minutes.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 1:27 p.m., recessed until 1:37 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer [Mr. REID].

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

IMPORTATION OF OBJECTS FROM THE "TITANIC"

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I send to the desk a bill that Senator WEICKER will call up under the time agreement that the distinguished majority leader will now present, I believe. I am not introducing this for Senator WEICKER. He will introduce it himself. But that is so everyone will know what the bill is that the majority leader is referring to.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a total of 10 minutes on the bill to be introduced by Mr. WEICKER dealing with the importation of objects from the *Titanic*, provided further that no amendments or motions to recommit the bill with or without instructions be in order, provided that the time be under the control of Mr. WEICKER, and provided that the majority leader may call up the bill at any time after consultation with the minority leader today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objections?

Hearing none, that is the order.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I thank the Chair.

Mr. STEVENS. I thank the majority leader. The distinguished Senator from Connecticut will be here later this afternoon.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the distinguished Senator.

SENATORIAL ELECTION CAMPAIGN ACT

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, today we return to the unfinished business of the Senate, campaign finance reform. Senate bill 2 is among the most important legislation to be considered by this historic 100th Congress. It concerns the very integrity of this body, it concerns the integrity of the legislative process, and it concerns the integrity very directly of our system of democratic elections. The never ending pursuit of campaign funds, the money chase, will only accelerate if we do not act to limit spending.

Raising money is so time consuming it results in a diminished legislative capacity. This is not good for America. It also means, as I have previously said, that we are becoming a part time legislature because we must be full time fundraisers. These concerns should be enough to prompt action, but there is an even bigger threat to the integrity of this Congress that looms on the horizon. This cloud over democracy is the public outcry which will arise if we do not act to limit the campaign spending appetite and the excessive dependence on special interests.

Mr. President, public trust and confidence are the essential building blocks upon which a free and democratic government is built. Keeping faith with the American people is our highest obligation as elected officials. Sadly, we have seen in the past few months what can happen when a branch of Government loses sight of this obligation. The hearings of the Iran select committee have documented executive branch deception and efforts to skirt, if not break, the law. This breach of faith with the public and the Congress has significantly weakened the President's ability to act and lead. This is not good for America.

When Government breaks faith with the people as it did during Watergate, and as we saw again in the Iran-arms transfer, it is not only the misguided officials who lose, but all Government loses. There is a shared responsibility for good Government.

Mr. President, there is another issue which could seriously undermine public trust and confidence even further. Congress has suffered in the past from misdeeds by executive branch officials and Presidents, but the problem I refer to is the dramatic rise in campaign costs and our growing dependence on special interests to finance this money chase. If we do not act to establish reasonable, fair limits for campaign spending, we will by our inaction do serious damage to the building blocks of democracy—trust and confidence.

I am not alone in this view. It is a view shared by many on both sides of the aisle. Past public statements by Republicans and Democrats alike have indicated a need to limit the seemingly insatiable appetite for campaign money. What is at stake here is not partisan interest or advantage but the integrity of Congress. The public understands this and so do the media. We know the problem, we understand its dangerous implications, now we must act to do something about it.

Mr. President, it is important to remember that we were at a very similar crossroads in terms of Presidential campaign finance in 1974. In 1974 we were responding to a scandal, whereas today, we are trying to act to avoid one. In that debate several of the same charges were raised against reform—it was asserted that such a system would limit competition, provide incumbent protection, and that it would not work. History has proven all of these charges to have been unjustified. The system has had widespread competition. Certainly the large field of candidates seeking the Presidency in 1988, including several of our colleagues from the Senate, demonstrates that the system is a success. Incumbent protection has also not been a problem, as two of the three incumbents running under the system have been defeated—Presidents Ford and Carter. Finally, while the system is not perfect, it has been widely perceived as a success. Only 1 Presidential candidate in 35 has not accepted public funds, and I believe all candidates in 1988 plan on accepting the spending limits and public funds, including the Republican and Democratic candidates for the Presidency from this very Chamber.

Previously, I introduced into the RECORD, editorials from newspapers in 43 States and the District of Columbia. Those editorials, all approved or written by the local editorial boards, called upon Congress to act now on this important legislation. We simply must take the people's branch off the auction block. We cannot permit Senate seats to be put up for sale to the highest bidder.

Mr. President, in the 6 weeks since I introduced those editorials, many additional editorials have appeared in newspapers expressing support for the Senatorial Election Campaign Act, S. 2. This raises to almost 250 the number of editorials which have appeared on this subject in the past few months. These editorials come from newspapers in all regions, from cities of all sizes, and editorial boards of varying ideological predispositions. These editorials are at once a call to action and at the same time a voice of warning. We must act to stem the growing tide of money in congressional elections. If we do not, we will erode public trust and confidence in this, the people's branch. Similarly, the legislation has been endorsed by the League of Women Voters, Common Cause, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, by farmers' groups, senior citizens' groups, and many others. Opposition to the measure is rarely found in the Nation's newspapers—conservative or liberal. The only real opposition has come from some elements of the Republican Party and those special interests which are a part of the problem. This is a case in which the public interest is clear and widely perceived.

As the newspaper editorials point out, we are at a crossroads. We can act to establish fair and responsible limits on spending, or we can stand aside and put Congress up for sale to the highest bidder. I extend today, as I have done before, an invitation to any and all interested Senators who have not yet joined in this effort to come forward and work with us to enact limits on spending which would be fair, and which would foster competition just as the limits on Presidential candidates' spending have fostered healthy competition.

Shortly before we began consideration of the trade bill, Senator BOREN and I introduced an amendment which contains all of the essential ingredients of campaign finance reform but minimizes the role of public financing. It is therefore, in terms of real reform, a bottom-line position. The amendment has the following major features:

It retains aggregate PAC contribution limits, computed as they were in S. 2.

It establishes voluntary spending limits and limits on the use of personal wealth.

It contains no public financing for Senate General elections so long as candidates abide by the voluntary spending limits.

It establishes incentives for candidates to abide by those spending limits by making only those candidates eligible for preferential postage rates and lowest unit broadcasting time rates, and by providing that candidates who exceed the voluntary spending limits will trigger compensating payments to opponents who have agreed to remain within those limits.

It assures that candidates who are targeted by independent expenditures against them or for their opponents will be able to respond effectively, by increasing the primary spending limits of participating candidates when such expenditures are made during the primary period, and by providing a compensating payment to participating candidates when such expenditures are made during the general election period.

If Congress should enact and the States ratify a constitutional amendment permitting Congress to set spending limits, all public finance provisions of S. 2 would be dropped, but the spending limits set by the bill would become the spending limits for the constitutional amendment.

Finally, the very slight potential cost of this legislation is more than fully offset by ending the preferential mailing rates for political parties. In effect, the amendment, as it now is drawn, will result in no net cost to the Federal budget—and quite possibly could result in a reduction in the Federal budget deficit if all candidates live within the spending limits for their States. But the most important point is that it sets in place vital reforms to our present campaign finance system.

It will be most unfortunate if narrow partisanship, which in fact is mistaken partisanship, deters us from putting our own house in order. During the past few weeks Senator BOREN and other Senators have sought out colleagues on both sides of the aisle, including the distinguished Republican leader. We are hopeful that these efforts will result in sufficient votes for cloture so that we can proceed to consideration of amendments to the bill and ultimately its enactment.

Mr. President, I have referred to various editorials which appeared on the subject of the Senatorial Election Campaign Act. I ask unanimous consent that those editorials be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Bluefield (WV) Daily Telegraph, June 19, 1987]

TIME TO STOP STALLING: SEND PACS PACKING

Most governmental scandals involve broken laws. But in the case of congressional campaign financing, the laws are the scandal.

And at the heart of that scandal are the political action committees—or PACs, as they're generally called—which poured more than $130 million into 1986's congressional races, a six-fold increase from a decade ago.

The Senate is debating—or, to be more accurate, is trying to debate in the face of a Republican filibuster—S. 2, a bill sponsored by Senator Majority Leader Robert C. Byrd, D-W.Va., and Sen. David Boren, D-Okla., which would curtail the scandalous influence of special-interest money in congressional elections.

As Archibald Cox, the former special prosecutor in the Watergate affair, has pointed out, this deluge of special-interest money "creates the image—if not the reality—that Congress is becoming populated with legislative Ivan Boeskys, pursuing a political brand of insider trading in which the currency is public policy."

It's time to end the congressional campaign financing scandal.

It's time for Senate Republicans to join with their Democratic colleagues in limiting the amount of PAC money a congressional candidate can accept.

It's time to establish a voluntary system of spending limits and partial public financing.

It's time to enact S. 2.

[From the Charleston (WV) Gazette, July 8, 1987]

CASH CORRUPTION

Senate Majority Leader Robert C. Byrd, D-W.Va., waged a valiant fight for S. 2, the Byrd-Boren campaign finance reform bill to end the cash corruption of Congress. But Senate Republicans—fearful of losing their big-money edge—filibustered him to a standstill.

The heart of Byrd's plan is public financing of congressional campaigns, the same system used in presidential races. To obtain public funds, a candidate would have to accept severe limits on total campaign spending. (This is the only way limits can be imposed, since the Supreme Court has rejected direct ceilings.)

When Byrd's plan first was introduced, Minority Leader Robert Dole, R-Kan., promised there would be no GOP resistance. The Republicans did a turnaround, saying they can't tolerate use of taxpayer money for campaigns. This is baloney, because GOP presidential candidates have accepted $127 million of taxpayer money for campaigns since 1976.

Now Byrd and Boren have drafted an ingenious substitute. It requires candidates to accept voluntary ceilings—and, if one violates the limit in an attempt to buy an election, his opponent is given public funds plus lower mailing rates and other benefits. If both candidates honor the ceiling, no tax funds would enter a campaign.

Byrd's substitute is expected to come up for a Senate vote this week. We hope it succeeds, because eradication of the special-interest cash cesspool is desperately needed.

It reform is beaten again, here's a possible strategy:

The president is eager for Senate confirmation of right-wing ideologue Robert Bork to the Supreme Court. Byrd should specify that the Bork nomination will be considered after an election cleanup bill is passed and signed into law.

[From the Charleston (WV) Daily Mail, July 11, 1987]

PAC REFORM

Spending limits, not public financing, are at the heart of the latest campaign finance bill pending in the U.S. Senate.

The bill deserves a look. It is not perfect, but it is a better defense against those who believe in spending as much as possible, and then some, to literally buy their way into office.

The new Boren-Byrd bill relies on the original measure's voluntary tax checkoff to generate funds. But the money will be made available only in races in which one of the candidates exceeds a voluntary spending limit. The candidate accepting the spending limit will be able to draw on the public funds, but only in sums to match his opponent's spending.

Senators who have joined in the filibuster against the original bill were rightfully concerned about tax dollars being used to support political candidates. But if they can get a guarantee that the funds used to finance campaigns can be covered from a voluntary tax check-off system, their doubts should be allayed.

As Oklahoma Sen. David Boren says, those who continue to oppose campaign finance reform must explain why "it is good for Congress to spend more and more time raising millions of campaign dollars; that it is good for challengers to be increasingly closed out of the system; that it is good for business and labor groups and their representatives to be increasingly victimized by escalating fund-raising requests; and finally, that it is good to allow even the appearance that the most important offices of public trust in our country are being placed on the auction block."

Boren is not using hyperbole. The average cost of winning a Senate seat last year was $3 million. To raise that amount in his or her six-year Senate term, a senator must beg or borrow $10,000 a week.

And the costs keep climbing. In 12 years, the average Senate race could cost $15 million.

It's time for candidates to return to standing on their records and qualifications, rather than mounds of cash.

[From the Charleston (WV) Daily Mail, June 23, 1987]

CAMPAIGN REFORM

Rejecting the notion that Republicans should be taxed to support Democratic congressional candidates and vice versa, the GOP minority in the U.S. Senate has filibustered a critical campaign spending bill all month.

As Texas Sen. Phil Gramm says, taxpayer financing of congressional campaigns is an idea "totally alien to American democracy."

Two features of this legislation to curb the excesses of political action committees and the ever-rising cost of political campaigns, however, do make sense. Both sides of the aisle should join in instituting a voluntary tax checkoff scheme for interested voters, similar to that used now for presidential races.

The funds thus raised probably will not equal the estimated $500 million proposed for campaigns in the House and Senate, but it would be a start toward halting the "aristocracy of the moneybag," as Carlyle says.

Candidates who spurn the voluntary spending caps under this checkoff-financed system would find themselves accused of trying to buy their way into office.

The other reform that deserves a Senate vote is a limit on contributions from PACs. Rep. Jim Leach of Iowa captures the importance of this and other moves to dilute the impact of PACs:

"If the trend toward more expensive races . . . is not curbed, individuals elected to Congress will increasingly become indebted to either big business or big labor."

That surely will destroy American democracy.

[From the Fairmont (WV) Times-West Virginian, June 19, 1987]

CAMPAIGN REFORM BILL DESERVES A CHANCE

A campaign reform bill that would bring sweeping and necessary changes to congressional elections is now being considered by the U.S. Senate.

Unfortunately that bill, as of this writing, is bottled up in a filibuster as Republicans are objecting. Democratic senators, led by Majority Leader Robert Byrd, have been trying for the last week to break the filibuster in order for the bill to proceed.

We hope that they succeed in that task with the bill largely intact, because we firmly believe that the measure would bring much-needed reforms to the spiraling cost of campaigns and influence of political action committees, better known as PACs.

The bill being considered now would provide a voluntary system of state-by-state candidate spending limits coupled with a partial system of federal financing provided by income tax return check-offs similar to those now used to fund presidential elections.

It would also put limits on how much could be financed through large contributions such as those customarily made by PACs to candidates.

We agree wholeheartedly with the sentiments expressed by Sen. David Boren of Oklahoma, the main sponsor of the bill. "We must not let party politics stand in the way," he said Tuesday. "This is not a Republican problem. It is not a Democratic problem. It is an American problem. It is clear something is wrong."

Senate Republicans have said they will fight any campaign bill that contains limits on campaign spending or provides taxpayer financing, jolting hopes that the bill will be approved in any thing close to its present form.

Byrd has contended, and we agree, that the GOP opposition is basically to the spending limits. "If we're entertaining notions that we can have reforms without limitations on campaign expenditures and the PAC contributions, we're kidding outselves," he said. "The real problem is that of putting limits on campaign spending."

We would hope that some Senate Republicans would think the issue through and vote for an end to the filibuster so that the main bill can be voted on. Such a serious issue deserves at least that chance for approval.

[From the Huntington (WV) Herald Dispatch, July 9, 1987]

REVISED APPROACH TO PUBLIC FINANCING

On June 3, the Senate began consideration of S. 2, a campaign finance reform bill which would put limits on contributions to Senate candidates by political action committees and establish overall campaign spending limits tied to a system of public financing.

Led by Minority Leader Robert Dole, R-Kan., most Senate Republicans have been conducting a filibuster for the past month, blocking Senate action on the measure.

The most controversial aspect of S. 2—introduced on the first day of the 100th Congress by Majority Leader Robert C. Byrd, D-W.Va., and Sen. David Boren, D-Okla.—has been its pubic financing provision. A number of the bill's opponents have cited public financing as the principal stumbling block preventing them from supporting it.

Now, in an effort to break the GOP filibuster, Byrd and Boren have unveiled a proposed substitute for S. 2 which is designed to meet the objections to public financing.

The new proposal establishes a system of state-by-state campaign spending limits where no public funds would be provided to the candidates in a general election as long as they both agreed to abide by the spending limits. However, if one candidate decided not to participate and made campaign expenditures in excess of the spending limit for his state, this would trigger public funds for his (or her) opponent.

As the Washington Post has aptly put it, a candidate would receive public dollars "only if he agreed to abide by the spending limits . . . and his opponent did not. The public money would be only an insurance policy."

In addition to this "insurance policy," a candidate who agreed to the spending limits would receive lower mailing rates and other benefits. (This apparently would satisfy the Supreme Court's ruling that in order to establish a system of campaign spending limits, public benefits must be provided.)

Byrd and Boren's new proposal transforms the fight over campaign spending into a whole new ball game. With it, the two lawmakers have sent opponents of S. 2 a strong signal that they're more than willing to meet them halfway. The key question now is whether the Senate is willing to resist partisan pressures and set aside obstructionist tactics in order to act in the nation's best interests by enacting effective campaign finance reform.

[From the Huntington (WV) Herald Dispatch, July 3, 1987]

CAMPAIGN FINANCING NEEDS REFORMS NOW

There's been considerable attention focused on a Senate campaign finance reform bill offered by Senate Majority Leader Robert C. Byrd, D-W.Va., and Sen. David Boren, D-Okla., that's currently being roadblocked by Senate Republicans. But even though it's the Senate fight that's been getting the headlines, it's equally important that the House, too, act on the campaign finance issue.

A logical starting point for action in the House is a measure introduced by Reps. Tony Coelho, D-Calif., Mike Synar, D-Okla., and Jim Leach, R-Iowa, on June 18.

The Coelho-Synar-Leach bill would establish a voluntary system of overall spending ceilings and limits on the use of personal wealth in campaigns, along with partial public financing for House general election campaigns. And—importantly—it would limit the total amount of political action committee contributions a congressional candidate can accept.

The problem is clear. Excessive campaign spending and the increasingly large role being played by the free-spending PACs have served to sharply undermine public confidence in the integrity of Congress.

The current Congress may not be "the best money can buy"—but it clearly looks that way to more and more disillusioned voters.

The need for comprehensive campaign reform is more urgent today than ever before. The current congressional campaign finance system is a scandal and disgrace.

Indeed, in this, the Bicentennial year of the U.S. Constitution, there are few, if any, needs facing Congress that are more important than that for comprehensive campaign finance reform. We urge the House and Senate to join in early passage of this vital legislation.

[From the Huntington (WV) Herald-Dispatch, June 19, 1987]

TIME TO STOP STALLING: SEND PAC'S PACKING

Most governmental scandals involve broken laws. But in the case of congressional campaign financing, the laws are the scandal.

And at the heart of that scandal are the political action committees—or PACs, as they're generally called—which poured more than $130 million into 1986's congressional races, a sixfold increase from a decade ago.

The Senate is debating—or, to be more accurate, is trying to debate in the face of a Republican filibuster—S. 2, a bill sponsored by Senate Majority Leader Robert C. Byrd, D-W.Va., and Sen. David Boren, D-Okla., which would curtain the scandalous influence of special-interest money in congressional elections.

As Archibald Cox, the former special prosecutor in the Watergate affair, has pointed out, this deluge of special-interest money "creates the image—if not the reality—that Congress is becoming populated with legislative Ivan Boeskys, pursuing a political brand of insider trading in which the currency is public policy."

It's time to end the congressional campaign financing scandal.

It's time for Senate Republicans to join with their Democratic colleagues in limiting the amount of PAC money a congressional candidate can accept.

It's time to establish a voluntary system of spending limits and partial public financing.

It's time to enact S. 2.

[From the Huntington (WV) Herald-Dispatch, June 15, 1987]

CAMPAIGN SPENDING SHOULD BE CURBED

One of the most important issues facing the 100th Congress is reform of the way congressional campaigns are financed.

As the Washington Post has said, the present congressional finance system "is fundamentally corrupt. Every citizen knows that. So does every legislator."

Now the Senate has an opportunity to address this national scandal. A campaign reform bill, S-2, sponsored by Senate Majority Leader Robert C. Byrd, D-W.Va., and Sen. David Boren, D-Okla., has been report-

ed to the floor by the Senate Rules Committee.

Commenting when S-2 was introduced on the very first day of the current session, Senate Minority Leader Robert Dole, R-Kan., said, "I would only indicate that it is a matter that I feel should be addressed. . . . I do not believe there will be any effort to stall any such legislation." And yet that's exactly what some Senate Republicans apparently intend to do.

Using the filibuster and other obstructionist tactics to delay reform of the congressional finance system is a clear attempt by some Senators to evade their responsibility.

S-2 or something very much like it is a "must" if any common sense is to be restored to the way congressional campaigns are financed.

Two provisions are essential to any meaningful, comprehensive legislation to reform the current system: overall spending limits and limits on the total amount of political action committee contributions a candidate can accept.

Both of these provisions are found in S-2.

The bill would establish a voluntary system of spending limits, as well as limits on the use of personal wealth, tying these to partial public funding. The bill also would place aggregate limits on the amount of PAC contributions a candidate may accept. If this provision had been in effect in the 1986 election, total PAC contributions to Senate candidates would have been cut by two-thirds—from $45 million to $16 million.

The need for comprehensive campaign spending reform has never been more clear or more urgent. As former Sen. Barry Goldwater has said, "Unlimited campaign spending eats at the heart of the democratic process. . . . Our nation is facing a crisis of liberty if we do not control campaign expenditures."

The time is long past due for Congress to address this dangerous problem.

[From the Morgantown (WV) Dominion-Post, June 9, 1987]

THE AUCTION BLOCK

The success of campaign finance reform at the congressional level will depend upon whether or not the various forces at work within the legislative body can effect a consensus that will provide a strong, comprehensive product.

The other day, during debate printed in the *Congressional Record*, there was general agreement upon five principles for real campaign finance reform. They are:

First: The arms race in campaign spending must be halted.

We need firm and realistic spending limits for federal candidates, and we must close the loopholes that allow surrogate spending to make a mockery of current law.

Second: Those limits must apply to primaries as well as general elections.

Third: We must dam the rivers of special interest money that are flooding our candidates and our parties.

That means tough restrictions on political action committees, including steps to ensure that, once limited, PAC money does not pop up somewhere else under some other name. Soft money, bundling, and independent expenditures must also be cut back.

Fourth: The only realistic way to achieve these goals is to adopt public financing of federal elections.

That is how we took presidential elections off the auction block in the 1970s, and it is time to do the same for Congress in the 1980s.

We are mindful that President Reagan himself took public financing in his presidential campaigns. It was not mandatory that he do so. He did not express at that time a resentment or suggest that Congress was acting illegally in ensuring that there were going to be public funds available for the funding of the presidential campaigns.

Fifth: The net impact of our proposals must be to encourage, not discourage, participation by citizens, both as candidates and as campaigners. Campaign reform must not become an exercise in incumbent protection.

We must not impose entry barriers which are unrealistic or constrain parties from encouraging citizens to be involved.

These, it seems to us, provide the kind of guidelines that we need. Citizens who feel strongly about campaign finance reform of congressional elections need to let their representatives know.

[From the Allentown (PA) Morning Call, June 11, 1987]

CAMPAIGNS: NEW MODEL NEEDED

Not so long ago it was a widely held belief that in a democratic society long periods of governance were interrupted by a fine-tuning process known as elections. But that belief has been a fiction in American politics for decades. The fact of political life in today's America is that for the most part our political leaders are engaged in a continuous political campaign. No sooner are the victors of November rejoicing over their victory than they start fattening up the war chest for their next campaign. In the case of members of the House of Representatives (who serve two-year terms), their round-the-clock campaigns only end with death, defeat or retirement.

Aside from the detrimental effect that this divided attention has upon the primary job of legislators—legislating—their continuous preoccupation for money grubbing produces a malaise in the body politic and an apathetic electorate. The campaigns are too long and too costly. The experience of Gary Hart provides an example of the direct link between the length of campaigns and their cost.

Before Mr. Hart declared his willingness to move into the Oval Office in 1989, his 1983-84 presidential campaign was still $1.3 million in the red. Unperturbed, the former senator expected to be given $900,000 in taxpayer money for his new campaign, some of which he would use to help pay his debtors from his last campaign. However, the Federal Election Commission nixed that request because Mr. Hart dropped out of the campaign before he got around to filing for the money. Any appeal by Hart should fall on deaf ears. As we argued before in this space, no presidential candidate should qualify for taxpayer money until all previous campaign debts have been honored. Bankrupts (a name Mr. Hart may assume) need not apply.

Closer to home, the campaign finance picture is little brighter. Pennsylvania candidates for U.S. House and Senate seats in 1986 received a record $7.5 million from political action committees. These candidates spent a record $21.3 million in their election efforts. In 1980, the cost of these campaigns was $7.2 million—$2 million less than Senator Arlen Specter and his challenger, Bob Edgar, spent in last year's senatorial battle.

There are two ways to break the back of interminable campaigns and their multimillion-dollar price tags. The first is to limit the length of campaigns—almost an impossibility in our system. The second possibility—campaign-finance reform—though, is possible. That is if the politicians will it. Right now, Senate Republicans have bottled up a bill that would provide public financing of Senate campaigns—an improvement over the present vested-interest-financed campaign.

In the meanwhile, those Americans who suffer from domestic political campaign fatigue can direct their attention to Western Europe. There is a great deal to recommend the dispatch with which the European parliamentary democracies order their election process. For example, today millions of Britons will go to the polls to elect a government. It is a process that was last played out in 1983. Then, as now, the campaign was limited to three weeks.

If the purpose of a national election is to elect a national government, then the shortest time practicable to accomplish this is preferable. This would allow the government to do what it's expected to do—govern—and not have its members constantly occupied with raising money and spending time on the next election. So far the politicians who control the political process of campaign reform have shown little inclination to mend their ways. Although this is not surprising, it is disappointing. If the European election model fails to attract our politicians, at least they could make the effort to devise a streamlined American model.

[From the Astoria, (OR) Daily Astorian, June 24, 1987]

SUBSTANTIAL BEGINNING

The debate in the United States Senate regarding campaign financing has produced no surprises. Senators are reluctant to give up an arrangement that serves them well, but they know they must. They cannot avoid confronting the hard facts that campaigns for the Senate cost too much and that the candidates must depend too much on special interests for the funding of their campaigns.

Major reform is proposed by two Democrats, Sen. David Boren of Oklahoma and Sen. Robert Byrd of West Virginia. They have 47 co-sponsors. They would use limited public financing of congressional campaigns as it is used in presidential campaigns. They would tie this to a limitation on how much political action committees could contribute singly or in groups to an individual candidate.

The U.S. Supreme Court has ruled that limits can be placed on campaign spending and contributions only if accompanied by a system of public finance.

Republican senators, led by Bob Packwood, would prohibit all direct PAC contributions to candidates. But they would permit PACs to make contributions to political parties. Of course the parties would send the money on to candidates.

If you accept the theory that a sinner knows best how to cope with sin, Sen. Packwood has imposing credentials. He raised a huge amount of money—much more than he was able to spend—to get re-elected. Much of it came from PACs. Charging lobbyists $5,000 to have breakfast with him handsomely benefited Packwood.

The proposal which Packwood espouses would not get a handle on congressional campaign finance for it really wouldn't change anything. The Boren-Bird plan wouldn't entirely clean up an arrangement that is begging for reform but it would make a substantial beginning.

[From the Athens (TX) Daily Review, June 5, 1987]

AS WE SEE IT: CONGRESS PONDERS ITS OWN "FILTHY LUCRE"

Money is on the mind of Congress these days—money scandals, to be specific. Congressional investigators are trying to trace the byzantine trail of funds connected to the Iran-Contra affair, and legislation is in the works that would deal with the Wall Street money scandal of insider trading. But Congress is dealing with a money scandal of its own as well—a scandal that involves the way congressional elections are financed.

A growing number of lawmakers are expressing dismay at the amount of money required to run for re-election and the amount of time it takes to raise that money. Chief among them is Senate Majority Leader Robert Byrd, D-W.Va., who complains that his colleagues are spending so much time trying to raise campaign funds that they have no time for Senate business. Byrd and Sen. David Boren, D-Okla., are cosponsors of legislation to curb political action committees (PACs) and limit campaign spending.

As approved by the Senate Rules Committee, the Byrd-Boren bill, Senate Bill 2, would create a series of voluntary spending limits in Senate primary and general election races. It also would provide public funds for general election candidates who agree to abide by those limits. Spending for Senate races in the 1987-88 election cycle would be set at about $181 million.

The bill also would limit the amount House and Senate candidates may accept from PACs. Initially, the ceilings would range from $190,950 to $825,000 in Senate races, depending on the population of the state involved, and from $100,000 to $150,000 for House candidates, depending on the number of contested elections faced.

The Byrd-Boren proposal faces heavy opposition from Republicans, many of whom view public financing of campaigns as anathema. They have threatened to kill the bill by filibuster, and they are rumored to be working on an alternative measure. The Republican measure would limit PAC contributions but would not include public financing or spending limits.

Though the Republican measure would effect the status quo only slightly, it's reassuring that they at least recognize change is needed. With spending going up in each of the last five election cycles monitored by the Federal Election Commission, with special-interest PAC contributions to House and Senate candidates reaching a record $130 million in the 1986 election and with the 100th Congress more indebted to special interests than any Congress in the nation's history, the need for significant change is urgent.

Senate Bill 2 will reach the floor of the Senate sometime in June. As it looks now, Byrd has enough votes to pass the bill, but he does not have the 60 votes needed to invoke cloture if the Republicans filibuster. We hope he will push hard to get the necessary votes.

[From the Augusta (ME) Kennebec Journal, June 16, 1987]

CAMPAIGN REFORM NEEDS GOP BOOST

The good news is that reform of congressional campaigns, with their vicious television commercials and exorbitant cost, is possible this year. The bad news is that the debate is proceeding along partisan lines, with Senate Democrats almost unanimously in favor of a public financing plan, and Republicans opposed.

The Senate is fertile ground for reform. Most senators are simply sick and tired of spending much of their time hounding potential contributors for the millions of dollars it takes to win a Senate seat these days. With contribution limits more or less ruled out by a 1976 Supreme Court decision, public financing—as in presidential races—is the obvious alternative.

Yet the Republicans are balking. In recent years, they have piled up a huge fundraising advantage over Democrats, and are reluctant to yield that edge.

The effect on attitudes is apparent. The party-line consensus is clearer on this issue than perhaps any other, even such "litmus test" votes as aid to Contras. On a motion to limit debate on the Byrd-Boren bill, every Democrat but three voted yes, and every Republican but two voted no. (Maine's George Mitchell (D) voted yes and William Cohen (R) voted no.)

Republican senators, anxious to avoid being labelled as defenders of the deplorable status quo, have offered various alternative bills, none of which, however, is a serious attempt to clean up the situation. Limiting contributions by political action committees has been tried and has failed. Allegedly "independent" spending in support of a candidate has multiplied and made a mockery of the existing PAC limits. Only by capping the overall costs of campaigns, and using partial public financing—with candidates matching the amount from taxpayers—will we ever stop auctioning seats to the highest bidder.

If that last statement seems harsh, consider the number of incumbent senators—and unsuccessful aspirants—who ran for the office almost solely on the basis of their private wealth. The majority of current senators are millionaires—not exactly representative of the American people. And a majority—even from small states such as Maine—spent more than a million dollars in their most recent campaign.

How to break the partisan deadlock? Perhaps offer a sweetener for the GOP, allowing increased contributions from national party headquarters.

But in the end, the Republicans must ask themselves this question: is their demonstrated fundraising clout really an advantage when the average voter is disgusted by the excesses of campaigning with the buy-and-sell atmosphere and the television commercials, repeated hourly, appealing to everyone's worst instincts?

Sen. Cohen, we hope, will change his mind and vote to end the filibuster, and then for campaign reform.

[From the Bakersfield (CA) Californian, June 29, 1987]

YACKETY, YACKETY, YACK!

When is a debate not a debate? When it's a debate, of course. In the looking-glass world of congressional politics that absurdity makes sense, even if the phenomenon it describes does not.

S2 is a bill by Senate Majority Leader Sen. Robert C. Byrd of West Virginia and Sen. David Boren, D-Okla., supported by Common Cause. It is a comprehensive federal campaign finance-reform measure. It is separate from a state initiative dealing with many of the same issues sponsored by a similarly named group, California Common Cause.

That there is a need for reform is almost unarguable. According to federal figures, in the last 10 years, U.S. Senate campaign costs quintupled—at one point doubling in two years!

At the present rate of increase, a person who next year wins a U.S. Senate seat will have to raise more than $1,300 every day (including Saturdays, Sundays and holidays) for the entire six-year term to finance his reelection campaign—and that is with the incumbent's advantage!

Those projections are based on average national costs, which usually are less than California's, so the seat now held by Pete Wilson, which will be contested then, will be at prices predictably higher. Incredibly, in the following term, increases will continue, quadrupling again over the present quintupled costs.

Aside from disproportionate inflation in the cost of politics compared to all other inflation components as a problem is the source of the money.

Contributions from special-interest political action committees—ironically envisioned as a Watergate-era campaign reform—are increasing faster than campaign costs. That means that contributions from individuals and groups within a district are becoming proportionately less of a candidate's war chest and interest.

To mitigate drawbacks, many solutions have been suggested. Naturally, there is disagreement on such issues as public financing, the so-called "millionaire's loophole" (the ability to use one's own money in a campaign without limit), mandated TV ad rates, etc.

Opponents of S2 have begun a filibuster—a non-stop debate—literally not letting the other guy get a word in edgewise: no meaningful give-and-take debate, no votes, no solution, no end to it.

Thus, we have the world's greatest deliberative body—as the Senate likes to bill itself—crippling itself.

It does not matter what side one takes on this issue. The issue does not even matter in the larger sense.

What matters is that despite the heroism with which filibusterers characterize themselves—voting and civil rights, Vietnam, fair housing and states rights are issues that come to mind that were subjects of a filibuster—it essentially is an undemocratic procedure designed to stifle the expression of differing points of view and votes on them.

The Senate should cease demonstrating the antithesis of all it thinks it stands for. Filibusterers should have the courage to allow a vote up or down on S2's considerable merits and amendments that may be offered as compromise solutions to some of its problems.

If senators don't deserve this basic courtesy of democracy, citizens do.

[From the Bangor (ME) Daily News, June 18, 1987]

CAMPAIGN FINANCING

Senate Democrats and Republicans are haggling over competing campaign finance reform plans in what is described as the best opportunity in years to get things changed. They should get together and design meaningful bipartisan reform. It's about time.

The campaign-financing problem is not that politicians are accepting bribes in briefcases. Rather, they're openly accepting huge campaign contributions from special interest groups, which, in effect, buy access to their offices, and drive up the cost of campaigning by quantum leaps. Frequently, the money comes from wealthy out-of-state

organizations representing narrow special-interest groups, not local folks.

The impact is evident:

Senate winners in 1986 spent an average of $3 million, five times higher than a decade previously. During the same period, Senate PAC donations increased by a factor of nine.

Meanwhile, almost half the members of the U.S. House of Representatives got half of their money from PACS in 1986 (both of Maine's representatives received less), with the vast majority of the funds going to incumbents.

The Democrats' plan, co-sponsored by Sen. George J. Mitchell, makes a comprehensive stab at serious reform. It asks candidates to place a lid on their campaign expenditures, and to further limit their take from the political action committees. In return, they get public funding for a portion of their expenses, the limit depending on the voting population in their states. The system is voluntary, and it conforms to U.S. Supreme Court rulings.

In Maine, Senate candidates would be able to raise $190,950 from PACs, and spend up to $950,000 overall. Compare that to the 1984 Senate election in which Sen. William S. Cohen raised $417,657 in PAC money and spent $1,007,359 overall. Or compare it to the 1982 election in which Sen. George J. Mitchell raised $562,253 in PAC money and spent $1,208,026.

The new limits obviously would mean candidates would have to raise more money from the grassroots, and spend less on slick TV spots and other high-tech gimmicks. The new limits would slow the rise in campaign costs. And, most important, they would lessen the perception that politicians are being bought off by special interests.

The Republican alternatives don't deal with reform in as comprehensive a way. For example, they rule out spending limits on the premise they would favor incumbents, who are already much better known than challengers. This is not what has occurred with public financing of presidential campaigns, however. Since 1976, two of the first three challengers to incumbent presidents won their elections.

One of the Republicans bills purports to ban PAC spending altogether, but it leaves a big loophole in the practice of "bundling." That occurs when PACs channel individuals' checks to candidates in a way that doesn't count toward the PACs' own donation limit. Such a half-hearted approach to change is unacceptable.

Public financing would be paid for by doubling the campaign income-tax checkoff from $1 to $2. The $50 million price tag for a cleaner campaign system would be relatively cheap. As Common Cause Chairman Archibald Cox points out, that's less than what Congress spends on military bands. How much is too much to clean up Congress' image, and slow down the rise in campaign costs?

[From the Boston (MA) Globe, July 5, 1987]

CAMPAIGN-FINANCE CURBS

The U.S. Senate spent much of last month debating S. 2, the Senatorial Election Campaign Act of 1987, which would provide public funds for willing Senate candidates and limit political action committee money for all.

The Senate has spent time on the issue largely because the majority leader, Sen. Robert C. Byrd (D-W.Va.), believes that "our electoral system is in crisis and badly in need of overhaul."

The minority leader, Sen. Bob Dole (R-Kan.), believes that the Republican Party, as it approaches the post-Reagan era, will be in crisis if its ability to spend money is limited. He has supported a filibuster against S. 2 with some lame rhetoric: "Why are we not addressing soft money? What about all the phone banks that organized labor uses in Democratic campaigns?"

Dole complains that "Putting on a campaign-expenditure limit is, in effect, putting a brake on our growth in certain parts of the country." Can Republican ideas flourish only regionally? Dole insists that "we are not trying to drive true volunteers off the political scene," but big money fuels big consultant fees and consultants find volunteers a nuisance.

Sen. Phil Gramm (R-Texas) says, "There is something very un-American about the whole approach" to public funds. It was not un-American when President Reagan agreed to accept voluntary limits in 1980 and 1984. The president obviously thinks that Republican ideas are strong enough to do without millions in advertising fertilizer.

Dole—who will soon be accepting "un-American" public funds for his presidential campaign—has made this issue a partisan test, along with Sen. Bob Packwood (R-Ore.) and others who are ignoring the real strengths of their own party.

Curbing big money was one of the final efforts of Barry Goldwater before he retired from the Senate. Goldwater, like Reagan, had the courage of his convictions. Only two Republicans, Sens. John H. Chafee of Rhode Island and Robert T. Stafford of Vermont, have voted to stop a filibuster aimed at protecting their party's money advantage. They are beginning to look wiser each day.

[From the Boulder (CO) Daily Camera, July 7, 1987]

LIMIT CAMPAIGN SPENDING

Sponsors of a Senate bill aimed at congressional campaign finance reform have offered an alternate plan in an effort to shut off a filibuster led by Senate Minority Leader Robert Dole, R-Kan.

Noting that many senators have claimed to be in favor of campaign spending reform but have problems advocating public financing, sponsors, led by Sen. David Boren, D, Okla., altered their proposal to restrict public financing to just the cases where candidates attempt to "buy" an election.

Sen. Dole and others blocking consideration of the original S.B. 2 have repeatedly said that they haven't heard a demand from the folks back home for taxpayers to pick up the cost of congressional campaigning.

Responding to the substance of the complaint, Sen. Boren and Senate Majority Leader Robert Byrd, D-W.Va., last week proposed a compromise. The new proposal would rely on campaign spending limits established on the basis of population, and would limit aggregate political action committee spending in each race.

Public financing would be provided only in instances where candidates violate the legal limits in an attempt to overwhelm their opponents.

This is a serious compromise on the part of the sponso2s of S.B. 2, in our opinion. It removes a valid objection—that public financing might add too much in new expenses at a time when the most pressing issue facing the country is the mounting national debt. Given a good-faith effort on the part of those seeking office, the new reform measure should cost very little. At the same time it would stop the runaway cost of campaigning and end what has become a national scandal of PAC-controlled politics.

In a recent editorial, the Washington Post pointed out that the average campaign for the Senate now costs around $3 million. That means that an incumbent has to raise almost $10,000 a week for his entire term of office to meet the competition. The National Journal has reported that at the end of 1986, four Senate incumbents had raised $1 million each for their 1990 campaigns. Three other incumbents had already raised over $700,000 for their 1990 campaigns.

Surely the demands of such heavy money raising cut into the quality of performance in office. The Senate can end this treadmill of wasted effort by voting to end the filibuster on campaign finance reform when it comes up later this week. The bill's sponsors have earned a full debate on the measure with their new and better proposal.

[From the Bozeman (MT) Daily Chronicle, June 23, 1987]

LIMIT PAC INFLUENCE

SENATE CAMPAIGN BILL A GOOD STARTING POINT

Every so often Congress comes face-to-face with its own self interests and the resulting battles are typically severe and protracted.

That's the case today as the U.S. Senate wrestles with a bill designed to curb campaign spending and reduce the influence of organizations that dole out cash to their favorite politicians.

The bill would set voluntary spending limits in Senate races and give Senate candidates public campaign funds in return for staying within those limits. The bill would place a limit on the total amount of contributions a candidate could receive from political action committees, or PACs.

According to Common Cause, had the Senatorial Election Campaign Act been law during the 1986 Senate elections, PAC contributions to candidates would have been slashed from nearly $29 million to $10 million.

If the bill had been law during the 1985-86 campaigns, Idaho Sen. Steve Symms would have been allowed about $191,000 in PAC contributions instead of the $1.36 million he reportedly received.

The bill, in spirit, is a step in the right direction and away from the ritual money chasing that has become a hallmark of congressional campaigns.

The hunt for PAC donations not only gives incumbents a tremendous advantage and sends campaign costs skyrocketing but it encourages public suspicion about the strings attached to such massive donations.

Although there is much lipservice sympathy for the idea of lowering campaign costs and reducing the potential for scandal, the finance reform bill is being effectively stalled by Senate Republicans.

One problem with the bill, critics say, is its use of public tax dollars for campaigning. The money would be offered as an incentive to candidates who voluntarily limit PAC receipts. There may be room for compromise on that point—candidates could be given mail privileges instead of cash, for instance—but the use of some form of public incentive to reduce PAC influence may be necessary.

But the major GOP objection the campaign finance bill has nothing to do with tax dollars or public policy. The sticking point is politics.

The problem, Republican critics say, is timing. Limits on campaign spending couldn't come at a worse time for the GOP minority which naturally wants no limits placed on the amount of money it feels it needs to spend to recapture control of the Senate.

In effect, the proposed spending reforms would give Democratic incumbents the upper hand in keeping their majority. Republicans argue. Would Democrats be so willing to limit PAC contributions if they were in the minority?

While there may be some short-term validity to the GOP complaint, that purely political argument could be used to effectively kill any move to get campaign spending under control. One party or another will always be in the minority.

Congress has to start somewhere and now is as good a time as any.

Only the most naive believe that money has little influence on political decisions. That influence must be controlled and the Senatorial Election Campaign Act is a worthwhile place to begin the job.

[From the Brookings (SD) Daily Register, June 5, 1987]

A DUBIOUS DISTINCTION

This past fall, South Dakota finished first in something, but it was a rather dubious distinction.

To get your vote in the race for the Senate, Tom Daschle and Jim Abdnor combined to spend more than $25 per vote, more than double the previous per-vote spending record set in 1984 in the race between Sen. Jesse Helms and Gov. Jim Hunt in North Carolina.

More than $7,000,000 was spent electing a senator from South Dakota!

The Daschle-Abdnor confrontation was only one example of how public trust in our election system is being undermined by big money interests who invest huge sums of money to curry favor with candidates.

It's understandable that voters are starting to wonder if their candidates are being bought and paid for by the special interests.

The process of raising and spending such huge amounts of money is what was in question this week as the Senate began debate on a bill to limit campaign spending.

In a statement made in April, Daschle said, "More than any other single facto2 it is this almost unlimited funding that is a problem. If we are ever to get a handle on the multiple maladies that afflict our campaign financing system, our very first step must be to limit spending."

That is what Senate Bill 2 is designed to do.

S-2 is the Senatorial Election Campaign Act which was introduced by Sen. David Boren, D-Okla., and Senate Majority Leader Robert Byrd, D-W.Va. It's the first comprehensive campaign finance reform bill sent to the full Senate since 1977.

The bill provides a system of public financing for Senate elections. It would require candidates to limit their total spending in both the primary and general elections in return for being eligible to receive public funds to finance their general election campaigns.

In South Dakota, that limit would be $950,000 on the general election per candidate and $636,500 in the primary.

That limit of $1.6 million is well under half what both Daschle and Abdnor spent in 1986.

That extra $2 million allowed the candidates to go far beyond what was necessary to get their messages to the voters of South Dakota. There was so much money in the two campaigns that they almost couldn't spend it all.

In the last few weeks, the money which was burning a hole in the pockets of the candidates was used to burn their opponents with negative advertising.

The presence of big money throughout the campaign created another problem for the candidates. The candidates had to spend an inordinate amount of 4ime trying to get those big bucks into their coffers.

That meant hours and hours on the phone and in meetings courting the big money people. Now even the most naive must wonder what promises had to be made to get that money.

The second important part of S-2 is a limit on how much money a candidate can accept from political action committees.

The limit in South Dakota would be $190,950.

For example, if S-2 had been in effect during the last election, the PAC receipts of Daschle would have been cut a whopping $971,000; for Abdnor, the cut would have been equally dramatic at $892,000.

We don't need to spend $7 million to get the message of candidates to the people of South Dakota.

If we don't limit campaign spending soon, what the voters of our state think won't much matter anymore.—Doug Anstaett, editor and publisher.

[From the Buffalo (NY) News, July 5, 1987]

CONGRESS SHOULD ADOPT ELECTION SPENDING CURBS

A sorely needed measure to reform congressional campaign financing is bogged down in the Senate—thanks to filibustering by misguided Republican opponents.

The bill, sponsored by Sen. David Boren, D-Okla., and Senate Majority Leader Robert Byrd, D-W.Va., is modeled on the successful method of funding presidential campaigns and would provide partial public funding for Senate candidates who agree to abide by voluntary spending limits.

It would also restrict the total amount of money a candidate can accept from political action committees (PACs) set up by a wide assortment of special interest groups.

Public financing of campaigns has its drawbacks, but it is the only practical way of getting candidates to accept campaign spending limits. The Supreme Court has ruled out mandatory limits on campaign spending as an unconstitutional infringement on the right of free speech, so any limits must be voluntary.

The significant fact is that public funding has worked very well in controlling spending and restraining the influence of private money in presidential elections.

The need for a similar plan for congressional campaigns is clear. The cost of these campaigns has reached vast proportions, and the growing dependency of candidates on PAC dollars, in particular, ought to alarm every citizen who recognizes the potentially corrupting nature of special interest financing.

Sen. Boren pointed out that the average cost of a successful Senate campaign has soared from $600,000 to more than $3 million in just 10 years. One consequence, as he noted, is that senators must spend more and more of their time, not on representing their constituents and working for the country, but simply on rising campaign funds.

"At this rate," said Boren, "a newly elected senator will have to raise more than $40,000 every single month of his or her six-year term just to fund a re-election race in 1992."

The surge in PAC contributions is no less worrisome. Common Cause, a leading proponent of campaign financing reform, stressed that PAC contributions to Senate candidates have grown from $5 million in 1976 to $45 million last year. One out of four senators received $1 million in PAC funds.

There is no excuse for Congress to continue to hide from this problem. In the words of Common Cause President Fred Wertheimer, the public financing bill now before the Senate is fair legislation "that will limit campaign spending and the undue influence of political money in Congress while allowing for competitive elections."

Unless its supporters make their feelings known, however, effective campaign reform is likely to remain buried under an continuing avalanche of special interest dollars.

[From the South Idaho Press, Burley, ID, June 14, 1987]

EFFORT ON TO CUT POWER OF PAC'S

Money is on the mind of Congress these days—money scandals, to be specific. Congressional investigators are trying to trace the byzantine trail of funds connected to the Iran-Contra affair, and legislation is in the works that would deal with the Wall Street money scandal of insider trading. But Congress is dealing with a money scandal of its own as well—a scandal that involves the way congressional elections are financed.

A growing number of lawmakers are expressing dismay at the amount of money required to run for reelection and the amount of time it takes to raise that money. Chief among them is Senate Majority Leader Robert Byrd, D-W.Va., who complains that his colleagues are spending so much time trying to raise campaign funds that they have no time for Senate business. Byrd and Sen. David Boren, D-Okla., are cosponsors of legislation to curb political action committees (PACs) and limit campaign spending.

As approved by the Senate Rules Committee, the Byrd-Boren bill, Senate Bill 2, would create a series of voluntary spending limits in Senate primary and general election races. It also would provide public funds for general election candidates who agree to abide by those limits. Spending for Senate races in the 1987-88 election cycle would be set at about $181 million.

The bill also would limit the amount House and Senate candidates may accept from PACs. Initially, the ceilings would range from $190,950 to $825,000 in Senate races, depending on the population of the state involved, and from $100,000 to $150,000 for House candidates, depending on the number of contested elections faced.

The Byrd-Boren proposal faces heavy opposition from Republicans, many of whom view public financing of campaigns as anathema. They have threatened to kill the bill by filibuster, and they are rumored to be working on an alternative measure. The Republican measure would limit PAC contributions but would not include public financing or spending limits.

Though the Republican measure would effect the status quo only slightly, it's reassuring that they at least recognize change is needed. With spending going up in each of the last five election cycles monitored by the Federal Election Commission, with special-interest PAC contributions to House and Senate candidates reaching a record

$130 million in the 1986 election and with the 100th Congress more indebted to special interests than any Congress in the nation's history, the need for significant change is urgent.

[From the Burlington Free Press, Burlington, VT, June 16, 1987]

DEMOCRATS' BILL TO BLUNT PAC'S WORTH PASSING

Even in Vermont, where the cost of a seat in the U.S. House or Senate is notoriously low by national standards, entirely too much money is being spent on political campaigns.

Excessive spending is fueled by more and more cash from political action committees, or PACs. As the power of government to regulate private interests has grown, so has the appetite of those interests to win and keep friends through judiciously distributed campaign contributions.

For the first time in more than a decade, Senate leaders appear to be serious about campaign spending reform. Democrats have written a bill worthy of passage not because it is ideal, but because it goes about as far as Congress can be expected to go on an issue so dear to every member's heart.

The Democrats would offer public funding to any Senate candidate who accepts spending limits, and would set a limit on PAC contributions to candidates and national political parties.

Republicans complain the Democrats want to pick the taxpayer's pocket to finance their own re-election and have blocked action on the bill. But what have the Republicans offered in return? Their own proposals are mere tinkering with the size of individual contributions.

Public financing might not be anybody's first choice. But a U.S. Supreme Court ruling has made mandatory spending limits unconstitutional. Voluntary limits offering the carrot of public funding seem to be best remaining choice.

It could be argued, in fact, that the Democrats didn't go far enough. Their proposal would not so much reduce campaign spending, as put a limit on future increases. (Under the proposed rules, a candidate could still spend more than $8 million on a campaign in California).

Nor would the bill necessarily work to an incumbent's advantage, at least in Vermont. Here, the bill would limit each candidate to about $1 million on the general election (plus, another $650,000 in the primary).

Last year, Sen. Patrick Leahy, D-Vt., spent $1.6 million defeating Republican Richard Snelling (who spent $1.2 million). Leahy was also much more dependent on the PACs, which kicked in more than 40 percent of his funding. The new law would limit him to 30 percent of the primary election spending limit.

The cost of running for federal office in the United States has doubled in the last 10 years. If the cost is not to double again, if elections are not to be buried in an avalanche of special interest money, if candidates are not to spend more time talking to out-of-state fundraisers than to their voters, Congress must seize the opportunity offered by the Democratic proposal.

[From the Nevada Appeal, Carson City, NV, July 2, 1987]

ELECTION FINANCE REFORM NEEDED

The U.S. Senate is tied up in knots over an issue that to lawmakers is of paramount importance.

It's not the Iran-Contra scandal or the budget or trade strategy. It's money—campaign money, to be exact.

Since early June, Senate Minority Leader Robert Dole, R-Kan., and most of his Republican colleagues have been engaged in a filibuster to prevent the Senate from acting on Senate Bill 2, much-needed legislation that would alter the system of election finance.

At issue is a Democratic-sponsored measure that would create voluntary spending limits in Senate elections, provide public funds for Senate general-election candidates agreeing to abide by the limits and restrict the amount of money that House and Senate candidates may accept from political-action committees, or PACs.

In 1988, if the bill were to pass, general-election limits would range from $950,000 in a low-population state such as Wyoming to nearly $5.5 million in California.

Senate Republicans don't necessa2ily dispute the need for campaign reform. Dole himself has spoken out about the outrageous expense of running for public office and the undue influence that PACs wield as a prime source of campaign financing.

In the past 10 years, PAC contributions to Senate candidates have increased from $5 million to $45 million; campaign spending in Senate elections has increased from $38 million to $179 million. Senators complain about becoming "panhandlers."

In the words of the public-interest lobby Common Cause, "We have seen a monster created, a fundamentally corrupt campaign-finance system for Congress."

Senate Republicans object to the idea of using government money to run congressional campaigns—even though the public financing scheme for presidential candidates is working well. They argue that spending limits in congressional campaigns help incumbents to the detriment of challengers.

The Republicans have offered a compromise that, in effect, is no compromise. It would cut the maximum amount that any single PAC can give to a candidate, but it would eliminate the spending limit and public-financing components of the legislation.

Campaign reform simply will not happen without spending limits.

The Supreme Court has ruled that there must be some form of public benefits in order to establish a system of voluntary campaign-spending limits.

The spending limits contained in Senate Bill 2 are reasonable and voluntary, as required by the Supreme Court.

If presidential elections are a reliable guide, Senate Bill 2 will provide for competitive elections. Neither party will be at a disadvantage.

Dole and his fellow filibusterers need to step aside and give the reform legislation a chance to slay the campaign monster.

In doing so, they would be helping restore the integrity of our representative form of government.

(Appeal editorials are the opinions of the newspaper's editorial board. All other opinions expressed on the Opinion page are those of the artist or author indicated.)

[From the Chandler (AZ) Arizonan, May 29, 1987]

CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM DUE

The Senatorial Election Campaign Act has cleared the Senate Rules Committee but faces the roadblock of a Senate filibuster unless integrity wins out over greed in the hearts of some members of the Senate.

The bill, known as the Boren-Byrd amendment, would place overall voluntary spending limits on senatorial campaigns and limits on the amount of political action committee contributions a candidate could accept.

Among those in opposition to the campaign finance reform act are such big-gun PACs as the American Medical Association and the National Association of Home Builders.

Supporters of the legislation include the American Association of Retired Persons and the International Association of Chiefs of Police.

Senate opposition already has set up a ruse in the amendment introduced by Sen. Todd Stevens, R-Alaska. It is campaign finance reform in name only, and contains neither the spending limits nor the PAC contribution limits.

PAC contributions to Senate candidates have jumped from $5.4 million in the 1976 election to $45.7 million in the 1986 election. In the 1976 election it took an average of $610,000 to win a Senate race. In 1986 it took $3 million.

Election campaigns are too expensive and financed to too great a degree by PACs. The Senatorial Election Campaign Act is long overdue.

[From the Chillicothe (OH) Gazette, May 28, 1987]

CAMPAIGN ACT NEEDED TO CURB SPENDING

Money sets the world in motion, and politicians want all the action they can get.

Currently the full Senate has in its hopper the Senatorial Election Campaign Act which would put an overall spending limit and limits on the total amount of Political Action Committee contributions a candidate can accept.

The act, designated S. 2, has picked up momentum, winning endorsements by 65 national organizations, the support of 49 senators—only two short of the majority needed for passage—and according to a Gallup Poll the approval of a majority of the American people who feel campaign expense reform is long overdue.

So, what's the problem? Opponents vow to block action on S. 2 by filibustering. To end such a filibuster, 60 senators would have to vote for cloture, and that means S. 2 is in deep trouble.

The PACs, which invest millions in legislators to ensure favorable votes on their pet projects, are not about to take reform lying down. Without the leverage of virtually unlimited cash contributions, the committees would find their powers checked.

Congressional campaigning is costly; in the last 10 years overall expenditures on Senate races have increased fivefold from $38.1 million in 1976 to $178.9 million in 1986.

The reform act would clamp a lid on such outrageous spending. Candidates would be required to agree to limit total spending in both the primary and general election in return for which they would be eligible for public funds for the general election campaigns.

The electorate has a right to expect its senators and representatives to do the job for which they presumably have been elected. That is to govern. Not be the puppets of the money machines that churn out the wherewithal needed to keep them on the Congressional payroll.

[From the Messenger, Clemson, SC, June 5, 1987]

CONGRESS PONDERS

Money is on the mind of Congress these days—money scandals, to be specific. Congressional investigators are trying to trace the byzantine trail of funds connected to the Iran-Contra affair, and legislation is in the works that would deal with the Wall Street money scandal of insider trading. But Congress is dealing with a money scandal of its own as well—a scandal that involves the way congressional elections are financed.

A growing number of lawmakers are expressing dismay at the amount of money required to run for re-election and the amount of time it takes to raise that money. Chief among them is Senate Majority Leader Robert Byrd, D-W. VA., who complains that his colleagues are spending so much time trying to raise campaign funds that they have no time for Senate business. Byrd and Sen. David Boren, D-Okla., are co-sponsors of legislation to curb political action committees (PACs) and limit campaign spending.

As approved by the Senate Rules Committee, the Byrd-Boren bill, Senate Bill 2, would create a series of voluntary spending limits in Senate primary and general election races. It also would provide public funds for general election candidates who agree to abide by those limits. Spending for Senate races in the 1987-88 election cycle would be set at about $181 million.

The bill also would limit the amount House and Senate candidates may accept from PACs. Initially, the ceilings would range from $190,950 to $825,000 in Senate races, depending on the population of the state involved, and from $100,000 to $150,000 for House candidates, depending on the number of contested elections faced.

The Byrd-Boren proposal faces heavy opposition from Republicans, many of whom view public financing of campaigns as anathema. They have threatened to kill the bill by filibuster, and they are rumored to be working on an alternative measure. The Republican measure would limit PAC contributions but would not include public financing or spending limits.

Though the Republican measure would effect the status quo only slightly, it's reassuring that they at least recognize change is needed. With spending going up in each of the last five election cycles monitored by the Federal Election Commission, with special-interest PAC contributions to House and Senate candidates reaching a record $130 million in the 1986 election and with the 100th Congress in the nation's history, the need for significant change is urgent.

Senate bill 2 will reach the floor of the Senate sometime in June. As it looks now, Byrd has enough votes to pass the bill, but he does not have the 60 votes needed to invoke cloture if the Republicans filibuster. We hope he will push hard to get the necessary votes.

[From the Cleveland (OH) Plain Dealer, June 23, 1987]

THE MUGGING OF S2

Everybody agrees that Congress needs to reform the system of financing campaigns. So why are Senate Republicans opposing that very effort? For three weeks (going on four) they have stalled action on a bill that would overhaul Senate campaign financing. They haven't offered any meaningful alternatives; they haven't raised any credible objections; they haven't offered any improvements. It is said that they are filibustering the bill, but they aren't. They're mugging it.

As written, the Senatorial Election Campaign Act (S2) would limit the total amount of money a candidate could receive from political action committees. It also would outlaw "bundling," a loophole through which PACs escape the $5,000 limit on their donations by delivering personal checks from PAC members. And it would establish voluntary spending limits for Senate candidates. As part of that voluntary limit, it would offer public financing to candidates who agree to the limits.

Arguments against the bill are difficult to pin down, largely because they are difficult to make. The Republican refrain has been, simply, that public financing somehow is bad. That sounds especially strange, however, when you consider that the man leading the opposition is Sen. Robert Dole, who was the grateful recipient of almost $450,000 in public funds for his brief, 1980 presidential campaign, and who recently received certification for public funding for his 1988 campaign.

Does public financing somehow skew electoral return? Not so you'd notice. In 1976, a Democrat beat an incumbent Republican. In 1980, a Republican beat an incumbent Democrat. And in 1984, a Republican incumbent was re-elected. Rather than distorting the campaign process, public financing seems to even it out. And if it's good enough for the presidency, it should be good enough for the Senate.

Despite the obvious absence of credible reasoning, Republicans, have remained remorseless. Senate Majority Leader Robert Byrd and Sen. David Boren, two Democrats who are devoted to the idea of Senate campaign finance reform, have thus been forced to seek compromises. The one currently in the works is sensible enough: Candidates who agree to spending limits would receive no public funds unless their opponent spends beyond the limit. The incentive for restraint is clear. What Senate hopeful would want to trigger public funds for his opponent? You can niggle about what the formula for spending limits should be, and how best to cap aggregate PAC contributions. But if Republicans agree with the basic idea of spending limits and only object to public financing, then this compromise is indisputably fair.

The proliferation of political action committees and their shameless manipulation of the limits of what they can contribute has helped inflate campaign spending to nearly impossible heights. In the last congressional elections, 4,000 PACs contributed $130 million to candidates. Reform is essential, and the Byrd-Boren compromise, if worked out, should satisfy every reasonable objection. If Republicans continue to fight campaign reform, they will only perpetuate and magnify the common belief that the Senate is available only to the highest bidders.

[From the Columbia (SC) Record, June 23, 1987]

HOLLINGS—PAC BILL "DAMNDEST ARROGANCE"

The world's most famous (or is it infamous?) deliberative body, the United States Senate, has spent more than three weeks in inconclusive, partisan wrangling over a fundamentally sound piece of legislation, one which would bring about genuine campaign reform. Five times proponents have sought cloture to break a Republican-sparked filibuster and failed. It is time surely, to resolve the impasse and send the bill to the House.

The legislation, commonly called S.2, is co-sponsored by 45 Democrats and two Republicans. It establishes a system of voluntary public financing for Senate elections, an extension of the check-off system now provided on income tax returns for funding presidential campaigns. Equally important, the bill sharply restricts the amount of money candidates can spend and accept from political action committees (PACs). It would allow Senate candidates to apply for public funds if they meet certain requirements or restrictions. For example, they would have to limit total general election spending to a specific amount depending on the population of the state.

It should come as no surprise that both South Carolina Senators—Republican Strom Thurmond and Democrat Ernest F. "Fritz" Hollings—oppose the bill. Both have been big PAC beneficiaries in past re-election efforts. Thurmond received $549,000 in PAC funds in 1984, and Hollings got $952,382 in 1986. Under the pending bill, the aggregate PAC limit for the South Carolina primary and general elections would be $226,627.

Hollings calls the bill "the damndest arrogance I have seen around here." He and other critics of the bill claim the cost to taxpayers could run as high as $500 million every two years. Not so, argue the proponents, who point to figures worked up by the Federal Election Commission, the agency which would administer the legislation and handle distribution of public funds to Senatorial candidates. The commission estimates the price tag in '88 at a relatively modest $87.3 million.

There is an arrogance in the way this nation conducts its political campaigns. It comes not from bills like S.2. It emanates instead, from PACs whose monetary impact on congressional candidates reached a record $130 million in '86, more than 10 times the amount spent in 1974.

Two years ago, the Commission on National Elections said public financing of presidential elections "has clearly proved its worth by opening up the process (and) reducing undue influence of individuals and groups." S.2 is the next logical step.

[From the Cumberland (MD) News, Aug. 1, 1987]

CAMPAIGN CASH CONCERNS SENATE

The U.S. Senate is tied up in knots over an issue that to lawmakers is of paramount importance. It's not the Iran-Contra scandal or the budget or trade strategy. It's money—campaign money, to be exact.

Since early June, Senate Minority Leader Robert Dole, R-Kan., and most of his Republican colleagues have been engaged in a filibuster to prevent the Senate from acting on Senate Bill 2, much-needed legislation that would alter the system of election finance.

At issue is a Democratic-sponsored measure that would create voluntary spending limits in Senate elections, provide public funds for Senate general-election candidates agreeing to abide by the limit and restrict the amount of money that House and Senate candidates may accept from political-action committees, or PACs.

In 1988, if the bill were to pass, general-election limits would range from $950,000 in a low-population state such as Wyoming to nearly $5.5 million in California.

Senate Republicans don't necessarily dispute the need for campaign reform. Dole himself has spoken out about the outrageous expense of running for public office and the undue influence that PACs wield as a prime source of campaign financing. In the past 10 years, PAC contributions to Senate candidates have increased from $5 million to $45 million; campaign spending in Senate elections has increased from $38 million to $179 million. Senators complain about becoming "panhandlers."

In the words of the public-interest lobby Common Cause, "We have seen a monster created, a fundamentally corrupt campaign-finance system for Congress."

Senate Republicans object to the idea of using government money to run congressional campaigns—even though the public financing scheme for presidential candidates is working well. They argue that spending limits in congressional campaigns help incumbents to the detriment of challengers.

The Republicans have offered a compromise that, in effect, is no compromise. It would cut the maximum amount that any single PAC can give to a candidate, but it would eliminate the spending limit and public-financing components of the legislation.

Campaign reform simply will not happen without spending limits. The Supreme Court has ruled that there must be some form of public benefits in order to establish a system of voluntary campaign-spending limits.

The spending limits contained in Senate Bill 2 are reasonable and voluntary, as required by the Supreme Court. If presidential elections are a reliable guide, Senate Bill 2 will provide for competitive elections. Neither party will be at a disadvantage.

Dole and his fellow filibusterers need to step aside and give the reform legislation a chance to slay the campaign monster. In doing so, they would be helping restore the integrity of our representative form of government.

CAMPAIGN FINANCING—SENATE REPUBLICANS SHOULD END FILIBUSTER

Whether congressional candidates compete on the basis of their ideas or on the basis of their fund-raising abilities is likely to be determined by what happens to a campaign finance reform bill now tied up in the U.S. Senate.

For more than a month, a Republican filibuster has blocked consideration of the measure, which is aimed at reducing the inordinate influence of special interest donations in congressional races and reining in the huge amounts of money that candidates need to spend in order to get elected.

Now, in an effort to end the filibuster, Senate Democrats have offered a compromise that addresses the concern that many Republicans has expressed about the system of public financing called for in the original bill. No longer would senatorial candidates be encouraged to use public money.

Under the proposed compromise, public financing would become the exception rather than the rule. A senatorial candidate would be entitled to such money only when an opponent exceeded the measure's suggested spending limits.

That's reasonable. Those Republicans who are committed to holding down spending in campaigns have no grounds for delaying consideration of the important legislation any further. They should end their filibuster and allow a vote by the full Senate.

Ten years ago, another filibuster killed campaign finance reform legislation. Since then, special interest donations have increased from $5.4 million to $45.7 million, and spending in Senate campaigns has soared from $38.1 million to $178.9 million. The nation simply cannot afford another successful filibuster.

The growing influence of special interest groups in Congress threatens the public's fundamental right to set the legislative agenda. And the rapidly climbing cost of campaigning not only discourages many talented men and women from entering politics, it forces officeholders to spend too much time raising money and to neglect their paramount business of lawmaking.

The reform legislation now before the Senate would attempt to restore the public's faith in its elected officials by limiting the overall amount of money a congressional candidate could accept from special interest groups and by encouraging Senate candidates to abide by prescribed spending limits.

Contrary to what critics say, limiting what candidates could spend would not punish challengers and reward incumbents. If anything, the present system of ever escalating campaign expenditures is making it increasingly difficult for challengers to raise enough money to defeat incumbents.

The sooner the Senate can break its deadlock over campaign finance reform and approve some meaningful legislation, the sooner it will ensure that congressional candidates devote their time to debating the issues rather than soliciting funds. Further delay only would add to the public's disdain.

[From the Dallas (TX) Times Herald, June 14, 1987]

TIME TO SEND PACS PACKING

One of the top priorities of Congress should be the reform of campaign financing, which has become a disgrace through its overdependence on political action committees. A bill now being debated in the U.S. Senate would impose limits on the total contributions allowed from PACs and provide for public financing of Senate campaigns.

The merits of this legislation are so apparent that it has 44 sponsors. But a small group of senators has promised to filibuster the bill into oblivion. Senate Majority Leader Robert Byrd is leading the effort to stop the talkathons with a petition to limit debate on the issue.

Neither senator from Texas can be counted on where this issue is concerned.

Sen. Lloyd Bentsen, who scrapped his $10,000-a-head, fat-cat breakfasts under public pressure early this year, is having trouble supporting the public-financing aspects of the legislation.

Sen. Phil Gramm, R-College Station, voted against similar legislation introduced last year by Sen. David Boren, D-Okla., who refuses to accept any PAC contributions. Sen. Gramm vehemently opposes using public funds to pay for campaigns. The estimated $50 million annual cost of public financing for Senate races would be paid for with a voluntary $1 tax checkoff. An overwhelming majority of taxpayers already have volunteered to pay the $1 per year for presidential campaigns.

The current process is far more expensive in terms of the valuable time allotted by members of Congress to raising large contributions from special-interests groups, the bad legislation passed at the behest of those groups and the hidden costs those special interests pass on to taxpayers in the form of industry tax breaks and consumer charges. Ultimately, every taxpayer and voter pays for those PAC gifts.

Those who oppose the reform measure should realize they are siding with what Common Cause President Fred Wertheimer calls a "fundamentally corrupt campaign finance system."

Each Senator's stand on this issue reflects his concern about the continuing loss of taxpayer influence in the face of growing PAC power. Voters should remember where each senator stood on this issue at election time.

[From the Danbury (CT) News-Times, June 18, 1987]

CAMPAIGN FINANCING

The U.S. Senate seems unable to move forward on reforming the way campaigns are financed, so strong is the lure of the big bucks donated by political action committees.

Legislation now stuck in the Senate would limit the total amount of PAC money any congressional candidate could accept and would establish a voluntary system of spending limits, together with partial public financing, in Senate races.

The bill would create a new world for congressional candidates, ending their dependence on wealthy special interest groups and giving challengers a better opportunity to compete with the incumbents who attract most of the PAC money.

The need for reform is clear. PACs poured more than $130 million into 1986 congressional races—a six-fold increase from a decade ago. Twenty-four U.S. senators received more than $1 million each from PACs during their last election. And almost half of all House members received 50 percent or more of their campaign money from PACs in 1986.

That means when PACs talk, congressmen and senators have to listen. Voters are no longer the primary consideration, getting money from PACs is. And the injection of PAC dollars has encouraged higher and higher spending on campaigns.

It is a system that, as former Sen. Barry Goldwater says, "eats at the heart of the democratic process." This must be the year it is stopped.

[From the Danville (PA) News, June 4, 1987]

CONGRESS PONDERS ITS OWN "FILTHY LUCRE"

Money is on the mind of Congress these days—money scandals, to be specific. Congressional investigators are trying to trace the byzantine trail of funds connected to the Iran-Contra affair, and legislation is in the works that would deal with the Wall Street money scandal of insider trading. But Congress is dealing with a money scandal of its own as well—a scandal that involves the way congressional elections are financed.

A growing number of lawmakers are expressing dismay at the amount of money required to run for reelection and the amount of time it takes to raise that money. Chief among them is Senate Majority Leader Robert Byrd, D-W.Va., who complains that his colleagues are spending so much time trying to raise campaign funds that they have no time for Senate business. Byrd and Sen. David Boren, D-Okla., are co-sponsors of legislation to curb political action committees (PACs) and limit campaign spending.

As approved by the Senate Rules Committee, the Byrd-Boren bill, Senate Bill 2, would create a series of voluntary spending limits in Senate primary and general elec-

tion races. It also would provide public funds for general election candidates who agree to abide by those limits. Spending for Senate races in the 1987-88 election cycle would be set at about $181 million.

The bill also would limit the amount House and Senate candidates may accept from PACs. Initially, the ceilings would range from $190,950 to $825,000 in Senate races, depending on the population of the state involved, and from $100,000 to $150,000 for House candidates, depending on the number of contested elections faced.

The Byrd-Boren proposal faces heavy opposition from Republicans, many of whom view public financing of campaigns as anathema. They have threatened to kill the bill by filibuster, and they are rumored to be working on an alternative measure. The Republican measure would limit PAC contributions but would not include public financing or spending limits.

Though the Republican measure would effect the status quo only slightly, it's reassuring that they at least recognize change is needed. With spending going up in each of the last five election cycles monitored by the Federal Election Commission, with special-interest PAC contributions to House and Senate candidates reaching a record $130 million in the 1986 election and with the 100th Congress more indebted to special interests than any Congress in the nation's history, the need for significant change is urgent.

Senate Bill 2 will reach the floor of the Senate sometime in June. As it looks now, Byrd has enough votes to pass the bill, but he does not have the 60 votes needed to invoke cloture if the Republicans filibuster. We hope he will push hard to get the necessary votes.

[From the Daytona Beach (FL) News-Journal, June 15, 1987]

SENATE PAC LIMITS BILL DESERVES A CHANCE

Campaign finance reform, off to such an unexpectedly brisk start at the beginning of the session, has become bogged down in the obstructionist tactics of a group of Republican senators. A filibuster was still continuing Friday against a plan to limit contributions from Political Action Committees (PACs) and place caps on campaign spending in U.S. Senate races.

When the bill was introduced at the start of the session, it had 47 co-sponsors including Florida's senators, Lawton Chiles and Bob Graham. At that time, the memory of the 1986 senatorial elections was still fresh and provided a powerful argument in favor of the bill. The average winning senate campaign cost $3 million that year. In Florida, the race between Sen. Graham and Paula Hawkins cost more than $12.5 million.

When elections cost this much, fundraising is the No. 1 campaign priority; anything else—such as getting out to meet the voters and talking about the issues—is secondary. In campaigns that expensive, a PAC is a senator's best friend. PACs spent $45.7 million in the 1986 senate elections. When special interests pick up such a large tab, they must expect a great deal in return.

The senatorial campaign act would help remedy the situation by regulating campaign spending in Senate campaigns the way presidential campaign spending is regulated.

The bill provides for public funding for campaigns. In exchange for accepting public funds, a candidate would have to agree to set campaign spending limits which would vary from state to state depending on its size. The funds would come from a voluntary tax check-off such as the one now used for presidential elections.

An individual PAC would be able to give no more than $3,000 to a candidate and a candidate would be limited to receiving between $175,000 and $750,000, depending on the size of the state.

Some have tried to head off this needed reform by proposing that PACs simply not be allowed to make contributions to individual senators.

On the surface this sounds like a step forward. In practice, it means PACs could pass along more money than they do now. Although PACs would be forbidden from making donations themselves, they would be able to pass along members' checks to candidates. This bill would change only the mechanics of collecting money. PACs currently are limited to contributing $5,000 per candidate each election. This misleading proposal would remove even that limitation.

It would be a pity if obstructionist tactics and phony "reform" bills derail this reform. Last November's senate elections highlighted how fundraising has gotten out of control. Unless this bill is passed, future elections promise the same problems on an even larger scale: more media campaigns, a larger role for special interests, and a voting public that is more turned off and alienated than ever.

[From the Denison (TX) Herald, June 19, 1987]

CONGRESS PONDERS "FILTHY LUCRE"

Money is on the mind of Congress these days—money scandals, to be specific. Congressional investigators are trying to trace the byzantine trail of funds connected to the Iran-Contra affair, and legislation is in the works that would deal with the Wall Street money scandal of insider trading. But Congress is dealing with a money scandal of its own as well—a scandal that involves the way congressional elections are financed.

A growing number of lawmakers are expressing dismay at the amount of money required to run for reelection and the amount of time it takes to raise that money. Chief among them is Senate Majority Leader Robert Byrd, D-W.Va., who complains that his colleagues are spending so much time trying to raise campaign funds that they have no time for Senate business. Byrd and Sen. David Boren, D-Okla., are co-sponsors of legislation to curb political action committees (PACs) and limit campaign spending.

As approved by the Senate Rules Committee, the Byrd-Boren Bill, Senate Bill 2, would create a series of voluntary spending limits in Senate primary and general election races. It also would provide funds for general election candidates who agree to abide by those limits. Spending for Senate races in the 1987-88 election cycle would be set at about $181 million.

The bill also would limit the amount House and Senate candidates may accept from PACs. Initially, the ceilings would range from $190,950 to $825,000 in Senate races, depending on the population of the state involved, and from $100,000 to $150,000 for House candidates, depending on the number of contested elections faced.

The Byrd-Boren proposal faces heavy opposition from Republicans, many of whom view public financing of campaigns as anathema. They have threatened to kill the bill by filibuster, and they are rumored to be working on an alternative measure. The Republican measure would limit PAC contributions but would not include public financing or spending limits.

Though the Republican measure would effect the status quo only slightly, it's reassuring that they at least recognize change is needed. With spending going up in each of the last five election cycles monitored by the Federal Election Commission, with special-interest PAC contributions to House and Senate candidates reaching a record $130 million in the 1986 election and with the 100th Congress more indebted to special interests than any Congress in the nation's history, the need for significant change is urgent.

Senate Bill 2 will reach the floor of the Senate sometime in June. As it looks now, Byrd has enough votes to pass the bill, but he does not have the 60 votes needed to invoke cloture if the Republicans filibuster. We hope he will push hard to get the necessary votes.

[From the DuBois (PA) Courier-Express, June 30, 1987]

CAMPAIGN MONSTER

The U.S. Senate is tied up in knots over an issue that to lawmakers is of paramount importance. It's not the Iran-Contra scandal or the budget or trade strategy. It's money—campaign money, to be exact.

Since early June, Senate Minority Leader Robert Dole, R-Kan., and most of his Republican colleagues have been engaged in a filibuster to prevent the Senate from acting on Senate Bill 2, much-needed legislation that would alter the system of election finance.

At issue is a Democratic-sponsored measure that would create voluntary spending limits in Senate elections, provide public funds for Senate general-election candidates agreeing to abide by the limits and restrict the amount of money that House and Senate candidates may accept from political-action committees, or PACs.

In 1988, if the bill were to pass, general-election limits would range from $950,000 in a low-population state such as Wyoming to nearly $5.5 million in California.

Senate Republicans don't necessarily dispute the need for campaign reform. Dole himself has spoken out about the outrageous expense of running for public office and the undue influence that PACs wield as a prime source of campaign financing. In the past 10 years, PAC contributions to Senate candidates have increased from $5 million to $45 million; campaign spending in Senate elections has increased from $38 million to $179 million. Senators complain about becoming "panhandlers."

In the words of the public-interest lobby Common Cause, "We have seen a monster created, a fundamentally corrupt campaign-finance system for Congress."

Senate Republicans object to the idea of using government money to run congressional campaigns—even though the public financing scheme for presidential candidates is working well. They argue that spending limits in congressional campaigns help incumbents to the detriment of challengers.

The Republicans have offered a compromise that, in effect, is no compromise. It would cut the maximum amount that any single PAC can give to a candidate, but it would eliminate the spending limit and public-financing components of the legislation.

Campaign reform simply will not happen without spending limits. The Supreme

Court has ruled that there must be some form of public benefits in order to establish a system of voluntary campaign-spending limits.

The spending limits contained in Senate Bill 2 are reasonable and voluntary, as required by the Supreme Court. If presidential elections are a reliable guide, Senate Bill 2 will provide for competitive elections. Neither party will be at a disadvantage.

Dole and his fellow filibusterers need to step aside and give the reform legislation a chance to slay the campaign monster. In doing so, they would be helping restore the integrity of our representative form of government.

[From the Du Bois (PA) Courier-Express, May 28, 1987]

CONGRESS HAS MONEY SCANDAL OF ITS OWN

Money is on the mind of Congress these days—money scandals, to be specific. Congressional investigators are trying to trace the byzantine trail of funds connected to the Iran-Contra affair, and legislation is in the works that would deal with the Wall Street money scandal of insider trading. But Congress is dealing with a money scandal of its own as well—a scandal that involves the way congressional elections are financed.

A growing number of lawmakers are expressing dismay at the amount of money required to run for re-election and the amount of time it takes to raise that money. Chief among them is Senate Majority Leader Robert Byrd, D-W.Va., who complains that his colleagues are spending so much time trying to raise campaign funds that they have no time for Senate business. Byrd and Senator David Boren, D-Okla., are co-sponsors of legislation to curb political action committees (PACs) and limit campaign spending.

As approved by the Senate Rules Committee, the Byrd-Boren bill, Senate Bill 2, would create a series of voluntary spending limits in Senate primary and general election races. It also would provide public funds for general election candidates who agree to abide by those limits. Spending for Senate races in the 1987-88 election cycle would be set at about $181 million.

The bill also would limit the amount House and Senate candidates may accept from PACs, depending on the number of contested elections faced.

The Byrd-Boren proposal faces heavy opposition from Republicans, many of whom view public financing of campaigns as anathema. They have threatened to kill the bill by filibuster, and they are rumored to be working on an alternative measure. The Republican measure would limit PAC contributions but would not include public financing or spending limits.

Though the Republican measure would effect the status quo only slightly, it's reassuring that they at least recognize change is needed. With spending going up in each of the last five election cycles monitored by the Federal Election Commission, with special-interest PAC contributions to House and Senate candidates reaching a record $130 million in the 1986 election and with the 100th Congress more indebted to special interests than any Congress in the nation's history, the need for significant change is urgent.

Senate Bill 2 will reach the floor of the Senate sometime in June. As it looks now, Byrd has enough votes to pass the bill, but he does not have the 60 votes needed to invoke cloture if the Republicans filibuster. It is hoped he will push hard to get the necessary votes.

[From the El Dorado (KS) Times, July 9, 1987]

SLAY THE MONSTER

The U.S. Senate is tied up in knots over an issue that to lawmakers is of paramount importance. It's not the Iran-Contra scandal or the budget or trade strategy. It's money—campaign money, to be exact.

Since early June, Senate Minority Leader Robert Dole, R-Kan., and most of his Republican colleagues have been engaged in a filibuster to prevent the Senate from acting on Senate Bill 2, much-needed legislation that would alter the system of election finance.

At issue is a Democratic-sponsored measure that would create voluntary spending limits in Senate elections, provide public funds for Senate general-election candidates agreeing to abide by the limits and restrict the amount of money that House and Senate candidates may accept from political-action committees, or PACs.

In 1988, if the bill were to pass, general-election limits would range from $950,000 in a low-population state such as Wyoming to nearly $5.5 million in California.

Senate Republicans don't necessarily dispute the need for campaign reform. Dole himself has spoken out about the outrageous expense of running for public office and the undue influence that PACs wield as a prime source of campaign financing. In the past 10 years, PAC contributions to Senate candidates have increased from $5 million to $45 million; campaign spending in Senate elections has increased from $38 million to $179 million. Senators complain about becoming "panhandlers."

In the words of the public-interest lobby Common Cause, "We have seen a monster created, a fundamentally corrupt campaign-finance system for Congress."

Senate Republicans object to the idea of using government money to run congressional campaigns—even though the public financing scheme for presidential candidates is working well. They argue that spending limits in congressional campaigns help incumbents to the detriment of challengers.

The Republicans have offered a compromise that, in effect, is no compromise. It would cut the maximum amount that any single PAC can give to a candidate, but it would eliminate the spending limit and public-financing components of the legislation.

Campaign reform simply will not happen without spending limits. The Supreme Court has ruled that there must be some form of public benefits in order to establish a system of voluntary campaign-spending limits.

The spending limits contained in Senate Bill 2 are reasonable and voluntary, as require by the Supreme Court. If presidential elections are a reliable guide, Senate Bill 2 will provide for competitive elections. Neither party will be at a disadvantage.

Dole and his fellow filibusterers need to step aside and give the reform legislation a chance to slay the campaign monster. In doing so, they would be helping restore the integrity of our representative form of government.

[From The Eugene (OR) Register-Guard, June 14, 1987]

REAL REFORM NEEDED

Once it dispenses with such parliamentary gamesmanship as a filibuster over the issue of campaign finance reform, the U.S. Senate will be presented with two choices:

(1) Genuine, get-to-the-heart-of-the problem reform, or . . .

(2) Cosmetic change aimed only at stopping real reform.

While the Senate's choice appears easy, it isn't. Politicians are less than eager to change a campaign system that has installed them in office and keeps them there. But, praise be, there are senators—49 at last count—who apparently are ready to halt the skyrocketing cost of campaigns and eliminate the stench of special interest money that accompanies it.

The effort at genuine campaign finance reform is sponsored by Sen. David Boren, D-Okla., Senate Majority Leader Robert Byrd, D-W.Va., and 47 co-sponsors. The Boren-Byrd proposal seeks a limited form of public finance for congressional races—similar to that now used in presidential campaigns—with a concomitant lid on how much political action committees (PACs) can contribute singly or in groups to an individual candidate. (For First Amendment reasons, the U.S. Supreme Court has said that limits can be placed on campaign spending and contributions only if accompanied by a system of public finance. The Boren-Byrd proposal appears to meet the court's test.)

The other choice facing the Senate is one put forth by a group of Republicans, led by Oregon's own Bob Packwood. Packwood, who received more than $1 million for his 1986 re-election campaign from PACs, ironically proposes to ban all direct PAC contributions to candidates.

The senator's prohibition seems appealing but is little more than a smokescreen. He would still permit PAC contributions to political parties (which could in turn give the money to candidates) and he makes no attempt to solve the problem of "bundling." Bundling occurs when a group of PACs, each theoretically limited in the amount it can donate to a candidate, combines members' individual contributions into a much larger—and more influential—single donation.

Packwood has long opposed publicly financed campaigns. It is irrelevant whether that's because he thinks taxpayer-subsidized campaigns would discourage "volumtary grass roots participation," as he claims, or because he functions so well in the present system. What's important is that rather than fight the Boren-Byrd proposal head-on, he has chosen the oblique path of a gimmick-laden substitute.

It should be unarguable that huge campaign donations from special interests bring with them what The (Portland) Oregonian correctly describes as "real or implied obligations." The greater the amounts of money donated, the greater the obligations.

The current system is an abomination and must be reformed. The Boren-Byrd proposal is an attempt to do that. The Packwood proposal isn't. The Senate's choice should be clear.

[From The Evansville (IN) Press, June 30, 1987]

SLAYING THE MONSTER

The U.S. Senate is tied up in knots over an issue that to lawmakers is of paramount importance. It's not the Iran-Contra scandal

or the budget or trade strategy. It's money—campaign money, to be exact.

Since early June, Senate Minority Leader Robert Dole, R-Kan., and most of his Republican colleagues have been engaged in a filibuster to prevent the Senate from acting on Senate Bill 2, much-needed legislation that would alter the system of election finance.

At issue is a Democratic-sponsored measure that would create voluntary spending limits in Senate elections, provide public funds for Senate general-election candidates agreeing to abide by the limits and restrict the amount of money that House and Senate candidates may accept from political action committees, or PACs.

In 1988, if the bill were to pass, general-election limits would range from $950,000 in a low-population state such as Wyoming to nearly $5.5 million in California.

Senate Republicans don't necessarily dispute the need for campaign reform. Dole himself has spoken out about the outrageous expense of running for public office and the undue influence that PACs wield as a prime source of campaign financing. In the past 10 years, PAC contributions to Senate candidates have increased from $5 million to $45 million; campaign spending in Senate elections has increased from $38 million to $179 million. Senators complain about becoming "panhandlers."

In the words of the public-interest lobby Common Cause, "We have seen a monster created, a fundamentally corrupt campaign-finance system for Congress."

Senate Republicans object to the idea of using government money to run congressional campaigns—even though the public financing scheme for presidential candidates is working well. They argue that spending limits in congressional campaigns help incumbents to the detriment of challengers.

The Republicans have offered a compromise that, in effect, is no compromise. It would cut the maximum amount that any single PAC can give to a candidate, but it would eliminate the spending limit and public-financing components of the legislation.

Campaign reform simply will not happen without spending limits. The Supreme Court has ruled that there must be some form of public benefits in order to establish a system of voluntary campaign-spending limits.

The spending limits contained in Senate Bill 2 are reasonable and voluntary, as required by the Supreme Court. If presidential elections are a reliable guide, Senate Bill 2 will provide for competitive elections. Neither party will be at a disadvantage.

We would prefer a much stronger bill, with tighter reductions on campaign spending. That probably won't happen, and the present bill offers at least the beginning of reform.

Dole and his fellow filibusterers need to step aside and give the reform legislation a chance to slay the campaign monster. In doing so, they would be helping restore the integrity of our representative form of government.

[From the Northwest Arkansas Times, Fayetteville (AR) June 11, 1987]

MONEY BUSINESS

While the Iran-Contra hearings are grabbing all the headlines in Washington, other things are going on as well. On the Senate floor for consideration this month is Senate Bill 2, which would overhaul the current campaign financing system.

Common Cause, the national citizens lobby group, has been in the forefront in supporting the measure. Fred Wertheimer, president of CC, says the proposed measure contains two provisions essential to any meaningful, comprehensive reform of the system; "overall spending limits and limits on the total amount of political action committee contributions a candidate can accept."

The need to curb the spending of political action committees (PACs) is evident. Over the past 10 years spending in Senate races has increased almost five-fold, from $38.1 million in 1976 to $178.9 million in 1986. In a letter to all members of the Senate, Wertheimer noted if the currently proposed legislation had been in effect in the 1986 election PAC spending would have been cut by two-thirds, from $45 million to $16 million.

The bill would also establish a voluntary system of spending limits and limits on the use of personal wealth, a move that would help open elected office to those who may not possess massive personal wealth.

"By placing congressional office increasingly out of the reach of citizens lacking considerable financial resources or the ability to raise large sums from private sources," Wertheimer wrote, "and by demanding an enormous commitment to candidate's time and attention to fundraising activities, soaring campaign spending is changing the very nature of elections and our political process."

An amendment offered to S. 2 by Republican Senators Mitch McConnell of Kentucky and Robert Packwood of Oregon has been labeled by its supporters as a measure to eliminate PAC contributions. But does it?

Hardly. The McConnell-Packwood bill would instead lead to PACs changing their method of providing money to a congressional candidate and in so doing would open the door to PACs providing unlimited sums to a candidate.

What the amendment proposes is prohibiting direct PAC contributions to a candidate. It would, however, legitimize the practice of PACs bundling and delivering unlimited sums to candidates, collected by the PACs from individual contributors. All the PACs need do is make sure the checks are made out to the candidate rather than the PAC. The process is called "bundling." What the so-called reform amounts to is simply a change in the mechanics of money-funneling the PACs are famous for.

S. 2, without the McConnell-Packwood amendment, would close the bundling loophole, would restrict the role of PAC money, limit the skyrocketing cost of campaigns and reduce the enormous amount of time being spent by candidates on fundraising. It deserves support.

[From the Fresno (CA) Bee, June 19, 1987]

TALKING REFORM TO DEATH

Republicans in the U.S. Senate are attempting to kill by filibuster a much-needed bill to reform the way senatorial campaigns are financed. In response, Senate Majority Leader Robert Byrd, a chief sponsor of the bill along with Sen. David Boren of Oklahoma, is threatening to keep the measure on the floor indefinitely.

Byrd and the Democrats should hold firm, even though it may prevent action on major trade and defense spending bills. The Republicans' demands that partial public financing of campaigns and limits on campaign spending be eliminated would render the bill meaningless. The Supreme Court in 1976 ruled, in effect, that spending limits can be established only as part of a voluntary system that includes public financing—the essence of the Boren-Byrd bill.

In an effort to compromise, Boren and Byrd recently offered an amendment that would cut the amount of public financing—and hence the cost to taxpayers—by at least half. The amendment also makes further attempts to limit the influence of political action committees by providing public matching funds only for contributions from individuals, to a maximum of $250.

Still, the Republicans have been unwilling to budge. Republican Leader Robert Dole claims that public financing of senatorial campaigns would be "an assault on the Republican Party" and "an assault on the taxpayer."

What Dole neglects to mention is that public financing of presidential campaigns, enacted in 1974 in the wake of the Watergate scandal, has worked well and has been used by 34 of 35 major party candidates who have sought the presidency. In 1985, the bipartisan Commission on National Elections concluded that it "has clearly proved its worth in opening up the process, reducing undue influence of individuals and groups, and virtually ending corruption in presidential election finance." Dole himself just became eligible the other day to receive public matching funds in his campaign for the presidency.

Of course Republicans tend to have a somewhat greater capacity for raising large chunks of private money. But that kind of money can hardly be regarded as one of the glories of the democratic process. The issue here is not partisan politics, it's the integrity of the political system.

The current system is corrupting. The skyrocketing costs of senatorial campaigns force incumbents to begin raising money almost as soon as they're returned to office. Challengers begin the quest for cash more than a year ahead of time. The bulk of the money comes in big chunks from political action committees and other special interests, which give it in expectation of favorable treatment. Too often the big contributors get what they seek.

While the Boren-Byrd bill won't solve all the problems, it will help restore some credibility to the system. For that, it's worth the fight.

[From the Gainesville (FL) Sun, June 30, 1987]

THE GOP OBSTRUCTIONISTS

In years past, many southern Democrats in the Senate were known to embrace the filibuster, using long-winded speeches to postpone or prevent a vote on legislation they opposed. Integration and equal rights legislation come to mind as examples.

Now it's the Republicans who are trying to talk a bill to death. Their efforts are as unbecoming as the Southern Democrats' efforts to delay equal justice for all. The bill now being filibustered seeks to remove the valid impression that Congress has a price. Or, as Florida Sen. Lawton Chiles said: "A large part of the American public thinks this Congress is the best money can buy."

The bill is entering its fifth week of debate. Its major provisions are:

Candidates would receive federal funds to help finance campaigns, provided they limited contributions from political actions committees.

Contributions from PACs could not exceed $175,000 to $750,000, depending on the size of the state.

Maximum individual contributions to PACs would be reduced from $5,000 to $3,000.

Archibald Cox, chairman of Common Cause, a public interest lobby, said high campaign expenditures "drive the candidate to seek money from special interests seeking favors from government. Senators and representatives become less responsive to the people as their campaigns become more dominated by PACs."

In 1986 races, PACs favored incumbents over challengers by a ratio of 6 to 1. Since 1978, the number of representatives receiving more than half their contributions from PACs has more than tripled.

Republican opponents argue that tax money shouldn't go toward congressional elections. But Cox puts the amount in perspective: "The annual cost of (the campaign-reform bill) is a small price to pay the annual representative government—one-third the annual amount appropriated by Congress for military bands."

Sen. David L. Boren, D-Okla., the bill's chief sponsor, said the pursuit of election funds has turned congressmen "into panhandlers; begging for money, spending their time raising money instead of dealing with problems."

The Republican effort to allow unlimited campaign spending has brought the Senate's business to a halt. Florida's two senators—Chiles and Bob Graham—supported a recent attempt to end the fillibuster, but it failed by eight votes.

The filibuster should end. Americans have the right to know which of their representatives want to continue to be panhandlers and beggars, more concerned with raising money to extend their terms in office than dealing with problems.

[From the Gardner (MA) News, June 19, 1987]

CONGRESS PONDERS ITS OWN "FILTHY LUCRE"

Money is on the mind of Congress these days—money scandals, to be specific. Congressional investigators are trying to trace the byzantine trail of funds connected to the Iran-Contra affair, and legislation is in the works that would deal with the Wall Street money scandal of insider trading. But Congress is dealing with a money scandal of its own as well—a scandal that involves the way congressional elections are financed.

A growing number of lawmakers are expressing dismay at the amount of money required to run for reelection and the amount of time it takes to raise that money. Chief among them is Senate Majority Leader Robert Byrd, D-W.Va., who complains that his colleagues are spending so much time trying to raise campaign funds that they have no time for Senate business. Byrd and Sen. David Boren, D-Okla., are co-sponsors of legislation to curb political action committees (PACs) and limit campaign spending.

As approved by the Senate Rules Committee, the Byrd-Boren bill, Senate Bill 2, would create a series of voluntary spending limits in Senate primary and general election races. It also would provide public funds for general election candidates who agree to abide by those limits. Spending for Senate races in the 1987-88 election cycle would be set at about $181 million.

The bill also would limit the amount House and Senate candidates may accept from PACs. Initially, the ceilings would range from $190,950 to $825,000 in Senate races, depending on the population of the state involved, and from $100,000 to $150,000 for House candidates, depending on the number of contested elections faced.

The Byrd-Boren proposal faces heavy opposition from Republicans, many of whom view public financing of campaigns as anathema. They have threatened to kill the bill by filibuster, and they are rumored to be working on an alternative measure. The Republican measure would limit PAC contributions but would not include public financing or spending limits.

Though the Republican measure would affect the status quo only slightly, it's reassuring that they at least recognize change is needed. With spending going up in each of the last five election cycles monitored by the Federal Election Commission, with special-interest PAC contributions to House and Senate candidates reaching a record $130 million in the 1986 election and with the 100th Congress more indebted to special interests than any Congress in the nation's history, the need for significant change is urgent.

Senate Bill 2 will reach the floor of the Senate sometime in June. As it looks now, Byrd has enough votes to pass the bill, but he does not have the 60 votes needed to invoke cloture if the Republicans filibuster. We hope he will push hard to get the necessary votes.

[From the Great Falls (MT) Tribune, June 6, 1987]

ELECTION SPENDING LIMITS ARE A MUST

Money is on the mind of Congress these days—money scandals, to be specific. Congressional investigators are trying to trace the trail of funds connected to the Iran-Contra affair, and legislation is in the works that would deal with the Wall Street money scandal of insider trading.

But Congress is dealing with a semi-scandal of its own involving the way congressional elections are financed.

A growing number of lawmakers are expressing dismay at the amount of money required to run for re-election and the amount of time it takes to raise that money. Chief among them is Senate Majority Leader Robert Byrd, D-W.Va., who complains that his colleagues are spending so much time trying to raise campaign funds that they have no time for Senate business.

Byrd and Sen. David Boren, D-Okla., are co-sponsors of legislation to curb political action committees (PACs) and limit campaign spending. As approved in committee, the measure would create a series of voluntary spending limits in Senate primary and general election races.

It also would provide public funds for general election candidates who agree to abide by those limits. Spending for Senate races in the 1987-88 election cycle would be set at about $181 million.

The bill also would limit the House and Senate candidates may accept from PACs. Initially, the ceilings would range from $190,950 to $825,000 in Senate races, depending on the population of the state involved, and from $100,000 to $150,000 for House candidates, depending on the number of contested elections faced.

The Byrd-Boren proposal faces heavy opposition from Republicans, many of whom oppose public financing of campaigns. They have threatened to kill the bill by filibuster, and they are rumored to be working on an alternative measure. The Republican measure would limit PAC contributions but would not include public financing or spending limits.

Though the Republican measure would affect the status quo only slightly, it's reassuring that they recognize change is needed. Last year, political action committees tossed more than $130 million into the campaigns of senators. That is far too much influence, and everyone realizes it.

Byrd's measure will reach the floor of the Senate this month. As it looks now, the Democrats have enough votes to pass the bill, but they may not have the 60 votes needed to invoke cloture if the Republicans filibuster. We support the measure—but recognize it may be necessary to frame a compromise with its opponents.

A grass-roots suggestion: If Congress were to revoke its pay increase of last fall, the money saved would pay for at least part of the public funding of congressional campaigns.

[From the Record, Hackensack, NJ, June 16, 1987]

WHERE CASH IS KING

Senate Republicans are blocking the most promising effort in years to free Senate campaigns from the tyranny of wealthy contributors. These GOP obstructionists aren't doing any favors for themselves, their party, or their country.

Under the present system of campaign financing, cash is king. Candidates are forced to humiliate themselves by fawning over rich lobbyists, tycoons, and heirs. The cost of running for office is high enough to scare off, or disgust, candidates who might make a strong contribution to Congress. In California in 1986, the two Senate candidates spent $22 million; in Florida, $12.6 million. The only way many candidates can get in the game is to cozy up to political-action committees.

PAC's—campaign-financing organizations set up by real-estate developers, banks, chemical companies, and nearly every other special interest you can think of—are growing like mushrooms. In 1976 they contributed a total of $22 million to congressional campaigns. By 1986 the figure was over $130 million. Almost one out of every four members of the Senate, 24 of 100, took in more than $1 million in PAC money the last time they ran. Almost half the members of the House of Representatives, 194 of 435, got at least 50 percent of their money from PAC's in 1986.

Sen. David Boren, D-Okla., and Senate Majority Leader Robert Byrd, D-W.Va., have a sensible proposal to limit both spending and PAC contributions in Senate campaigns. Spending would be tied to a population-based formula; in New Jersey, for example, the U.S. Senate candidates would have to keep their total spending—for both primary and general elections—below $4.8 million. This is considerably less than either incumbent spent on the last go-round—Bill Bradley $5.1 million in 1984, Frank Lautenberg $6.4 million in 1982. Total PAC contributions for both elections would be limited to $578,880. The present $5,000 ceiling on individual PAC contributions would be unchanged.

Candidates wouldn't have to accept these limits. But if they did, they could collect some of their campaign funds from the public treasury. Perhaps more important, they could escape being tagged as out to buy the election.

Republicans argue that the change would make it harder for a challenger to defeat a

well-known incumbent. This ignores the overwhelming support PAC's give incumbents now. It's also worth recalling that the first two incumbent presidents to seek reelection under the public-financing system already in place for presidential races, Gerald Ford and Jimmy Carter, both lost. And although Republicans grumble about the cost of public financing, it's a bargain at $50 million a year, to be financed by a voluntary tax checkoff. The price is worth paying to get people to stop snickering about candidates who do everything but dive off high cliffs to get money.

Senate Majority Leader Byrd says he's going to keep holding Senate votes on campaign financing until he gets it passed. In the end, he hopes, Republicans will realize they're wrong. If that's too much to hope for, they may realize that they're embarrassing themselves and the GOP. Only rich lobbyists could love the present system. And even a lot of lobbyist would be grateful if senators and would-be senators would stop putting the arm on them.

[From the Hartford Courant, Hartford, CT, July 13, 1987]

SENATORS TESTED ON ELECTION SPENDING

Do members of the Senate believe that congressional election spending and the role of political action committees in Senate and House compaigns have gotten out of hand? In an interview, most probably would frown with concern and say yes. Soon we'll see what they do when the question, in as basic a form as it's ever likely to take, comes to a vote.

A comprehensive, workable, fair and effective campaign finance reform package has been awaiting action in the Senate for more than a month. It would combine controls on what House and Senate candidates could take from PACs with a system of voluntary public financing linked to spending limits in Senate general election campaigns.

But a vote on the bill, which is sponsored by Democrats Robert C. Byrd of West Virginia and David L. Boren of Oklahoma, has been blocked by a Republican filibuster. Not even the considerable talents of Mr. Byrd, the majority leader, could work the measure free. Attempts to invoke cloture—supported by Connecticut's Christopher J. Dodd, a Democrat, but opposed by Lowell P. Weicker, a Republican—have come to naught.

So the sponsors turned to compromise, and have offered a substitute version of their bill. A cloture vote to clear the way for action on the new package could occur this week. Any senator who wants to reduce the huge and unhealthy role of money in congressional politics will vote for cloture and the bill.

The compromise amounted to removing the public financing provisions, with one exception: If a candidate who decided not to take part in the voluntary spending-limit system exceeded the limits established by the bill, the candidate's opponent would receive offsetting public money derived from a voluntary tax checkoff.

To induce candidates to accept the spending limits, the bill would give them special low rates for mailing and broadcast advertising. Nominees who rejected the limits couldn't get the low rates, and their rejection would have to be disclosed in advertising and other campaign materials.

When reform is badly needed, no compromise satisfies. Public financing remains the best way to reduce the influence of special-interest groups and to return campaign spending to reasonable levels. It has been highly effective in reforming the presidential campaign system and returning at least that sector of politics to the people.

But modest reform is better than none, and the substitute bill would do a lot of good. With the elimination of routine public financing—apparently the most objectionable part of the original bill in the eyes of many senators—the only credible explanation for a vote against cloture or the compromise package will be a desire to preserve the status quo.

[From the Hartford Courant, Hartford, CT, June 9, 1987]

DOES THE SENATE WANT REFORM?

You would be hard-pressed to find many members of the U.S. Senate who say they're unconcerned about the monetary saturation of congressional election campaigns. Today you may be able to learn how many senators want to translate purported concern into meaningful action by supporting effective campaign finance reform.

The Senate last week began debating a measure that would produce meaningful reform, a bill sponsored by David L. Boren, an Oklahoma Democrat, and Majority Leader Robert C. Byrd of West Virginia. It would dramatically reduce the role of political action committees in Senate and House elections—and thus the unhealthy influence of PACs in the making of the nation's laws. Most important, it would establish a system of public financing for candidates in Senate elections. That step is essential if the public interest is going to recapture the ground that special interests have managed to buy.

It was predictable that many members of Congress would resist any fundamental change in the vehicle that brought them to Washington, and sure enough, opposition has surfaced. Republican senators have criticized public financing as intrusive and offered several alternative campaign finance reform bills—most of them unworthy of the name. Fearing passage of the Boren-Byrd bill, which at last count had 47 co-sponsors, Republicans have threatened to block it by filibustering. A vote on whether to invoke cloture, thus stopping the delay, is expected to occur today.

Although the Republican bills contain some attractive ideas, they basically seem to be attempts to present an illusion of reform while preserving as much of the status quo as possible.

One measure, for example, would prohibit PAC contributions to congressional candidates, certainly a dramatic step. But the bill, offered by Sens. Robert W. Packwood of Oregon and Mitch McConnell of Kentucky, would allow PACs to continue donating to party committees and groups not linked to candidates. Since this money then could be used to help particular candidates, little would be accomplished.

Legislation offered by Sen. Ted Stevens, an Alaska Republican, would limit committee contributions to candidates but it would allow individuals to give more than they can now. Ostensibly it would deal with a loophole in the law that invites an abuse called bundling, in which PACs evade the legal limits on what they can give to candidates to encouraging and delivering individual contributions to them. But the Stevens measure only would require that bundled checks be made payable to candidates. That's authorization, not prevention.

Yet the biggest weakness in the GOP bills is that they don't squarely confront the root issue: the enormous, and rapidly growing, amount of money spent on congressional elections. About $38 million was spent on Senate races in 1976; 10 years later, almost $179 million was spent. A reasonable but firm cap on spending is indispensable, as is a total limit on what each candidate can receive from PACs. The Boren-Byrd bill has both, and a lot more.

If the Senate, to borrow a phrase from Sen. Edward M. Kennedy of Massachusetts, is serious about driving "the money lenders out of the temple of politics," it won't let a fillibuster, or the temptation of ersatz campaign finance reform, divert it from the real thing.

[From the South Dade News Leader, Homestead, FL, June 3, 1987]

CONGRESS PONDERS A FINANCING SCANDAL

Money is on the mind of Congress these days—money scandals, to be specific. Congressional investigators are trying to trace the byzantine trail of funds connected to the Iran-Contra affair, and legislation is in the works that would deal with the Wall Street money scandal of insider trading. But Congress is dealing with a money scandal of its own as well—a scandal that involves the way congressional elections are financed.

A growing number of lawmakers are expressing dismay at the amount of money required to run for reelection and the amount of time it takes to raise that money. Chief among them is Senate Majority Leader Robert Byrd, D-W.Va., who complains that his colleagues are spending so much time trying to raise campaign funds that they have no time for Senate business. Byrd and Sen. David Boren, D-Okla., are co-sponsores of legislation to curb political action committees (PACs) and limit campaign spending.

As approved by the Senate Rules Committee, the Byrd-Boren bill, Senate Bill 2, would create a series of voluntary spending limits in Senate primary and general election races. It also would provide public funds for general election candidates who agree to abide by those limits. Spending for Senate races in the 1987-88 election cycle would be set at about $181 million.

The bill also would limit the amount House and Senate candidates may accept from PACs. Initially, the ceilings would range from $190,950 to $825,000 in Senate races, depending on the population of the state involved, and from $100,000 to $150,000 for House candidates, depending on the number of contested elections faced.

The Byrd-Boren proposal faces heavy opposition from Republicans, many of whom view public financing of campaigns as anathema. They have threatened to kill the bill by filibuster, and they are rumored to be working on an alternative measure. The Republican measure would limit PAC contributions but would not include public financing or spending limits.

Though the Republican measure would effect the status quo only slightly, it's reassuring that they at least recognize change is needed. With spending going up in each of the last five election cycles monitored by the Federal Election Commission, with special-interest PAC contributions to House and Senate candidates reaching a record $130 million in the 1986 election and with the 100th Congress more indebted to special interests than any Congress in the nation's history, the need for significant change is urgent.

Senate Bill 2 will reach the floor of the Senate sometime this month. As it looks now, Byrd has enough votes to pass the bill,

but he does not have the 60 votes needed to invoke closture if the Republicans filibuster. We hope he will push hard to get the necessary votes.

[From the Clarion-Ledger, Jackson, (MS), July 13, 1987]

FINANCE REFORM—BILLS ENCOURAGE FAIRER CAMPAIGNS

A comprehensive campaign finance bill has surfaced in the U.S. House of Representatives—a good sign that some reform will come from Congress soon.

The House bill would establish a voluntary system of overall spending limits and prescribe limits on the use of personal wealth in campaigns, along with providing partial public financing for House general election campaigns. It would also limit the total amount of political action committee contributions a congressional candidate can accept.

A host of members in the Senate, including John C. Stennis of Mississippi, introduced their plan for campaign finance reform last month, but have gained little ground due to a filibuster led by Republican conservatives.

The stall tactic forced supporters of the Senate reform bill to introduce a new proposal that limits campaign spending and puts and aggregate limit on the total amount of political action committee contributions which candidates may accept. The new proposal eliminates the controversial public financing for Senate elections, except in certain circumstances.

Both plans are fair and reasonable. The key is to limit campaign spending, which has gotten out of control, and to set confines on contributions from political action committees.

[From the Clarion-Ledger, Jackson, (MS), June 12, 1987]

LESS MONEY—CONTROLLING SPECIAL INTERESTS

Campaign financing for candidates seeking election to the U.S. Senate must be reformed and the best improvement offered so far is through the taxpayer.

Sen. John Stennis of Mississippi is cosponsor of legislation before the Senate this week that would allow partial public financing of Senate elections, instead of heavy dependence on political action committees.

Stennis received $232,300 from political action committees during his 1983 campaign in which contributions totaled $994,000.

The reform measure, which was written by Sen. David Boren of Oklahoma, sets up optional public financing of political campaigns using a formula based on a state's population and setting various spending ranges for primary and general elections as well as runoff elections.

On the other end of the spectrum, Sen. Thad Cochran, also of Mississippi, says he supports more limits on media advertising and better disclosure of contributors to a candidate.

In his 1984 re-election bid, in which contributions totaled $2.8 million, Cochran received $969,739 from Political action committees.

The special interest groups are willing to spend the dollars and attract candidates who will likely feel indebted to vote for certain causes.

Reforms to dilute the strength of special interest groups are necessary. Stennis' legislation is a good beginning. Campaign financing must be changed.

[From the Kenosha News, Kenosha, WI, July 7, 1987]

SLAY THE MONSTER

The U.S. Senate is tied up in knots over an issue that to lawmakers is of paramount importance. It's not the Iran-Contra scandal or the budget or trade strategy. It's money—campaign money, to be exact.

Since early June, Senate Minority Leader Robert Dole, R-Kans., and most of his Republican colleagues have been engaged in a filibuster to prevent the Senate from acting on Senate Bill 2, much-needed legislation that would alter the system of election finance.

At issue is a Democratic-sponsored measure that would create voluntary spending limits in Senate elections, provide public funds for Senate general-election candidates agreeing to abide by the limits and restrict the amount of money that House and Senate candidates may accept from political-action committees, or PACs.

In 1988, if the bill were to pass, general-election limits would range from $950,000 in a low-population state such as Wyoming to nearly $5.5 million in California.

Senate Republicans don't necessarily dispute the need for campaign reform. Dole himself has spoken out about the outrageous expense of running for public office and the undue influence that PACs wield as a prime source of campaign financing. In the past 10 years, PAC contributions to Senate candidates have increased from $5 million to $45 million; campaign spending in Senate elections has increased from $38 million to $179 million. Senators complain about becoming "panhandlers."

In the words of the public-interest lobby Common Cause, "We have seen a monster created, a fundamentally corrupt campaign-finance system for Congress."

Senate Republicans object to the idea of using government money to run congressional campaigns—even though the public financing scheme for presidential candidates is working well. They argue that spending limits in congressional campaigns help incumbents to the detriment of challengers.

The Republicans have offered a compromise that, in effect, is no compromise. It would cut the maximum amount that any single PAC can give to a candidate, but it would eliminate the spending limit and public-financing components of the legislation.

Campaign reform simply will not happen without spending limits. The Supreme Court has ruled that there must be some form of public benefits in order to establish a system of voluntary campaign-spending limits.

The spending limits contained in Senate Bill 2 are reasonable and voluntary, as required by the Supreme Court. If presidential elections are a reliable guide, Senate Bill 2 will provide for competitive elections. Neither party will be at a disadvantage.

Dole and his fellow filibusterers need to step aside and give the reform legislation a chance to slay the campaign monster. In doing so, they would be helping restore the integrity of our representative form of government.

[From the Record-Courier, Kent-Ravenna, OH, June 30, 1987]

ALL UP IN KNOTS

The U.S. Senate is tied up in knots over an issue that to lawmakers is of paramount importance. It's not the Iran-Contra scandal or the budget or trade strategy. It's money—campaign money, to be exact.

Since early, June, Senate Minority Leader **Robert Dole, R-Kans., and most of his Re**publican colleagues have been engaged in a filibuster to prevent the Senate from acting on Senate Bill, 2, much-needed legislation that would alter the system of election finance.

At issue is a Democratic-sponsored measure that would create voluntary spending limits in Senate elections, provide public funds for Senate general-election candidates agreeing to abide by the limits and restrict the amount of money that House and Senate candidates may accept from political-action committees, or PACs.

In 1988, if the bill were to pass general-election limits would range from $950,000 in a low-population state such as Wyoming to nearly 5.5 million in California.

Senate Republicans don't necessarily dispute the need for campaign reform, Dole himself has spoken out about the outrageous expense of running for public office and the undue influence that PACs wield as a prime source of campaign financing. In the past 10 years, PAC contributions to Senate candidates have increase from $5 million to $45 million; campaign spending in Senate elections has increased from $38 million to $179 million. Senators complain about becoming "panhandlers."

In the words of the public-interest lobby Common Cause, "We have seen a monster created, a fundamentally corrupt campaign-finance system for Congress."

Senate Republicans object to the idea of using government money to run congressional campaigns—even though the public financing scheme for presidential candidates is working well. They argue that spending limits in congressional campaigns help incumbents to the detriment of challengers.

The Republicans have offered a compromise that, in effect, is no compromise. It would cut the maximum amount of any single PAC can give to a candidate, but it would eliminate the spending limit and public-financing components of the legislation.

Campaign reform simply will not happen without spending limits. The Supreme Court has ruled that there must be some form of public benefits in order to establish a system of voluntary campaign-spending limits.

The spending limtis contained in Senate Bill 2 are reasonable and voluntary, as required by the Supreme Court. if presidential elections are a reliable guide, Senate Bill 2 will provide for competitive elections. Neither party will be at a disadvantage.

Dole and his fellow filibusterers need to step aside and give the reform legislation a chance to slay the campaign monster. In doing so, they would be helping restore the integrity of our representative form of government.

[From the Valley News, Lebanon, NH, June 27, 1987]

CAMPAIGN SPENDING

The most direct, and perhaps best, way to control the spiraling cost of campaigns would be to place a limit on donations from political action committees (PACs) and an overall limit on campaign spending. But that has been judged unconstitutional by the Supreme Court.

The second best way to slow the flow of cash into politics is to ask candidates to vol-

untarily accept spending limits by offering public financing as an inducement. Such a system has been used for presidential elections since 1974 and all but one of the 35 major party candidates have accepted public financing and limitations on campaign spending.

It is now time to bring the same sensible kind of reform to congressional campaigns. In 10 years, spending on Senate races has increased five-fold to $179 million. On average, a successful candidate for the Senate spends $3 million to get elected.

The Senate is now considering a bill sponsored by Sens. Robert Byrd, D-W.Va., and David Boren, D-Okla., that would place those types of limitations on congressional campaigning. The bill proposes to limit the total amount of PAC contributions a candidate may accept ($1,000,000 for House elections; between $191,000 and $825,000 in Senate elections, depending on the size of the state) and limit total campaign spending.

Common Cause, which has long fought for campaign finance reform, estimates that the bill would have reduced PAC contributions by two-thirds in 1986 Senate races. Sen. Patrick Leahy, D-Vt., for example, raised about $825,000 in 1986. Under the proposal, he would have been limited to $190,000.

There are several good reasons why PAC donations and overall spending should be reduced. Businesses, unions and industrial groups don't make campaign contributions out of generosity. They make them to gain political access. Judging from the steady increase in PAC giving, they apparently are satisfied with what they're getting.

PAC donations also tend to benefit incumbents over challengers. Incumbents are much more likely to win any given election and therefore hold more promise to make PAC contributions a good investment. And, because of the astronomical cost of running for office, politicians find themselves spending more and more time raising money for their next election than delivering on all the promises they made in their previous one. Limiting overall spending would take some of that burden off our politicians and give them more time to fulfill the responsibilities of their offices.

Although 49 senators initially supported the Byrd-Boren measure, a sizable opposition has since surfaced. Opponents, who are mostly Republican, have offered an alternative proposal that would change the mechanics of PAC giving but not affect aggregate amounts. They have also complained about the drain of public financing on the Treasury.

Democrats have responded with a couple of reasonable compromises: One that would limit public financing to 40 percent of the established limit for overall spending and another that would provide public financing only to a candidate whose opponent refused to accept the voluntary limits.

Right now, the Boren-Byrd proposal is going nowhere. It is locked in filibuster in the Senate. The same tactic was used in 1979, the last time a comprehensive campaign finance reform package was considered.

We hope the tendered compromise, the continued climb of campaign costs in the last eight years and, ultimately, concern for the integrity of Congress will make for a different outcome in 1987.

[From The Leesburg Commercial, Leesburg, FL, July 4, 1987]

SENATE SHOULD ADOPT PROPOSAL TO RESTRICT CAMPAIGN SPENDING

The issue of political action committee financing of congressional races is being addressed by the Senate. It's about time.

In 1976, PACs contributed $5.4 million to Senate candidates. That's a big hunk of change, but that's all it is when compared to the $45 million donated to Senate races last year by PACs, with almost half of all senators collecting at least $1 million for their 1986 and future campaigns.

The growth of the PAC system has been detailed time and again, along with calls for meaningful reforms in campaign finance laws to eliminate PAC spending and influence. On the whole, Congress has ignored those calls, with proposals to limit or do away with PACs falling mainly on deaf ears.

Now, however, the Senate has a chance to begin meaningful campaign finance reform by supporting and refining a proposal from Senate Majority Leader Robert Byrd to limit campaign spending. Byrd's proposal ties campaign spending by Senate candidates to a state population on a voluntary basis, and limits House candidates to receiving no more than $100,000 from PACs.

Senate candidates not going along with the volunteer program would be limited to what he or she could receive from PACs. Also, Senate candidates could dip into the federal election fund for money to match what they receive in contributions of $250 or less.

In Florida, Senate candidates could spend up to $2.8 million on the general election. Considering that last year winner Bob Graham and loser Paula Hawkins spent about six times that much, the Byrd proposal could greatly reduce what's spent on Senate campaigns here.

There are some bugs that ought to be worked out of the Byrd proposal, such as the need to extend its coverage to primary races, making it mandatory instead of voluntary, and tying it into overall campaign finance reforms. But it is a good starting point, and one that enlightened members of the Senate, such as Graham and Florida's other senator, Lawton Chiles, support.

[From the Lewiston (ID) Tribune, June 10, 1987]

THIS BILL WON'T CURB PACS' INFLUENCE

A Democratic Senate bill to curb campaign financing by political action committees, or PACs, is being countered by a Republican-sponsored bill to eliminate PAC contributions altogether to specific congressional candidates. Sens. Bob Packwood of Oregon and Mitch McConnell of Kentucky, who introduced the Republican measure last week, have said they do not necessarily believe the PACs are a bad influence on campaigns but that the public seems to think so—and that their role therefore should be restricted.

That is what they call in politics, these days, a case of smoke and mirrors. The Packwood-McConnell bill would in effect expand the role of the PACs while appearing to restrict it. This is how it would work, according to Fred Wertheimer, president of Common Cause:

"The impact that the McConnell-Packwood legislation would have on PAC money is perhaps best demonstrated by what occurred in Senator Packwood's 1986 reelection campaign. In that election, ALIGNPAC, a PAC representing insurance interests, gave Senator Packwood a $1,000 contribution made out from ALIGNPAC to Senator Packwood. At the same time, ALIGNPAC also gathered and turned over to Senator Packwood $215,000 in checks made out by ALIGNPAC's members directly to Senator Packwood.

"This controversial practice, known as 'bundling,' allowed ALIGNPAC to massively evade the $5,000 per election PAC contribution limit and to get credit for providing what was the equivalent of a $215,000 contribution form ALIGNPAC to Senator Packwood."

The McConnell-Packwood bill would prevent any PAC from contributing money directly to any candidate, but it would permit the PACs to give unlimited amounts to committees that could then turn the money over to specific candidates. And, as Wertheimer notes, PACs could collect checks from members in any amount, and the candidates would have no doubt where it came from. The influence of special-interest money on congressional campaigns would be expanded, not curbed.

This is the Republican answer to a Democratic bill that would reduce PAC influence on members of Congress by closing the "bundling" loophole and by financing campaigns partly with public funds. If the Senate truly seeks to reduce big-money influence on congressional elections, these bills offer an easy choice.

[From the Lewiston (ME) Daily Sun, June 15, 1987]

CAMPAIGN THEATRICS

As the cost of running a successful campaign for Congress climbs, the cast of characters in the political arena declines.

And as the qualifiers for the Washington playbill shrink, the quality of representation wanes.

But alack, is this trend to be or not to be? A bill before the U.S. Senate would reverse this course by limiting contributions from private donors as well as spending from candidates' personal funds.

The Senate Election Campaign Act took center stage Thursday but the script on the Senate floor was reduced to a dull filibuster.

In the spotlight is the measure that is also known as the Byrd-Boren bill—a proposal to limit campaign costs and Political Action Committee contributions by propping up the revenues with public financing. The Supreme Court prompted the need for public money by ruling that Congress can limit campaign finances only if it provides public funds—thus the rub.

The protagonists of the opposition—Sens. Robert Packwood, R-Ore., and Mitch McConnell, R-Ky.—have submitted a legislative charade to counter the Byrd-Boren bill. The two claim their bill would eliminate PAC contributions but the fact is it would simply change the path of the money. The absurd proposal would force PACs to adopt a method called bundling—having individual PAC members make small donations to candidates instead of the organization as a whole. It would also make PACs funnel money to the political parties and the parties would then pass it on to the candidates—thus in effect eliminating any ceiling for PAC contributions.

By contrast, the Byrd-Boren bill would explicitly prohibit bundling and limit PAC contributions to $5,000. It would put a stop to the spiraling costs of campaigns, decrease the influence of special-interest groups and

reduce the amount of time candidates spend raising funds.

There are over 4,000 PACs increasing their monetary theatrics for candidates every year. In 1976, Senate candidates received $5 million in PAC funds. In 1986, the figure had climbed to $45 million.

Meanwhile, Packwood and McConnell were enacting a tragedy on the congressional stage Thursday. If the Senate had its act together, it would have mustered the 60 votes needed to pull the curtain on the filibuster.

The scene for the next act will take place with a cloture vote scheduled for next week. Hopefully, the slings and arrows of outrageous PAC fortune will miss their target in the election arena and rationality will prevail.

[From the Lewistown (PA) Sentinel, June 17, 1987]

CURBS ARE NEEDED ON CAMPAIGN COSTS

It's about time.

For the first time in a decade, Congress is taking a hard look at an issue close to every one of its members—the high cost of getting elected.

Campaign expenses have risen astronomically. In 1976, the average cost of a successful Senate campaign was $610,000. Last year's average for winners was $3 million.

Or consider California, where Democratic Sen. Alan Cranston spent more than $8.5 million last year to defeat a $8.9 million challenge from Republican Ed Zschau. More than $17 million spent for a job that pays $89,500 a year.

Congressional reformers, led by Senate Democrats, are doing more than criticizing the amounts being spent. They are also targeting political action committees—PACs—the fastest rising sources of campaign money.

PACs are booming. In 1976 they gave $5.4 million to Senate candidates. Last year, the total reached $45.7 million. Fourteen of the 34 senators elected last year got more than $1 million each from PACs. More than 200 House members get at least half their election funds from them.

Legislation now stalled by a Republican filibuster in the Senate proposes PAC limits that would have cut the special-interest money going to winning 1986 Senate candidates from $28.9 million to $10.2 million, according to Common Cause, a citizens lobby that has been prodding Congress to change the system.

Democratic Sen. Robert Byrd of West Virginia, the Senate Majority Leader, brought the campaign finance bill to the floor earlier this month. He has shown no signs of withdrawing it despite a filibuster that has stopped most other business.

Even if the bill should eventually become law, participation by candidates would be voluntary to get around a Supreme Court decision that says mandatory spending limits violate constitutional free-speech rights.

Under the Democratic plan, a candidate could get up to 40 percent of general election expenses paid from the Treasury by agreeing to limit PAC receipts and restrict spending to $950,000 from $5.5 million, depending on a state's population.

Something needs to be done to curb campaign spending. PACs are largely responsible for the skyrocketing costs of getting elected, so it makes sense to limit contributions from those special-interest groups.

The Democratic plan represents a step in the right direction. It would at least provide an incentive for candidates to put less emphasis on PACs, and that would eventually make PACs less powerful.

[From the Lincoln (IL) Courier, June 3, 1987]

CONGRESS PONDERS ITS OWN FILTHY LUCRE

Money is on the mind of Congress these days—money scandals, to be specific. Congressional investigators are trying to trace the byzantine trail of funds connected to the Iran-Contra affair, and legislation is in the works that would deal with the Wall Street money scandal of insider trading. But Congress is dealing with a money scandal of its own as well—a scandal that involves the way congressional elections are financed.

A growing number of lawmakers are expressing dismay at the amount of money required to run for re-election and the amount of time it takes to raise that money. Chief among them is Senate Majority Leader Robert Byrd, D-W.Va., who complains that his colleagues are spending so much time trying to raise campaign funds that they have no time for Senate business. Byrd and Sen. David Boren, D-Okla., are cosponsors of legislation to curb political action committees and limit campaign spending.

As approved by the Senate Rules Committee, the Byrd-Boren bill, Senate Bill 2, would create a series of voluntary spending limits in Senate primary and general election races. It also would provide public funds for general election candidates who agree to abide by those limits. Spending for Senate races in the 1987-88 election cycle would be set at about $181 million.

The bill also would limit the amount House and Senate candidates may accept from PACs. Initially, the ceilings would range from $190,950 to $825,000 in Senate races, depending on the population of the state involved, and from $100,000 to $150,000 for House candidates, depending on the number of contested elections faced.

The Byrd-Boren proposal faces heavy opposition from Republicans, many of whom view public financing of campaigns as anathema. They have threatened to kill the bill by filibuster, and they are rumored to be working on an alternative measure. The Republican measure would limit PAC contributions but would not include public financing or spending limits.

Though the Republican measure would effect the status quo only slightly, it's reassuring that they at least recognize change is needed. With spending going up in each of the last five election cycles monitored by the Federal Election Commission, with special-interest PAC contributions to House and Senate candidates reaching a record $130 million in the 1986 election and with the 100th Congress more indebted to special interests than any Congress in the nation's history, the need for significant change is urgent.

Senate Bill 2 will reach the floor of the Senate sometime this month. As it looks now, Byrd has enough votes to pass the bill, but he does not have the 60 votes needed to invoke cloture if the Republicans filibuster. We hope he will push hard to get the necessary votes.

[From the Little (AR) Rock Gazette, June 18, 1987]

MUTING THE VOICE OF MONEY

Nearly everyone there acknowledges that money has gotten the upper hand in the United States Senate. The average cost of a winning Senate campaign in 1986 raced to $3.1 million, an increase of more than 400 per cent in 10 years, and though every candidate is relieved to have it no one is proud of how he raises it.

Public opinion accounts for part of this nervous consensus in the Senate. Americans believe that special interests buy far too much power over public policy by campaign gifts and honoraria to senators and congressmen. Voters have ample opportunity to measure it. Anyone in Central Arkansas wondering how Congressman Tommy Robinson will vote, for example, must only look at his political action gifts. (But we get ahead of ourselves here: the House of Representatives doesn't feel moved on campaign finance yet because all its members are counting next year on the advantages the system offers them.)

But the consensus in the Senate doesn't embrace a solution. Both parties fear the other might get some advantage from a law controlling campaign spending and giving. If the Senate votes, it will approve a bill by Senator David Boren of Oklahoma, but Republicans have twice blocked a vote by defeating cloture of a filibuster.

Boren's bill would limit contributions from political action committees and install voluntary public financing of Senate campaigns. Taxpayers could designate a $1 checkoff on their income tax returns. To qualify for public funds, candidates would have to accept ceilings on their private fund-raising and on PAC gifts. The PAC ceiling for a candidate in Arkansas would be $190,950.

Republicans aren't so protective of PAC money as they are worried about the overall spending limitations. The GOP generally raises a lot more money for its candidates. Republicans support a bill by Senators Bob Packwood of Oregon and Mitch McConnell of Kentucky that would prohibit direct PAC contributions to candidates altogether. But the rub is that PACs would give to party organizations, which would funnel unlimited sums to candidates. The Republican bill would continue and expand the practice of "bundling," which the Boren bill would prohibit.

Arkansas voters saw the effects of bundling last year. The Republican Party bundled $125,000 in contributions from outside Arkansas to the Senate campaign of Asa Hutchinson, who was running against Senator Dale Bumpers. When Gazette reporters telephoned a few of the donors, they had never heard of Hutchinson or even been aware of the race in Arkansas.

If the Senate approves the Boren bill, it will be one of its more unselfish acts. Its principal effect will not be to help Democrats, but challengers, who must run against a tide of money. Indeed, Democrats might be the Boren bill's instant casualties because more of them will face re-election in 1988 and 1990. Such ironies have been the history of efforts to reform campaign finance. The explosion of corporate PACs followed a law to protect union PACs.

But the greater beneficiary would be the public interest, which is served whenever the influence of overpowering money is curtailed.

The Reagan administration opposes the Boren bill, and the president will surely veto it if it somehow passes in its present form—a setback most of the Senate, especially the 33 members facing re-election in 1988, no doubt would take philosophically. But the people shouldn't.

[From The Lock Haven (PA), Express, June 15, 1987]

POWERFUL PAC-MEN

Political action committee contributions to Pennsylvania congressional candidates rose to an all-time high $7.5 million in 1986, a lobbying group says.

Common Cause, which supports changes in the federal laws governing campaign contributions, said the increase in PAC contributions paralleled a record $21.3 million in overall campaign spending in 1986.

Almost 30 percent—or $2.1 million—of PAC funds funnelled to Pennsylvania went to the Senate campaigns of victorious incumbent Republican Arlen Specter and Democrat Bob Edgar.

Specter received $1.26 million, or 23 percent of the $5.4 million raised by his campaign, from PACs, according to statistics provided by Common Cause.

Edgar, a former Philadelphia-area congressman, received $814,254, or 21 percent of his total campaign till, from PACs, Common cause said.

In 1982, Sen. John Heinz, R-Pa., and his Democratic opponent, Cyril Wecht, received $644,512 in PAC contributions, Common Cause said.

Democratic Rep. William H. Gray III of Philadelphia, the powerful chairman of the Budget Committee, received the most money from PACs among House candidates, with contributions totalling $459,048.

At the other end of the spending spectrum, Rep. William Gooding, R-Jacobus, took no money from PACs in 1986. He is among the handful in Congress who will not accept special interest contributions.

Among area candidates, Cong. Joe McDade accepted $203,665 in PAC money, George Gekas $50,014, Bill Clinger $286,980.

The big PAC man? Clinger's unsuccessful challenger Bill Wachob with $320,804.

"The spiralling cost of congressional campaigns combined with the millions of dollars in special interest PAC contributions that flood candidates' coffers, in Pennsylvania and nationwide, vividly underscores the urgent need to reform the way congressional campaigns are financed," Common Cause President Fred Wertheimer said.

The group supports a Senate bill that would establish partial public funding for Senate campaigns and limit PAC contributions and overall campaign spending.

The measure was endorsed by the Rules Committee in April. Debate on the measure by the Senate began last week.

"The campaign financing system is a national scandal which threatens the very integrity of Congress," Wertheimer said. "Senator Specter and Senator Heinz have a historic opportunity to support the fundamental reforms this process so desperately needs."

The senators should do all they can to be a part of that reform.

[From the Lodi (CA) News-Sentinel, June 10, 1987]

CONGRESSMEN PONDER THEIR OWN "FILTHY LUCRE"

Money is on the mind of Congress these days—money scandals, to be specific. Congressional investigators are trying to trace the byzantine trail of funds connected to the Iran-Contra affair and legislation is in the works that would deal with the Wall Street money scandal of insider trading. But Congress is dealing with a money scandal of its own as well—a scandal that involves the way congressional elections are financed.

A growing number of lawmakers are expressing dismay at the amount of money required to run for re-election and the amount of time it takes to raise that money. Chief among them is Senate Majority Leader Robert Byrd, D-W.Va., who complains that his colleagues are spending so much time trying to raise campaign funds that they have no time for Senate business. Byrd and Sen. David Boren, D-Okla., are cosponsors of legislation to curb political action committees (PACs) and limit campaign spending.

As approved by the Senate Rules Committee, the Byrd-Boren bill, Senate Bill 2, would create a series of voluntary spending limits in Senate primary and general election races. It also would provide public funds for general election candidates who agree to abide by those limits. Spending for Senate races in the 1987-88 election cycle would be set at about $181 million.

The bill also would limit the amount House and Senate candidates may accept from PACs. Initially, the ceilings would range from $190,950 to $825,000 in Senate races, depending on the population of the state involved, and from $100,000 to $150,000 for House candidates, depending on the number of contested elections faced.

The Byrd-Boren proposal faces heavy opposition from Republicans, many of whom view public financing of campaigns as anathema. They have threatened to kill the bill by filibuster, and they are rumored to be working on an alternative measure. The Republican measure would limit PAC contributions but would not include public financing or spending limits.

Though the Republican measure would effect the status quo only slightly, it's reassuring that they at least recognize change is needed. With spending going up in each of the last five election cycles monitored by the Federal Election Commission, with special-interest PAC contributions to House and Senate candates reaching a record $130 million in the 1986 election and with the 100th Congress more indebted to special interests than any Congress in the nation's history, the need for significant change is urgent.

Senate Bill 2 will reach the floor of the Senate sometime this month. As it looks now, Byrd has enough votes to pass the bill, but he does not have the 60 votes needed to invoke clouture if the Republicans filibuster. We hope he will push hard to get the necessary votes.

[From the Long Island (NY) Newsday, July 7, 1987]

WHY NOT VOLUNTARY CAMPAIGN SPENDING LIMITS

Congressional reformers may have found an acceptable way to limit campaign spending at last: Make the limit voluntary—but make the alternative very unpleasant for those who don't go along. It worked with "Voluntary" quotas on cars from Japan (the alternative would have been mandatory quotas), and it's worth a try to reduce the obscene amounts now spent on congressional races.

When Congress provided for partial public financing of presidential campaigns 13 years ago, it also put mandatory ceilings on spending by House and Senate candidates. Two years later the Supreme Court found those limits unconstitutional, but it had no problem with voluntary restrictions.

Ever since, reformers have searched in vain for a way to induce candidates to hold down their expenditures voluntarily. And ever since, campaign costs have soared, political action committees have proliferated and fund raising has become such an onerous and time-consuming chore that many members of Congress have started to have second thoughts about the system. Now a majority of the Senate seems to favor an overhaul.

But that largely Democratic majority has been stymied by a largely Republican minority, which has filibustered successfully against a campaign reform bill sponsored by Sens. David Boren (D-Okla.) and Robert Byrd (D-W.Va.) It originally featured strict spending and contribution limits coupled with public financing for congressional candidates, along the lines of the presidential system.

Opponents objected chiefly to the cost but also to limiting spending and making taxpayers fund political campaigns. This proposal should put the cost argument to rest: Instead of providing substantial public funds to those who agree to abide by spending limits, it would use public funding only as a form of insurance. Candidates would be eligible only if their opponents exceeded the limit set for that race; the amount would be equal to that opponents' excess.

Public funds would also be allocated to match negative attacks mounted by independent forces—a provision that might prove difficult to enforce. Even so, this proposal makes it difficult to oppose spending limits out of concern for the public purse.

On the contrary, concern for the public interest argues strongly for reining in runaway campaign costs and the growing influence of political action committees. The minority should quit filibustering and allow a vote on this proposal's considerable merit. Who knows? It might even become a model for states and municipalities as well.

[From the Louisville (KY) Courier-Journal, July 15, 1987]

LIMITING POLITICAL BUCKS

U.S. Senators who claim they deplore the abuses of the political money game have refused to support the only effective reform proposal in Congress because it provides public money for U.S. Senate campaigns. A new version puts that complaint to rest, leaving critics with no plausible pretext for continuing the filibuster that has prevented action since early June.

The rewritten bill retains the two essential ingredients of campaign finance reform—a voluntary over-all spending limit for Senate candidates based on each state's population and a ceiling on contributions from special interest political action committees.

Unlike the original version, it does not offer public money to every candidate who raises a specified amount in individual contributions. But a candidate could become eligible for public dollars to offset the advantage of an opponent who refuses to accept the limit. Matching money could also go to candidates who are targets of negative advertising sponsored by independent groups. And Senate hopefuls would have other incentives to participate, including a break on postal and TV ad rates.

The idea is to encourage candidates to observe the limits and to deter so-called "independent expenditures," thereby minimizing the use of public money. This approach should satisfy the Supreme Court rule that Congress may set voluntary campaign spending limits if candidates are offered an inducement, such as public money, to

comply. Because of its simplicity and low cost, it could be adopted by the House and even by states.

The limits wouldn't leave candidates bereft. A Kentucky contender could raise $243,290, or 20 per cent of the spending limit, from PACs. Hoosiers could take in $321,177 in PAC money and spend five times that amount. That's ample for a respectable race.

Opponents will raise the usual objections. One is that any one PAC contribution is too small a part of a campaign budget to influence a congressman's voting habits. But studies show members of key committees often receive money from many PACS with common legislative interest. Anyone who thinks lawmakers are oblivious to these large sums has his head in the sand.

Another claim is that spending limits would help incumbents. However, 98 percent of House members were re-elected last year, suggesting that no system could be more protective of incumbents than the present one.

The bottom line is that Congress must finally curb the corrupting influence of special interest money. The compromise answers the opponents' chief complaint. They should quit being obstructionists and allow the issue to come to a vote.

[From the Louisville (KY) Courier-Journal, June 11, 1987]

CAP CAMPAIGN SPENDING

Kentucky's Republican senator, Mitch McConnell, and his colleagues won the first skirmish in the campaign finance reform battle. If they win the war, look for the cost of congressional races to go from scandalous to nauseating.

Before the Senate is a simple proposition. It would set up a system of public financing of Senate campaigns similar to the system that has financed the last three presidential campaigns. Candidates would not have to take the tax money. If they did, though, they would have to abide by ceilings on spending that vary according to the population of the states.

Public financing is the only legal way to limit the role of megabucks in political campaigns, according to the Supreme Court. That is what Senate Democrats want to do and a vote Tuesday showed that a majority of the Senate favors that approach.

Unfortunately, the 52-47 vote on a motion to cut off a Republican-backed filibuster was eight short of the necessary 60. The prospect of prolonged debate set off talk of a compromise. But any change short of public financing would be mere window dressing.

That was shown when Sen. McConnell said that the $12 million spent by Kentucky's Democratic gubernatorial candidates wasn't "obscene or inappropriate," but just a healthy indication of vigorous political competition. Such big spending "represents participation" in, rather than corruption of, the political process, he argued.

He tossed off his remarks in support of a window-dressing substitute for the Democratic bill that he and Sen. Bob Packwood of Oregon offered. Their measure tries to obscure the issue by attacking political action committee spending. It would forbid PAC contributions to congressional candidates—but the PACs could continue to influence elections by making "independent expenditures" on behalf of candidates, and by donating to state and national political-party committees.

What McConnell-Packwood proposes is to change the mix of funds flowing into congressional campaigns. It would not cap those funds. The cash and checks from PACs and fat cats would still flood campaign headquarters and the cost of running for office—which has more than doubled in the past decade—would continue to skyrocket.

Surely the senators don't want that. They must not settle for cosmetic change.

[From the Lyndhurst (NJ) Commercial Leader-Review, June 18, 1987]

CAMPAIGN SPENDING LIMITS

Campaign finance reform is poised for a breakthrough. On the opening day of the 100th Congress, Sen. David Boren (D-Okla.) and Senate Majority Leader Robert Byrd (D-W. Va.) introduced a comprehensive campaign finance reform bill. The bill, S.2, would set aggregate limits on the amount of political action committee (PAC) money candidates for Congress could receive. It would also create a voluntary system of campaign spending limits and limits on the use of personal wealth, along with partial public financing for senatorial campaigns. Much like the system already in place for presidential public financing, S.2 would provide for financing by the checkoff on individual tax returns. For more on the reform bill.

CC President Fred Wertheimer says the bill "attacks the most dangerous aspects of the current campaign finance system: the obscene and excessive sums candidates are spending to get elected, and their increasing dependence on special interest PACs for funding."

Last year's elections underscored the need for such reforms. Congressional candidates in 1985 spent close to $400 million, four times the amount spent a decade ago. On the average, winning Senate candidates spent over $3 million on their election efforts. Between January 1, 1985 and December 31, 1986, Senate candidates received over $45 million from special interest PACs, a 63 percent increase over PAC giving in the 1984 races.

Pressure for reform, both from within Congress and from the public, is strong. The S.2 bill has 30 cosponsors spanning the political spectrum. As Budget Committee chairman Sen. Lawton Chiles (D-Fla.) has said, "I sense a growing consensus among members of this body that the trend toward more money in campaigns and bigger, richer and more PACs needs to be reversed . . . . I believe the partial public financing of Senate elections . . . is the way to change."

This could well be the year for long-awaited reforms to take shape, says Wertheimer. "With the Senate leadership strongly behind the campaign finance reform effort, this dramatically improves the chances for successful action in 1987 on this historic legislation. We must make an extraordinary effort to take advantage of this extraordinary opportunity."

While the chances appear better than ever for passage of the bill in 1987, the battle will not be easy—particularly with well-funded PACs like those of the American Medical Association and the National Rifle Association expected to lobby intensely against S.2. That's why, ultimately, it will take massive grassroots pressure to get the comprehensive reform package passed.

We must pull out all the stops to get Congress to pass these needed reforms. It is essential for your senators to hear from you. The U.S. Senate needs to know that the public is fed up with the current system of financing congressional elections.

Write your senators today. If they have not already done so, urge them to go on the record against special interest money and in favor of comprehensive campaign finance reform by signing on as a cosponsor to the Boren-Byrd bill. And if your senators are already cosponsors, thank them for their support and urge them to keep campaign finance reform a top priority in the 100th Congress.

If you have time, please also write to Sen. Robert Dole (R-Kan.), Republican leader of the Senate, who is expected to play a key role in this fight. Tell him how essential it is to the country to clean up congressional campaign financing and ask him to support and cosponsor S.2.

Mail your letter in care of your senators' names to: U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C. 20510.

[From the Marion (OH) Star, July 5, 1987]

LET'S SLAY IT

The U.S. Senate is tied up in knots over an issue that to lawmakers is of paramount importance. It's not the Iran-Contra scandal or the budget of trade strategy. It is money—campaign money, to be exact.

Since early June, Senate Minority Leader Robert Dole, R-Kan., and most of his Republican colleagues have been engaged in a filibuster to prevent the Senate from acting on Senate Bill 2, much-needed legislation that would alter the system of election finance.

At issue is a Democratic-sponsored measure that would create voluntary spending limits in Senate elections, provide public funds for Senate general-election candidates agreeing to abide by the limits and restrict the amount of money that House and Senate candidates may accept from political-action committees, or PACs.

In 1988, if the bill were to pass, general-election limits would range from $950,000 in a low-population state such as Wyoming to nearly $5.5 million in California.

Senate Republicans do not necessarily dispute the need for campaign reform. Dole himself has spoken out about the outrageous expense of running for public office and the undue influence that PACs wield as a prime source of campaign financing. In the past 10 years, PAC contributions to Senate candidates have increased from $5 million to $45 million; campaign spending in Senate elections has increased from $38 million to $179 million. Senators complain about becoming "panhandlers."

In the words of the public-interest lobby Common Cause, "We have seen a monster created, a fundamentally corrupt campaign finance system for Congress."

Senate Republicans object to the idea of using government money to run congressional campaigns—even though the public financing scheme for presidential candidates is working well. They argue that spending limits in congressional campaigns help incumbents to the detriment of challengers.

The Republicans have offered a compromise that, in effect, is no compromise. It would cut the maximum amount that any single PAC can give to a candidate, but it would eliminate the spending limit and public financing components of the legislation.

Campaign reform simply will not happen without spending limits. The Supreme Court has ruled that there must be some

form of public benefits in order to establish a system of voluntary campaign-spending limits.

The spending limits contained in Senate Bill 2 are reasonable and voluntary, as required by the high court. If presidential elections are a reliable guide, Senate Bill 2 will provide for competitive elections. Neither party will be at a disadvantage

Dole and his fellow filibusterers need to step aside and give the reform legislation a chance to slay the campaign monster. In doing so, they would be helping restore the integrity of our representative form of government.

[From the Marion (OH) Star, June 5, 1987]

GET THEM

Money is on the mind of Congress these days—money scandals, to be specific.

Congressional investigators are trying to trace the byzantine trail of funds connected to the Iran-Contra affair, and legislation is in the works that would deal with the Wall Street money scandal of inside trading. But Congress is dealing with a money scandal of its own as well—a scandal that involves the way congressional elections are financed.

A growing number of lawmakers are expressing dismay at the amount of money required to run for re-election and the amount of time it takes to raise that money. Chief among them is Senate Majority Leader Robert Byrd, D-W.VA., who complains that his colleagues are spending so much time trying to raise campaign funds that they have no time for Senate business. Byrd and Sen. David Boren, D-Okla., are co-sponsors of legislation to curb political action committees (PACs) and limit campaign spending.

As approved by the Senate Rules Committee, the Byrd-Boren bill, Senate Bill 2, would create a series of voluntary spending limits in Senate primary and general election races; it also would provide public funds for general election candidates who agree to abide by those limits. Spending for Senate races in the 1987-1988 election cycle would be set at about $181 million.

The bill also would limit the amount House and Senate candidates may accept from PACs. Initially, the ceilings would range from $190,950 to $825,000 in Senate races, depending on the population of the state involved, and from $100,000 to $150,000 for House candidates, depending on the number of contested elections faced.

The Byrd-Boren proposal faces heavy opposition from Republicans, many of whom view public financing of campaigns as anathema. They have threatened to kill the bill by filibuster, and they are rumored to be working on an alternative measure. The Republican measure would limit PAC contributions but would not include public financing or spending limits.

Though the Republican measure would effect the status quo only slightly, it is reassuring that they at least recognize change is needed. With spending going up in each of the last five election cycles monitored by the Federal Election Commission, with special-interest PAC contributions to House and Senate candidates reaching a record $130 million in the 1986 election and with the 100th Congress more indebted to special interests than any Congress in the nation's history, the need for significant change is urgent.

Senate Bill 2 will reach the floor of the Senate sometime in June. As it looks now, Byrd has enough votes to pass the bill, but he does not have the 60 votes needed to invoke cloture if the Republicans filibuster. We hope he will push hard to get the necessary votes.

[From the Medford (OR) Mail Tribune, July 9, 1987]

LIMITS ARE NEEDED

Members of the U.S. Senate will try again later this week to end a filibuster that has blocked a campaign spending reform bill since early June. If they fail, the price of winning a Senate seat will continue to increase at an obscene rate and the public's worry that political influence is being bought and sold will become stronger.

Leaders of this latest effort to limit campaign spending and reduce the power of political action committees (PACs) hope that July 1 revisions to the Senatorial Election Campaign Act will win enough votes to end the filibuster. The new proposal would retain key elements of S. 2, the original legislation, that are considered essential to holding down Senate campaign spending that has jumped from $45 million to $179 million between 1977 and 1986.

Those essential elements, which are endorsed by the citizens' lobby Common Cause, are: limits on spending, based on a state's population, and a limit on the total amount of PAC contributions that a candidate would be able to accept.

Candidates who abide by the spending limits would become eligible for preferential mailing rates and the lowest available TV rates. They also could receive taxpayer-funded "compensating payments" if their opponent refused to accept the ceiling on expenditures or if a third party spent money to campaign against them.

Common Cause says the presidential campaign spending system created after the Watergate affair proves that reform is possible. In 1972, with no limits, President Richard Nixon spent $62 million in his re-election effort. In 1984, with limits in effect, President Ronald Reagan spent $68 million—an increase of $6 million over 12 years.

By comparison spending in Senate races climbed from $35.5 million in 1972 to $137 million in 1984. During roughly the same period, PAC contributions went from $5 million in 1976 to $45 million in 1986.

"The question now before the Senate is whether the political will exists to resist partisan pressures and set aside obstructionist tactics, and to act instead in the nation's best interest by enacting effective and comprehensive campaign finance reform," says Common Cause President Fred Wertheimer. "Two hundred years after the framing of our Constitution and establishment of the U.S. Congress, senators cannot tell the American people that the present scandalous campaign finance system is the best they have to offer the country."

Amen to that.—R.A.S.

[From the Milwaukee (WI) Journal, June 10, 1987]

MAYBE A CHANCE TO THWART THE PACS

Since Congress voted in 1974 to provide for public financing of presidential elections, the lawmakers repeatedly have refused to take even a nip of their own good medicine. Most senators and representatives have preferred to get campaign money the old-fashioned way, by accepting donations from special interests.

After all, it's a system that heavily favors the incumbents and discourages challengers. But attitudes on Capitol Hill may be changing a bit for the better, thanks to public disgust with a system that has enabled well-heeled political action committees (PACs) to severely distort the electoral and governmental processes.

The Senate on Tuesday voted 52 to 17 against a Republican-led filibuster that threatens to keep a sensible campaign-reform bill from coming to a vote. The majority was not large enough; it takes 60 votes to limit debate. Nonetheless, it was a slightly encouraging sign, indicating that the bill could pass if the full Senate were allowed to vote on it.

The measure, sponsored by Sen. David Boren (D-Okla.) and Majority Leader Robert Byrd (D-W.Va.), would provide partial public financing for senatorial candidates if they agreed to abide by prescribed limits on total campaign spending and on total donations accepted from PACs.

A similar system in Wisconsin, covering legislative and statewide offices, has been widely accepted by politicians and has had generally beneficial effects. It has restrained both the total amount of political spending and the influence of PACs.

The Wisconsin system would work even better if it included a provision, as the Senate bill does, to prevent the evasion of PAC contribution limits through a trick known as bundling. (PACs are now allowed to round up checks for a candidate and give them as a bundle without counting them against PAC limits).

Of course, even if the Senate bill is eventually approved, obstacles will remain. The House has yet to act on the issue, and the possibility of a presidential veto must be considered. But supporters of campaign-finance reform say the chances for enacting at least partial public funding of congressional elections are better than they have been in many years.

Even some senators who oppose the concept are paying lip service to reform. For instance, Sen. Bob Packwood (R-Ore.), leader of the filibuster, has proposed that political action committees be forbidden to make direct contributions to candidates. But Packwood leaves a loophole large enough to accommodate a herd of elephants: PACs would be allowed to channel their gifts through the political parties.

Regrettably, he and some other prominent Republicans have resorted to outright demagogy on the issue of public financing. Packwood says the public-finance feature of the Boren-Byrd bill would "pick the taxpayers pocket," even though the cost is estimated at only about 50 cents a year per taxpayer.

That's a mighty reasonable price to pay for a finance system that will help take the government back from the PACs.

[From the New Bern (NC) Sun Journal, July 7, 1987]

PAC MONSTER IS TARGET OF REFORM

The U.S. Senate is tied up in knots over an issue that to lawmakers is of paramount importance. It's not the Iran-Contra scandal or the budget or trade strategy. It's money—campaign money, to be exact.

Since early June, Senate Minority Leader Robert Dole, R-Kan., and most of his Republican colleagues have been engaged in a filibuster to prevent the Senate from acting on Senate Bill 2, much-needed legislation that would alter the system of election finance.

At issue is a Democratic-sponsored measure that would create voluntary spending limits in Senate elections, provide public

funds for Senate general-election candidates agreeing to abide by the limits and restrict the amount of money that House and Senate candidates may accept from political-action committees, or PACs.

In 1968, if the bill were to pass, general-election limits would range from $950,000 in a low-population state such as Wyoming to nearly $5.5 million in California.

Senate Republicans don't necessarily dispute the need for campaign reform. Dole himself has spoken out about the outrageous expense of running for public office and the undue influence that PACs wield as a prime source of campaign financing. In the past 10 years, PAC contributions to Senate candidates have increased from $5 million to $45 million; campaign spending in Senate elections has increased from $38 million to $179 million. Senators complain about becoming "panhandlers."

In the words of the public-interest lobby Common Cause, "We have seen a monster created, a fundamentally corrupt campaign-finance system for Congress."

Senate Republicans object to the idea of using government money to run congressional campaigns—even though the public financing scheme for presidential candidates is working well. They argue that spending limits in congressional campaigns help incumbents to the detriment of challengers.

The Republicans have offered a compromise that, in effect, is no compromise. It would cut the maximum amount that any single PAC can give to a candidate, but it would eliminate the spending limit and public-financing components of the legislation.

Campaign reform simply will not happen without spending limits. The Supreme Court has ruled that there must be some form of public benefits in order to establish a system of voluntary campaign-spending limits.

The spending limits contained in Senate Bill 2 are reasonable and voluntary, as required by the Supreme Court. If presidential elections are a reliable guide, Senate Bill 2 will provide for competitive elections. Neither party will be at a disadvantage.

Dole and his fellow filibusterers need to step aside and give the reform legislation a chance to slay the campaign monster. In doing so, they would be helping restore the integrity of our representative form of government.

[From the New Brunswick (NJ) Central New Jersey Home News, June 9, 1987]

THE ISSUE THAT WON'T DIE

Sometime today the Senate is expected to vote on a cloture petition to cut off debate on a sweeping campaign finance reform proposal. The bill's principal author, Oklahoma Sen. David Boren, doesn't think the necessary 60 votes are there to stop what threatens to become a summer-long filibuster aimed at stalling the Democratic-sponsored legislation. But as a tactical move, the cloture vote may move some senators to the negotiating table where a compromise reform bill can be drafted.

Campaign finance reform is the issue that won't die, but the Senate is torn by uneasiness about Boren's tough proposal—it would establish a public financing system and set overall spending limits as well as limits on the total amount of political action committee money Senate candidates could accept—and a desire to look good on the issue of runaway campaign spending and ballooning PAC contributions. Last week, in a move widely interpreted as an attempt to protect Republicans from being labeled anti-reform, two GOP senators introduced their own version of a campaign finance bill, which was promptly denounced by the citizens' lobby Common Cause as a "charade" that "should be rejected out of hand."

The Boren bill is not perfect. But it is a real attempt to right a campaign finance system that is out of control. The Senate can play games with filibusters and weak substitute proposals, but only real reform will address the problem of campaigns that cost too much—and the PAC money that pays for them.

[From the New London (CT) Day, June 23, 1987]

BLOCKING REFORM—THEY CAN ALWAYS FIND A GOOD EXCUSE

At least Minority Leader Robert Dole is honest about it. He won't let a bill aimed at reforming campaign financing through the Senate because it would hurt Republican political chances in some parts of the country where the GOP hopes to increase its effectiveness.

The result is that S. 2, a much-needed limitation on contributions from Political Action Committees, is stalled by a filibuster. ". . . Putting on a campaign-expenditure limit is, in effect, putting a brake on our growth in certain parts of this country. It may not be intended, but that is going to be the result," says Sen. Dole in explaining the filibuster.

This is raw politics, nothing more. There always will be compelling reasons for those candidates who can raise the most funds to want to raise as much as their contributors will give. Sen. Dole's fondness for unfettered campaign financing has as much appeal in areas where the GOP already is strong and merely wants to hold onto seats as it does where the party needs more support. It just happens that at this juncture, the Republicans are able to raise much more money that the Democrats, and that's why Sen. Dole disparages reform.

With such thinking, no reform would ever arrive, and campaign financing abuses would get worse and worse.

S. 2, whose principal sponsor is Sen. David Boren of Oklahoma, provides limits of $190,950 to $825,000 in Senate races, depending upon the size of the state. The measure also sets limits of $950,000 to $5.5 million for general and primary elections combined.

Candidates who wanted to accept public financing contributions from the government would have to agree to limit PAC contributions under the proposed legislation.

In the past decade, PAC contributions to Senate races have increased by nine times. The numbers show clearly how PAC money plays an increasing role in helping candidates run and win elections. Putting congressmen and senators in the position of having to beg for money from special-interest groups in order to match the spending of the competition denigrates the office and opens up the potential for buying votes.

The only way to reform that situation is to put in place absolute dollar limits on PAC contributions.

Senate bill 2 is not designed to help Democrats or Republicans, but to assist the free election process that makes America work. Sen. Dole, get out of the aisle and stop blocking this good legislation.

[From the New London (CT) Day, May 27, 1987]

CAMPAIGNS—LIMIT SPECIAL INTERESTS

There's nothing complicated about the effort to reduce the influence of the money peddlers who now try to shape legislation by filling congressional pockets. Either there will be a limit on the donations of PACs to individual candidates or there will not. Without question, there should be limits.

Political Action Committees were intended to get control of unbridled campaign contributions, the likes of which came to their most egregious public display in the revelations about Richard M. Nixon's fund raising prior to his re-election in 1972. Mr. Nixon spend $62 million for his primary and general election campaigns, some $6 million less than President Reagan spent in 1984. But given the adjustments for the Consumer Price Index, Mr. Nixon's expenditures would have been $153.9 million in 1984 if it were not for the campaign limitations and public financing already in existence.

Now the reformer no longer is chaste. PACs continue to be misused and abused to unduly influence the outcome of elections. Special interests increasingly are buying candidates with the not-so-subtle subversion of ready cash whenever a candidate needs it. The overwhelming percentage of the contributions go to incumbents, rather than challengers.

S. 2, a bill favorably reported out by the Senate Rules Committee would put a limit on such shenanigans. Some 49 senators currently favor the bill, but when the final vote is taken, arms weary from twisting may not go up in support of this much-needed continuation along the path of election reform.

The measure would set spending limits of $950,000 to $5.5 million, depending upon size of the election district. The limits apply to general and primary elections combined. Candidates who wanted to accept public financing contributions from the government would have to agree to limit PAC contributions.

In Senate campaigns, the limit would be $190,950 for PAC donations in the smallest states to $825,000 in the largest. Under these rules, the PAC donations of candidates such as Kansas' Robert Dole, the Senate minority leader, would have been just $190,950 instead of the more than $1 million in contributions he received from PACs.

Common Cause, the citizen's lobbying group that does so effective a job of making public the many campaign contribution abuses, is leaning hard on Sen. Dole to support the reform legislaltion. As a presidential candidate who may need to raise huge amounts of money, the senator obviously has some interest in protecting the status quo.

The influential support of Sen. Dole easily would push this much-needed campaign reform legislation over the top. Such statesmanship is necessary to curtail the ever growing abuses of PACs.

[From the New York Times, June 19, 1987]

THE REPUBLICANS' BIG-BUCKS FILIBUSTER

They don't filibuster in the Senate the way they used to in the days when Wayne Morse or Sam Ervin would strap on a tube and bag called The Motorman's Friend and then go out on the floor and orate for 22 hours without a break. Still, even lacking such individual heroics, Senate Republicans seem determined to prove their filibustering skills. For two weeks, they've blocked a bill

that would clean up the present system of campaign finance. The filibuster will go on, unless some sensible Republicans recognize how obstructionist their party looks on this issue, and is.

To run for Congress these days costs amazing amounts. In 1976, Senate campaigns cost a total of $38 million; in 1986, $179 million. One reason for such increases is technology. Television costs more than handbills, direct mail costs more than door-to-door volunteers. But there's another reason: There's more money to be had.

Some comes from rich candidates. Senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan is alarmed by a "trend to megacampaigns, vast fortunes clashing one with the other." More money also comes from the profusion of special interest political action committees. With more and more money to solicit, the spending war spirals ever upward.

Conscientious candidates hate the escalation. "I do not think a candidate for the U.S. Senate should have to sit in a motel room in Goldendale, Wash., at 6 in the morning and spend three hours on the phone talking to political action committees," says Senator Brock Adams, a Washington Democrat. The public ought to hate the escalation, too. When legislators depend so much on contributions, they leave ugly questions about their votes on issues affecting big contributors.

The obvious remedy is to enact a lid on campaign spending, based on population or other local variables. Obvious but impossible; the Supreme Court says Congress can't limit spending unless it puts up public funds for campaigns.

Senate Democrats are willing. They can muster 53 votes for the Byrd-Boren reform bill to limit PAC contributions and create public finance for Congressional races, as in the Presidential system. That's a majority, but it's still seven votes short of the number needed to stop the Republican filibuster. Some Republicans are concerned, and ought to be. The filibuster makes their party look baldly obstructionist on How Big Bucks Buy Elections.

There may now be some movement. Democrats are willing to cut back sharply their public finance proposals if only Republicans will accept the principle of total campaign spending limits. There's a worthy opening here for negotiations that could end the filibuster and, much more, bring the Big Bucks under control. It's up to the Senate Republicans.

[From Ogden Standard-Examiner, Ogden, UT, July 19, 1987]

TIME TO CAP COSTS OF ELECTION RACES IN SENATE, HOUSE

The U.S. Senate is expected this week to untie the knots that have kept the august body hamstrung over an issue that to lawmakers is of paramount importance. It's not the Iran-Contra scandal or the budget or trade strategy. It's money—campaign money, to be exact.

Since early June, Senate Minority Leader Robert Dole, R-Kan., and most of his Republican colleagues have been engaged in a filibuster to prevent the Senate from acting on Senate Bill 2, much needed legislation that would alter the system of election finance.

At issue is a Democratic-sponsored measure that would create voluntary spending limits in Senate elections, provide public funds for Senate general-election candidates agreeing to abide by the limits and restrict the amounts of money that House and Senate candidates may accept from political-action committees, or PACs.

In 1988, if the bill were to pass, general-election limits would range from $950,000 in a low population state such as Wyoming to nearly $5.5 million in California.

Senate Republicans don't necessarily dispute the need for campaign reform. Dole himself has spoken out about the outrageous expense of running for public office and the undue influence that PACs wield as a prime source of campaign financing. In the past 10 years, PAC contributors to Senate candidates have increased from $5 million to $45 million; campaign spending in Senate elections has increased from $38 million to $179 million. Senators complain about becoming "panhandlers."

In the words of the public-interest lobby Common Cause, "We have seen a monster created, a fundamentally corrupt campaign-finance system for Congress."

Senate Republicans have stymied action on Senate Bill 2 because of objections to the idea of using government money to run congressional campaigns—even though the public financing scheme for presidential candidates is working well. They argue that spending limits in congressional campaigns help incumbents to the detriment of challengers.

The Republicans have offered a compromise that, in effect, is no compromise. It would cut the maximum amount that any single PAC can give to a candidate, but it would eliminate the spending limit and public-financing components of the legislation.

Campaign reform simply will not happen without spending limits. The Supreme Court has ruled that there must be some form of public benefits in order to establish a system of voluntary campaign-spending limits.

The spending limits contained in Senate Bill 2 are reasonable and voluntary, as required by the Supreme Court. If presidential elections are a reliable guide, Senate Bill 2 will provide for competitive elections. Neither party will be at a disadvantage.

The average Senate reelection campaign now costs $3 million. To amass that much, an incumbent it has been estimated must raise $10,000 a week 52 weeks a year every year of his term to build a campaign kitty. And that is obscene.

Consideration of the new proposal and a vote on ending the filibuster on campaign reform is due before week's end. A substitute to the proposal that has caused the Republican heartburn should be acceptable.

It protects candidates against independent expenditures and disclosure of so-called soft money funds and responds to the principal argument of public financing for Senate elections, except where a candidate exceeds the limits on established campaign spending.

Its time for Republicans to bargain. Dole and his fellow filibusterers need to step aside and give the reform legislation a chance to slay the campaign monster. In doing so, they would be helping to restore the integrity of our representative form of government.

[From Ogden Standard-Examiner, Ogden, UT, May 31, 1987]

DOMINANCE OF PAC'S IN NATIONAL ELECTIONS MUST BE REDUCED

Political action committees are playing an increasingly bigger role than ever in national elections. PAC contributions accounted for nearly 31 percent of the total 1986 receipts, compared with nearly 29 percent of 1984's fund-raising.

Fourteen senators elected in 1986 raised more than $1 million each in political action committees contributions for their Senate campaigns. That more than doubled the number of PAC millionaires in the Senate, from 10 to 24 PAC contributions to all Senate general election candidates in 1985-86 totaled $45.7 million.

The recipients of such largesse are getting nervous. They realize that congressional campaigns are obscenely expensive, that special interest money invariably comes with strings attached and that addiction to PAC dollars undermines their credibility as representatives of the people.

The high cost of campaigning was a contributing factor in former Utah Gov. Scott Matheson's announcement last week that he would not run for the U.S. Senate in 1988. He said that as a candidate, he would have to spend most of his time seeking campaign contributions instead of studying and speaking out on the important issues of the day. Matheson said a spokesman for incumbent Sen. Orrin Hatch had predicted that $10 million would be spent on next year's Senate race.

Whether current office-holders are nervous enough to do something is an open question, but recently introduced legislation offers them an opportunity to make a conscious decision not to be beholders to PACs and their vested interests.

Languishing in the Congress is a bill introduced by Senators David Boren, D-Okla., and Senate Majority Leader Robert Byrd, D-W.Va. that would limit the total amount of special interest action committee funds candidates for Congress can accept. It would further establish for Senate general elections limits on total campaign spending together with a voluntary system of partial public financing, besides clamping down on PAC contributions and extending the current system of public financing of presidential elections to the congressional level.

It has more than 30 co-sponsors.

The likelihood of the upward spiral of campaign costs is not apt to end anytime soon without reform such as is embraced in the Boren-Byrd bill.

In 1986, House winners spent an average of $347,000 to capture their seats. Senate winners average $3 million. Total spending on TV ads and other campaign costs, including primary and general election disbursements came to $372 million, up from $321 million in 1984. Interestingly, Republicans outspent the Democrats for Senate races and the Demos were the big spenders in the House contests.

Under the Boren bill, a candidate could receive public funds for part of his campaign costs if he agreed to a spending limit that would vary from state to state.

The measure also would reduce the size of a PAC's maximum contribution from $5,000 to $3,000 per election and limit total PAC gifts to a candidate. Those limits would range from $175,000 to $750,000 for Senate candidates, depending on a state's population.

Reform in PAC giving cannot guarantee less-expensive campaigns or campaigns less dependent on special interests. The PAC system itself was supposed to be a reform and special interests groups are wonderfully ingenious at finding loopholes.

Say what you want to about the integrity of individual members of Congress or the lack of a precise correlation between campaign contributions and votes. The potential

for abuse is clear. What we have now is a mess, an intolerable situation of a bought and paid for Congress.

Cost of running for Congress in 1968 increased by 16 percent. The Boren-Byrd measure could be a way out to put the skids on big bucks buying tickets to Capitol Hill.

[From the Orlando Sentinel, Orlando, FL, June 15, 1987]

CHANCE TO BREAK PAC CHAINS

On Tuesday the Senate finally can break its dependency on campaign contributions from the political-action committees of special interests. It can limit how much money PACs can give a Senate candidate—and limit total spending in Senate races.

The status quo cannot continue. Ten years ago no senator had accepted more than $1 million in PAC contributions. Now two dozen members of that august body have accepted that much from special-interest groups.

That simply makes lawmakers too beholden to bankers, doctors, labor unions and other powerful groups. Another way to gauge the change: In 1976 PAC contributions in Senate races totaled $5.4 million; last year the total was $45 million.

Last year's winning candidates for the Senate spent an average of $3 million; in Florida, Democrat Bob Graham spent twice that to unseat Sen. Paula Hawkins, who spent roughly the same amount. The soaring cost threatens to make politics the province of folks who have personal wealth or wealthy pals. Yet these megabuck races, rather than airing serious issues more fully, revolve around dueling TV spiels.

So Senate Majority Leader Robert Byrd is pushing limits based on each state's population. In Florida, a Senate candidate could spend no more than $2.8 million on the General Election, with the federal government ready to match smaller contributions dollar-for-dollar after a candidate raised $650,000 in individual contributions of $250 or less. A candidate uninterested in the matching money could ignore the spending limit but could accept no more than $564,307 from PACs no matter what.

The plan also limits House candidates to $200,000 from PACs in the general election. That's plenty.

It's time for lawmakers to stop quibbling. Congressional committees have held hearings on PACs nearly every year since 1977. There's no perfect plan. Many Republicans, for example, complained that a plan shelved last week would cost $100 million every two years.

Mr. Byrd's new one would cost less than half that. Compared with the hidden cost of a Congress hypersensitive to special interest agendas, that's a bargain.

[From Times, Ottawa, IL, June 2, 1987]

AS WE SEE IT: CAMPAIGN SPENDING IS OUT OF CONTROL AND CHANGE IS NEEDED

Money is on the mind of Congress these days—money scandals, to be specific.

Congressional investigators are trying to trace the byzantine trail of funds connected to the Iran-Contra affair, and legislation is in the works that would deal with the Wall Street money scandal of insider trading. But Congress is dealing with a money scandal of its own as well—a scandal that involves the way congressional elections are financed.

A growing number of lawmakers are expressing dismay at the amount of money required to run for reelection and the amount of time it takes to raise that money. Chief among them is Senator Majority Leader Robert Bryd, D-W.Va., who complains that his colleagues are spending so much time trying to raise campaign funds that they have no time for Senate business.

Byrd and Sen. David Boren, D-Okla., are cosponsors of legislation to curb political action committees or PACs.

As approved by the Senate Rules Committee, the Byrd-Boren bill, Senate Bill 2, would create a series of voluntary spending limits in Senate primary and general election races. It also would provide public funds for general election candidates who agrees to abide by those limits. Spending for Senate races in the 1987-88 election cycle would be set at about $181 million.

The bill also would limit the amount House and Senate candidates may accept from PACs. Initially, the ceilings would range from $190,950 to $825,000 in Senate races, depending on the population of the state involved, and from $100,000 to $150,000 for House candidates, depending on the number of contested elections faced.

The Byrd-Boren proposal faces heavy opposition from Republicans, many of whom view public financing of campaigns as anathema.

Though the Republican measure would effect the status quo only slightly, it's reassuring that they at least recognize change is needed.

It is significant to note that spending has gone up in each of the last five election cycles monitored by the Federal Election Commission, that special interest PAC contributions to House and Senate candidates reached a record of $130 million in the 1986 election and the 100th Congress is more indebted to special interests than any Congress in the nation's history.

We also have concerns about putting public funds into the campaign treasure chest, but the need for significant change is urgent.

[From the Messenger-Inquirer, Owensboro, (KY), June 19, 1987]

CAMPAIGN FINANCING REFORM LONG OVERDUE

The Senate Election Campaign Act will not change the way the governor's and lieutenant governor's races are financed in Kentucky. But U.S. Sen. Wendell Ford of Owensboro thinks those races demonstrate why it's time for public financing of congressional races. He's right on the money.

Spending for campaigns has gone out of control. In just 10 years spending just for Senate races has increased five-fold, from $38.1 million in 1976 to $178.9 million in 1986. Keep in mind that only one-third of all the Senate terms expire each election.

The money it takes to get elected is a problem in two ways. First, it biases the system in favor of wealthy candidates who can loan money to their own campaigns. And that's where the recent Kentucky primary was an instructive example. Winners in both the governor's and lieutenant governor's races for the Democratic primary were millionaire businessmen. Gubernatorial candidates alone spent $12 million on the race.

Kentucky's other U.S. senator, Republican Mitch McConnell, thinks the spending is just dandy, a healthy sign of vigorous competition. "It represents participation," said McConnell.

Unfortunately, it represents participation by special-interest groups, not the public at large. The contributions of political action committees has grown from $5.4 million in 1976 to $45.7 million in 1986, according to Common Cause. And most of the PAC money goes to incumbents, making competition for the office far from equal.

S. 2 would change that by placing spending limits on campaigns, limiting the use of personal wealth, providing partial public financing and, as a consequence, reduce PAC funding by two-thirds.

Election financing reform is long overdue. And you don't have to leave Kentucky to see why.

[From the Berkshire Eagle, Pittsfield, MA, June 16, 1987]

THE INCUMBENTS CLUB

When a women's rights activist was once asked what single issue was most important to women, her answer was an insightful one: campaign-financing reform. This is not only because the current system of letting special interests pay for such a large share of campaign costs means that legislators are beholden to them and not to the people, but the system also makes if difficult for challengers—female or male—to break into the old-boy network that is the U.S. Congress.

In that sense, campaign-financing reform is the leading issue not just for women but for any number of groups that are concerned about Congress's failure to be responsive to their needs. As long as campaign bills are picked up to such a great extent by business, labor and professional political-action committees, it is their agendas that Congress will get to first, not the agendas of blacks, the elderly or the uninsured.

Next to the special interest, the group that thrives most under the exiting system is incumbent lawmakers. As the New York Times pointed out Monday, genuinely competitive races for seats in the House of Representatives are increasingly a thing of the past, although the Senate still does get its share of well-fought contests. In the House, though, a record 98.4 percent of incumbents running last November regained their seats. Nor did they have to run very hard. In both the 1986 and the 1984 elections, less than one-eighth of all contests saw the winner getting less than 55 percent of the vote—a dividing line between a closely fought election and a cakewalk.

The campaign-financing system, The Time article noted, plays a big part in the enormous edge that incumbents have. The practice of the special-interest PACs is to get on the right side of the likely winner, almost regardless of his political views, and in most cases that means they steer their money toward the person who already has the office. Last year, the PACs dished out eight times as much money to House incumbents as to challengers.

A bill that would substantially limit the role of PACs and introduce a measure of public financing of campaigns (as in presidential elections) is now before the Senate. Although the measure has the support of more than a majority of the 100 senators, backers have had trouble getting the 60 votes they need to end a filibuster against it.

In New England and New York, senators who are balking at ending the filibuster include five Republicans: Alphonse D'Amato of New York, Lowell Weicker of Connecticut, William Cohen of Maine and New Hampshire's Gordon Humphrey and Warren Rudman. They are standing in the way of legislation that could affect the way this country is governed far more profoundly than any new laws likely to come out of the Iran-contra hearings.

[From the Berkshire Eagle, Pittsfield, MA, June 2, 1987]

LET'S BUY CONGRESS BACK

If there were any doubt about the poisonous role that special-interest money plays in Congress, let it just be noted that the biggest-spending lobbying group on Capitol Hill last year was a coalition of electric utilities and coal companies fighting acid-rain legislation. The coalition, by the way, was extremely successful, as another year passed without a meaningful law requiring sharp reductions in the smokestack emissions that cause acid rain.

There is a defense against this kind of spending. The Senate's campaign-financing reform bill would limit the contributions of the special interests' political action committees, put a lid on candidates' expenditures and, at the same time, introduce a degree of public funding. The measure is strongly supported by the citizens' lobbying group, Common Cause, and already has the backing of about 50 of the Senate's 100 members.

This degree of support would seem to assure the bill of fairly clear sailing, but there is a problem. Because the reform proposal is considered such anathema by the special interests and their errand-runners in the Senate, the latter are virtually certain to mount a filibuster against it. To bring that to an end requires not just a 51-vote majority but a vote of 60 senators for cloture.

Even that number would be achievable if senators focused more on the damage that the current system of campaign financing does to the fabric of this country's democracy. In the 1986 election, nearly half of the House of Representatives received 50 percent or more of their campaign funds from PACs. PACs donated a record total of $130 million to both Senate and House candidates in 1986, a six-fold increase over 1976 when they gave "just" $22 million.

Proof that PACs' legalized bribes are motivated less by ideology than by a desire to curry favor with incumbents (who are much more likely than challengers to win) can be found in this statistic compiled by Common Cause: In 1986, PACs gave more than $65 million to House incumbents and just $8 million to challengers for House seats.

This is a thoroughly unhealthy situation that would best be corrected by switching to a system in which private financing would play an insignificant role and public funds would be the order of the day. Failing that, the Senate's bill is the best bet. The most important action that chamber takes this year will almost certainly be its response—or lack of response—to this legislation.

[From the Daily News, Port Angeles, WA, Feb. 19, 1987]

PAC-FUNDING OF CONGRESSIONAL CAMPAIGNS NEEDS TO BE LIMITED

Now-retired Sen. Barry Goldwater once observed that "Unlimited campaign spending eats at the heart of the democratic process."

The Arizona Republican tried unsuccessfully to place limits on that spending last year, just before his retirement. Goldwater, with Sen. David Boren, D-Okla., co-sponsored legislation that won a test vote in the Senate but never made it to the floor before adjournment.

The effort is still alive. In the 100th Congress, Boren and Senate Majority Leader Robert Byrd have introduced a newly drafted campaign finance reform measure.

Byrd's sponsorship dramatically improves the chances for passage of campaign spending limits this year. It is the first time in more than a decade that the full weight of the Senate leadership has been behind a campaign reform effort.

The last time was in 1974, when Congress approved spending limits for congressional campaigns and presidential candidates. Two years later, the Supreme Court invalidated the limits in congressional campaigns, ruling that overall spending limits could be established only as part of a voluntary system that includes public financing. Public financing was included for presidential candidates, but not for congressional candidates.

Free of limits, spending in congressional campaigns has soared. In just 10 years, total congressional campaign spending for a general election candidates has increased nearly three times—from $99 million in 1976 to $289 million in 1986. Raising money has become the primary consideration for congressional incumbents and challengers alike. And the special interests represented by political action committees (PACs) have become a primary source of campaign money.

Obviously, these special interests are handing out campaign funds with the expectation of special consideration. This practice is as old as politics, but the stakes have changed dramatically with the advent of political action committees. Specifically, the stake needed for a political race has become prohibitive for most challengers. And it has made it virtually impossible for most incumbents to turn away special-interest dollars.

The Byrd-Boren bill would establish a voluntary system that includes public financing and limits the total amount of special-interest political action committee money a congressional candidate could accept. The reform is sorely needed.

Goldwater was right. A political system that gives overwhelming advantage on the basis of fund-raising skills or personal wealth threatens the heart of the democratic process.

[From the Portsmouth (NH) Herald, May 13, 1987]

ELECTION REFORM

The Senatorial Election Campaign Act is pending on the Senate floor. We hope it passes.

Should the legislation pass, candidates for the Senate in New Hampshire would be limited to PAC (Political Action Committee) receipts of $190,950. Sen. Gordon Humphrey raised a total of $704,864 from PACS for his 1984 re-election campaign, according to Common Cause/New Hamshire. If the bill had been in effect at that time, Humphrey would have had to forgo $513,914 in PAC receipts. Sen. Warren Rudman raised only $5,000 from PACs during his 1986 re-election race.

Rudman, the state's junior senator, has a long-standing policy of accepting funds only from PAC within the state of New Hampshire.

Ironically, Rudman and Humphrey hold important votes in the fight to fend off a filibuster threatened when the bill comes to the floor. Common Cause/New Hampshire has called on the Granite Staters to oppose those efforts.

The legislation limits total PAC funds for each Senate candidate and limits total campaign expenditures and the use of personal wealth in Senate campaigns as part of a partial public finance system. It would establish a system for senatorial campaigns similar to the one that has worked for presidential elections.

The bill is supported by 49 senators and at least one former member of that body, Barry Goldwater, R-Ariz., who says, "Unlimited campaign spending eats at the heart of the democratic process. . . . Our nation is facing a crisis of liberty if we do not control campaign expenditures."

Again, according to Common Cause/New Hampshire, present senators received a total of $64.3 million in PAC contributions in their most recent elections. Under the provisions of the pending legislation, these senators would have been limited to $27.2 million form PACs—less than half the total they actually received.

The bill is supported by 65 national organizations, including the American Association of Retired Persons, the International Association of Chiefs of Police and the National Farmers Organization.

Spending in campaigns has long since gotten to the point of ridiculousness and we favor anything which would reduce the amount of money needed to run a competitive campaign because it opens the door to additional, qualified candidates.

"The Senate has the opportunity to end the national scandal caused by the way our congressional campaigns are financed by enacting this historic reform legislation," John Thomas, Common Cause/New Hampshire chairman and National Governing Board member John Thomas has said.

With that in mind, we hope Sen. Humphrey and Sen. Rudman will help choke off a filibuster if it should arise and then support the legislation itself.

[From the Roseburg (OR) News-Review, May 2, 1987]

CAMPAIGN SPENDING REFORM BADLY NEEDED

Money is on the mind of Congress these days—money scandals, to be specific. Congressional investigators are trying to trace the byzantine trail of funds connected to the Iran-Contra affair, and legislation is in the works that would deal with the Wall Street money scandal of insider trading. But Congress is dealing with a money scandal of its own as well—a scandal that involves the way congressional elections are financed.

A growing number of lawmakers are expressing dismay at the amount of money required to run for re-election and the amount of time it takes to raise that money. Chief among them is Senate Majority Leader Robert Byrd, D-W.Va., who complains that his colleagues are spending so much time trying to raise campaign funds that they have no time for Senate business. Byrd and Sen. David Boren, D-Okla., are cosponsors of legislation to curb political action committees (PACs) and limit campaign spending.

As approved by the Senate Rules Committee, the Byrd-Boren bill, Senate Bill 2, would create a series of voluntary spending limits in Senate primary and general election races. It also would provide public funds for general election candidates who agree to abide by those limits. Spending for Senate races in the 1987-88 election cycle would be set at about $181 million.

The bill also would limit the amount House and Senate candidates may accept from PACs. Initially, the ceilings would range from $190,950 to $825,000 in Senate races depending on the population of the state involved, and from $100,000 to

$150,000 for House candidates, depending on the number of contested elections faced.

The Byrd-Boren proposal faces heavy opposition from Republicans, many of whom view public financing of campaigns as anathema. They have threatened to kill the bill by filibuster, and they are rumored to be working on an alternative measure. The Republican measure would limit PAC contributions but would not include public financing or spending limits.

Though the Republican measure would affect the status quo only slightly, it's reassuring that they at least recognize change is needed. With spending going up in each of the last five election cycles monitored by the Federal Election Commission, with special-interest PAC contributions to House and Senate candidates reaching a record $130 million in 1986 election and with the 100th Congress more indebted to special interests than any Congress in the nation's history, the need for significant change is urgent.

Senate Bill 2 will reach the floor of the Senate sometime in June. As it looks now, Byrd has enough votes to pass the bill, but he does not have the 60 votes needed to invoke cloture if the Republicans filibuster. We hope he will push hard to get the necessary votes.

[From the Red Bluff (CA) Daily News, May 16, 1987]

MONEY ON THE MIND

Money is on the mind of Congress these days—money scandals, to be specific. Congressional investigators are trying to trace the byzantine trail of funds connected to the Iran-Contra affair, and legislation is in the works that would deal with the Wall Street scandal of insider trading. But Congress is dealing with a money scandal of its own as well—a scandal that involves the way congressional elections are financed.

A growing number of lawmakers are expressing dismay at the amount of money required to run for re-election and the amount of time it takes to raise that money. Chief among them is Senate Majority Leader Robert Byrd, D-W.Va., who complains that his colleagues are spending so much time trying to raise campaign funds that they have no time for Senate business. Byrd and Sen. David Boren, D-Okla., are cosponsors of legislation to curb political action committees (PACs) and limit campaign spending.

As approved by the Senate Rules Committee, the Byrd-Boren bill, Senate Bill 2, would create a series of voluntary spending limits in Senate primary and general election races. It also would provide public funds for general election candidates who agree to abide by those limits. Spending for Senate races in the 1987-88 election cycle would be set at about $181 million.

The bill also would limit the amount House and Senate candidates may accept from PACs. Initially the ceilings would range from $190,950 to $825,000 in Senate races, depending on the population of the state involved, and from $100,000 to $150,000 for House candidates, depending on the number of contested elections faced.

The Byrd-Boren proposal faces heavy opposition from Republicans, many of whom view public financing of campaigns as anathema. They have threatened to kill the bill by filibuster, and they are rumored to be working on an alternative measure. The Republican measure would limit PAC contributions but would not include public financing or spending limits.

Though the Republican measure would effect the status quo only slightly, it's reassuring that they at least recognize change is needed. With spending going up in each of the last five election cycles monitored by the Federal Election Commission, with special-interest PAC contributions to House and Senate candidates reaching a record $130 million in the 1986 election, and with the 100th Congress more indebted to special interests than any Congress in the nation's history, the need for significant change is urgent.

Senate Bill 2 will reach the floor of the Senate any day. As it looks now, Byrd has enough votes to pass the bill, but he does not have the 60 votes needed to invoke cloture if the Republicans filibuster. We hope he will push hard to get the necessary votes.

[From the St. Cloud (MN) Daily Times, May 19, 1987]

SENATORS NEED TO HEAL CAMPAIGN FINANCE ILLNESS

Politicians, like physicians, have trouble healing themselves. Most members of the U.S. Senate know that something has gone terribly wrong with campaign financing, but they cannot seem to administer the legislative cure.

For two weeks now, senators have been trying to come to some terms on a bill that would limit the amount of contributions candidates could accept from political action committees (PACs), establish a voluntary system of spending limits and allow partial public financing for Senate candidates. The bill would help prevent a practice that is becoming a political cancer: the overwhelming influence of PAC contributions in congressional campaigns.

Public debate has been marked by virulent anti-PAC rhetoric, but the bill's merits should be considered in a reasonably cautious light. Following a previous bout of campaign contribution reform in the 1970s, lobbying groups of all kinds and policies began forming separate committees for the distribution of their campaign funds. There is, in itself, nothing intrinsically wrong with such a practice, for PACs are simply a congregation of like-minded individuals who have the right to support whom they please.

The trouble begins, however, when the cost of election campaigns begins to dominate the business of congressional government, and when PAC contributions begin to become the dominant source of congressional campaign funds. That is exactly what has happened, and that is why campaign finance reform is needed now. In the 1976 election, successful Senate candidates spent an average of $610,000. Last year, winning Senate candidates spent an average of $3 million. During the same decade, the amount of PAC contributions to Senate candidates has increased markedly, from a total of $5.4 million in 1976 to $45.7 million in 1986.

Senators are loath to make changes when it comes to something as personally critical as their own election campaigns, and a Republican filibuster has further slowed progress on the reform bill. But senators are scheduled to vote today on a motion to end debate and take final action. For the sake of their chamber's credibility and the integrity of congressional campaigns, senators first must end the filibuster, and then end the growing reliance of congressional campaigns on special-interest contributions.

[From the St. Louis (MO) Post-Dispatch, July 10, 1987]

LIMIT CAMPAIGN SPENDING

Somehow, the idea of public financing of campaigns is a bitter pill for many to swallow. Why? They have the mistaken idea that so long as campaigns are financed privately, they control who gets their contributions. Dyed-in-the-wool conservatives, for example, don't have to worry about taxpayer money (including their own) going to support some bleeding-heart liberal.

It's an idea as appealing as it is wrong. Under the present system of financing campaigns for the U.S. Senate and House, the public foots the bill, but instead of controlling the outlay, it has hardly any say in the process. When, for example, utilities donate to political action committees set up to help elect members of Congress who will be sympathetic to their cause, that money does not come from thin air. When board members of corporations write checks for favored candidates, don't think for a moment that they personally are going to be so much the poorer for having done so. Despite efforts to limit corporate influence or to ensure that donations to PACs come from shareholders' profits, not cutomers' pockets, the costs of expensive campaigns are borne by everyone.

There's another cost, less calculable but even more significant. And that is in the quality of the product paid for: the elected official. As campaign expenses rise, more and more of the legislator's time and energy are devoted to fund-raising, and less and less to the business of making good laws. As Missourians saw so well in the decision of former Sen. Thomas F. Eagleton to retire rather than run again under ever-worsening conditions, the situation has become so severe that good legislators are being driven from the field.

Third, there's the appearance—if not in fact the reality—of growing numbers of legislators whose actions, including votes, may be influenced disproportionately by the need to raise funds for coming campaigns against potential challengers whose resources may exceed their own.

The Boren-Byrd bill, known as S.2, would address these problems. Costs in general Senate elections would be limited voluntarily. Candidates choosing to exceed those limits would trigger public funding for qualified opponents who agree to live within them, thus reducing candidates' incentive to buy ever greater amounts of broadcast time. In races where both candidates abide by the limits—and where no outside group targets either candidate—no public funds would be spent. Aggregate limits would be set on donations from PACs, while one of the most flagrant circumventions of PAC Limits—a practice known as bundling—would become more difficult, S.2 also required disclosure of "soft money" contributions (indirect support from political parties, PACs and others).

S.2 is not a perfect bill, but it goes further than anything else yet proposed to relieve the burden of soaring campaign costs—a burden that falls heavily on senators, challengers, and voters alike. Missourians should urge Sens. John Danforth and Christopher Bond to support the best solution to date to the unacceptably high costs of campaigning.

[From the St. Louis (MO) Post-Dispatch, May 15, 1987]

CURB PAC POWER IN THE SENATE . . .

In the last decade, campaign spending for seats in the U.S. Senate increased by nearly five times, to the point where in 1986, senatorial candidates spent $178.9 million on their races. The proportion of that sum contributed by political action committees has multiplied even faster: to $45.7 million from $5.4 million.

If the present system of fund-raising is allowed to continue unchecked, the only candidates able to run will be those who are beholden to PACs. The winners, in turn, will be those beholden to the wealthiest PACs. The result is an unhealthy political imbalance in which a politician's sympathies are weighted toward the rich and powerful rather than the down and out.

A bill, S. 2, introduced in the Senate by David Boren and Robert Byrd, would go far toward inhibiting these dangerous tendencies. It would allow Senate candidates to obtain public financing if they agree to limit overall spending and accept a cap on the use of their personal funds in the campaign. S. 2 would also establish a formula for effectively limiting PAC contributions to $5,000 per PAC per campaign cycle.

S. 2 has won the support of 47 senators, but despite this and the endorsement of a wide-based coalition of national organizations, voting on the bill is being held up by a filibuster. In a conciliatory gesture, Sens. Byrd and Boren have offered to amend the bill to reduce the amount of public funds spent, and another cloture vote is scheduled within a few days.

The Byrd-Boren bill is vital to putting the Senate back on a track attuned to public rather than private interests. The electorate would be well served by senators voting to end the filibuster and then approving S. 2 without further amendments.

[From the St. Petersburg (FL) Times, May 14, 1987]

NOW IS THE TIME

Now is the time, goes the old typist's exercise, for all good men to come to the aid of the party.

Just seven more will do.

A partisan filibuster is under way against the Boren-Byrd campaign reform bill, which would pass if the Senate could vote. There were 52 votes for cloture last week, more than a majority. But it takes 60 to shut off debate. Counting an absent supporter, there are 53 votes to pass the bill. It will take seven more to let democracy work.

The obstacle is the Senate Republican minority, which voted 44 to 2 against cloture. John Chafee of Rhode Island and Robert T. Stafford of Vermont remain the only Senate Republicans willing to combat the corrupting influence of congressional campaign spending. The Boren-Byrd bill, which they cosponsor, would establish partial public financing of Senate campaigns in exchange for voluntary state-by-state spending limits. It would also set overall limits—none now exist—on what candidates for the Senate or the House may accept from political action committees (PACs).

Minority Leader Robert Dole, R-Kans., and other opponents had been arguing that it would be unprincipled to invest the taxpayers' money in campaigns even though that's the only approach by which the Supreme Court will allow spending ceilings and even though Dole himself is asking for public funds for his presidential race. Majority Leader Robert Byrd, D-W.Va., called the GOP bluff last week. He proposed an amendment to cut by half the public finance component. The Republicans rejected that, too, confessing that they really don't want any spending ceilings at all.

In so saying, they committed their party to an indefensible position. Congressional races cost $373-million last year—almost four times as much as in 1976—and PACs representing special interests gave a third of it. Most members scarcely attempt any longer to deny that the money obliges them to listen first to their big contributors. The shakedown of lobbyists has become so constant and shameless that lobbyists themselves have formed an organization to support the Boren-Byrd bill.

"Money has become the sour milk of American politics . . ." said a statement by the pro-reform lobbyists. "Like you," they told Congress, "we spend far too much time raising money. And we share your distress at being diverted from the public issues of the day to the pursuit of endless campaign dollars."

Even as America celebrates the bicentennial of the Constitution, the very premise of representative democracy is being subverted by institutionalized bribery. Dole and 43 other Republican senators seem to be saying that's just fine with them. Their only alternative has been to offer amendments purporting to restrict PAC money but which wouldn't do so at all.

"Unlimited campaign spending eats at the heart of the democratic process . . ." former Sen. Barry Goldwater, R-Ariz., has said. "Our nation is facing a crisis of liberty if we do not control campaign expenditures."

Will Goldwater's warning continue to fall on deaf ears among his own Republican ex-colleagues? Or will seven more come forward to join Chaffee and Stafford in support of legislation that would resolve the crisis?

Another cloture vote is scheduled this week. The integrity of Congress is at stake. So are the conscience and reputation of the Republican Party.

[From the St. Petersburg (FL) Times, May 7, 1987]

WHAT PRICE HONESTY?

In a recent letter to constituents, Senate Minority Leader Robert Dole, R-Kan., said he opposes public financing of senatorial campaigns. The next day, he applied for public financing for his presidential campaign.

The inconsistency between Dole the senator and Dole the would-be president is one of the fascinating things to watch as the Senate debates what is possibly the most important election reform bill it will see in many years. The bill (S. 2) by Majority Leader Robert Byrd of West Virginia, Sen. David Boren, D-Okla., and a host of cosponsors, would clean up congressional campaigns in three dramatic ways. It would cut back substantially on contributions from political action committees (PACs). It would stop PACs from evading present limits by the so-called "bundling" of checks from individual contributors. Above all, it would subsidize much of the cost of general election campaigns—although in Senate races only—for party nominees who agree at the outset to limit their total spending to amounts determined by the size of their states.

These measures, taken together, compose the only practical antidote for the poisonous influence of big money on congressional elections, congressional conduct and public confidence in the U.S. government. Since 1976, when the Supreme Court invalidated all campaign spending ceilings that aren't tied to a candidate's acceptance of public funds, congressional campaign spending has soared almost fourfold to $373-million. PACs, each of which represents a special interest, gave more than $130-million last year, nearly six times as much as a decade before. Most of the PAC money goes to incumbents as tribute to their influence or as payoffs for their votes, or to buy what a Democratic House fund-raiser once shamelessly described as "acess . . . the opportunity to be heard," a right supposedly guaranteed free of charge by the First Amendment.

The Byrd-Boren bill has 49 declared supporters, including both Florida senators, but only two of them are Republicans. Most Senate Republicans, heedless of former Sen. Barry Goldwater's warning that "unlimited campaign spending eats at the heart of the democratic process," oppose the bill. In addition to threatening a filibuster, they are supporting two alternatives, which purport to stand for reform, but they are shams. Neither would limit total spending or genuinely reduce PAC participation. Common Cause, the public affairs lobby, has charged that one of them, an amendment by Sen. Ted Stevens, R-Alaska, would permit PACs in some cases to give even more.

The other Republican proposal, by Sens. Robert Packwood of Oregon and Mitch McConnell of Kentucky, would forbid PACs from contributing directly to any candidate for Congress. But they could contribute indirectly through party campaign committees. It appears they could even earmark the money for a specific candidate, which would result in no reform at all. The PACs could also continue "bundling," the practice of collecting checks from PAC members made out to a specific candidate in order to evade the $10,000 per candidate limit on the PAC itself.

Packwood's indulgence for "bundling" is understandable in view of his 1986 campaign, in which he raised $986,517 from PACs and another $215,000 in bundled checks from a PAC representing insurance interests. The Byrd-Boren bill, had it been in effect last year, would have allowed him to take only $223,000 from PACs and nothing by way of bundling.

The Republicans say it's wrong to ask the public to pay for political campaigns—but how is it any more wrong than public support for presidential campaigns, which are no longer dominated by special interests? Dole objects that partial public financing for congressional races would "alter the very foundation of our American political system." Yes, indeed. It would turn a corrupt system into an honest one.

According to the Citizens' Research Foundation at the University of Southern California, the taxpayers would pay a maximum of $87.6-million in 1988 and $69.3-million in 1990 if all Senate nominees participated. PACs could contribute no more than $21.5-million next year, barely half as much as they gave in 1986. Total spending—assuming full participation in the public finance plan—would be held to just above this year's level, and less in the next three elections. In the House, where 323 candidates received more than $100,000 each from PACs last year and 51 topped $300,000 apiece, a flat limit of $100,000 per candidate from all PACs would apply.

"How can you govern a nation," lamented the late Charles de Gaulle, "that has 246 different kinds of cheese?" Lucky he was

that he didn't have to try his hand at one that has 4,157 political action committees. America needs a Congress that isn't obliged to answer their telephone calls first, and if it takes $87-million in public subsidies to insure an honest Senate, no greater bargain could be had.

[From the Salem (NJ) Today's Sunbeam, July 2, 1987]

LET'S REDUCE PAC POWER

One of the top priorities of Congress should be the reform of campaign financing, which has become a disgrace through its overdependence on political action committees. A bill being debated in the U.S. Senate would impose limits on the total contributions allowed from PACs and provide for **public financing of Senate campaigns.**

The merits of this legislation are so apparent that it has 44 sponsors. But a small group of senators has promised to filibuster the bill into oblivion. Senate Majority Leader Robert Byrd is leading the effort to stop the talkathons with a petition to limit debate on the issue.

Senator Lloyd Bentsen of Texas, who scrapped his $10,000-a-head, fat-cat breakfasts under public pressure early this year, is having trouble supporting the public-financing aspects of the legislation.

The estimated $50 million annual cost of public financing for Senate races would be paid for with a voluntary $1 tax checkoff. An overwhelming majority of taxpayers already have volunteered to pay the $1 per year for presidential campaigns.

The current process is far more expensive in terms of valuable time allotted by members of Congress to raising large contributions from sepecial-interest groups, the bad legislation passed at the behest of those groups and the hidden costs those special interests pass on to taxpayers in the form of industry tax breaks and consumer charges. Ultimately, every taxpayer and voter pays for those PAC gifts.

Those who oppose the reform measure should realize they are siding with what Common Cause President Fred Wertheimer calls "a fundamentally corrupt campaign finance system."

Each senstor's stand on this issue reflects his concern about the continuing loss of taxpayer influence in the fact of growing PAC power. Voters should remember where each senator stood on this issue at election time.

[From the San Diego (CA) Tribune, June 26, 1987]

TIME TO SLAY CAMPAIGN MONSTER

The U.S. Senate is tied up in knots over an issue that to lawmakers is of paramount importance. It's not the Iran-Contra scandal or the budget or trade strategy. It's money—campaign money, to be exact. Since early this month, Senate Minority Leader Robert Dole, R-Kansas, and most of his Republican colleagues have been engaged in a filibuster to prevent the Senate from acting on Senate Bill 2, much-Needed legislation that would alter the system of election finance.

At issue is a Democratic-sponsored measure that would create voluntary spending limits in Senate elections, provide public funds for Senate general-election candidates agreeing to abide by the limits and restrict the amount of money that House and Senate candidates may accept from political-action committees (PACs) in 1988, if the bill were to pass, general-election limits would range from $950,000 in a low-population state such as Wyoming to nearly $5.5 million in California.

Senate Republicans don't necessarily dispute the need for campaign reform. Dole himself has spoken out about the outrageous expense of running for pubic office and the undue influence that PACs wield as a prime source of campaign financing. In the past 10 years, PAC contributions to Senate candidates have increased from $5 million to $45 million; campaign spending in Senate elections has increased from $38 million to $179 million. Senators complain about becoming "panhandlers."

In the words of the public-interest lobby Common Cause, "We have seen a monster created, a fundamentally corrupt campaign-finance system for Congress."

Senate Republicans object to the idea of using government money to run congressional campaigns—even though the public financing scheme for presidential candidates is working well. They argue that spending limits in congressional campaigns help incumbents to the detriment of challengers.

The Republicans have offered a compromise that, in effect, is no compromise. It would cut the maximum amount that any single PAC can give to a candidate, but it would eliminate the spending limit and public-financing components of the legislation.

Campaign reform simply will not happen without spending limits. The Supreme Court has ruled that there must be some from of public benefits in order to establish a system of voluntary campaign-spending limits.

The spending limits contained in Senate Bill 2 are reasonable and voluntary, as required by the Supreme Court. If presidential elections are a reliable guide, Senate Bill 2 will provide for competitive elections. Neither party will be at a disadvantage.

Dole and his fellow filibusterers need to step aside and give the reform legislation a chance to slay the campaign moster. In doing so, they would be helping restore the integrity of our representative form of government.

[From the San Diego (CA) Tribune, May 26, 1987]

CONGRESS PONDERS ITS OWN "FILTHY LUCRE"

Money is on the mind of Congress these days—money scandals, to be specific.

Congressional investigators are trying to trace the byzantine trail of funds connected to the Iran-Contra affairs, and legislation is in the works that would deal with the Wall Street money scandal of insider trading.

But Congress is dealing with a money scandal of its own as well—a scandal that involves the way congressional elections are financed.

A growing number of lawmakers are expressing dismay at the amount of money required to run for re-election and the amount of time it takes to raise that money.

Chief among them is Senate Majority Leader Robert Byrd, D-W.Va., who complains that his colleagues are spending so much time trying to raise campaign funds that they have no time for Senate business.

Byrd and Sen. David Boren, D-Okla., are co-sponsors of legislation to curb political action committees (PACs) and limit campaign spending.

As approved by the Senate Rules Committee, the Byrd-Boren bill, Senate Bill 2, would create a series of voluntary spending limits in Senate primary and general election races. It also would provide public funds for general election candidates who agree to abide by those limits. Spending for Senate races in the 1987-88 election cycle would be set at about $181 million.

The bill also would limit the amount House and Senate candidates may accept from PACs. Initially, the ceilings would range from $1909,950 to $825,000 in Senate races, depending on the population of the state involved, and from $100,000 to $150,000 for House candidates, depending on the number of contested elections faced.

The Byrd-Boren proposal faces heavy opposition from Republicans, many of whom view public financing of campaigns as anathema. They have threatened to kill the bill by filibuster, and they are rumored to be working on an alternative measure. The Republican measure would limit PAC contributions but would not include public financing or spending limits.

Though the Republican measure would affect the status quo only slightly, it's reassuring that they at least recognize change is needed.

With spending going up in each of the last five election cycles monitored by the Federal Election Commission (FEC), with special-interest PAC contributions to House and Senate candidates reaching a record $130 million in the 1986 election and with the 100th Congress more indebted to special interests than any Congress in the nation's history, the need for significant change is urgent.

Senate Bill 2 will reach the floor of the Senate sometime next month. As it looks now, Byrd has enough votes to pass the bill, but he does not have the 60 votes needed to invoke cloture if the Republicans filibuster. We hope he will push hard to get the necessary votes.

[From the Sanford (FL) Evening Herald, July 6, 1987]

CHANCE TO SLAY CAMPAIGN BEAST

The U.S. Senate is tied up in knots over an issue that to lawmakers is of paramount importance. It's not the Iran-Contra scandal or the budget or trade strategy. It's money—campaign money, to be exact.

Since early June, Senate Minority Leader Robert Dole, R-Kan., and most of his Republican colleagues have been engaged in a filibuster to prevent the Senate from acting on Senate Bill 2, much-needed legislation that would alter the system of election finance.

At issue is a Democratic-sponsored measure that would create voluntary spending limits in Senate elections, provided public funds for Senate general-election candidates agreeing to abide by the limits and restrict the amount of money that House and Senate candidates may accept from political-action committees, or PACs.

In 1988, if the bill were to pass, general-election limits would range from $950,000 in a low-population state such as Wyoming to nearly $5.5 million in California.

Senate Republicans don't necessarily dispute the need for campaign reform. Dole himself has spoken out about the outrageous expense of running for public office and the undue influence that PACs wield as a prime source of campaign financing. In the past 10 years, PAC contributions to Senate candidates have increased from $5 million to $45 million; campaign spending in Senate elections has increased from $38 million to $179 million. Senators complain about becoming "panhandlers."

In the words of the public-interest lobby Common Cause, "We have seen a monster

created, a fundamentally corrupt campaign-finance system for Congress."

Senate Republicans object to the idea of using government money to run congressional campaigns—even though the public financing scheme for presidential candidates is working well. They argue that spending limits in congressional campaigns help incumbents to the detriment of challengers.

The Republicans have offered a compromise that, in effect, is no compromise. It would cut the maximum amount that any single PAC can give to a candidate, but it would eliminate the spending limit and public-financing components of the legislation.

Campaign reform simply will not happen without spending limits. The Supreme Court has ruled that there must be some form of public beneifts in order to establish a system of voluntary campaign-spending limits.

The spending limits contained in Senate Bill 2 are reasonable and voluntary, as required by the Supreme Court. If presidential elections are a reliable guide, Senate bill 2 will provide for competitive elections. Neither party will be at a disadvantage.

Dole and his fellow filibusterers need to step aside and give the reform legislation a chance to slay the campaign monster. In doing so, they would be helping restore the integrity of our representative form of government.

[From the Sanford (FL) Evening Herald, June 4, 1987]

CONGRESS MULLS ITS "FILTHY LUCRE"

Money is on the mind of Congress these days—money scandals, to be specific. Congressional investigators are trying to trace the byzantine trail of funds connected to the Iran-Contra affair, and legislation is in the works that would deal with the Wall Street money scandal of insider trading. But Congress is dealing with a money scandal of its own as well—a scandal that involves the way congressional elections are financed.

A growing number of lawmakers are expressing dismay at the amount of money required to run for reelection and the amount of time it takes to raise that money. Chief among them is Senate Majority Leader Robert Byrd, D-W.Va., who complains that his colleagues are spending so much time trying to raise campaign funds that they have no time for Senate business. Byrd and Sen. David Boren, D-Okla., are co-sponsors of legislation to curb political action committees (PACs) and limit campaign spending.I21As approved by the Senate Rules Committee, the Byrd-Boren bill, Senate Bill 2, would create a series of voluntary spending limits in Senate primary and general election races. It also would provide public funds for general election candidates who agree to abide by those limits. Spending for Senate races in the 1987-88 election cycle would be set at about $181 million.

The bill also would limit the amount House and Senate candidates may accept from PACs. Initially, the ceilings would range from $190,950 to $825,000 in Senate races, depending on the population of the state involved, and from $100,000 to $150,000 for House candidates, depending on the number of contested elections faced.

The Byrd-Boren proposal faces heavy opposition from Republicans, many of them who view public financing of campaigns as anathema. They have threatened to kill the bill by filibuster, and they are rumored to be working on an alternative measure. The Republican measure would limit PAC contributions but would not include public financing or spending limits.

Though the Republican measure would affect the status quo only slightly, it's reassuring that they at least recognize change is needed. With spending going up in each of the last five election cycles monitored by the Federal Election Commission, with special-interest PAC contributions to House and Senate candidates reaching a record $130 million in the 1986 election and with the 100th Congress more indebted to special interests than any Congress in the nation's history, the need for significant change is urgent.

Senate Bill 2 will reach the floor of the Senate sometime in June. As it looks now, Byrd has enough votes to pass the bill, but he does not have the 60 votes needed to invoke cloture if the Republicans filibuster. We hope he will push hard to get the necessary votes.

[From the San Jose (CA) Mercury News, June 26, 1987]

DOLE'S DELAY—SENATE REPUBLICANS MUST END THE FILIBUSTER ON CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

Just as the California election system is corrupt, so is the congressional system. Elections have been taken over by special interests and big money. The time is ripe for remedies.

In California, the Assembly should pass the Lockyer bill and the governor should sign it. Next year, Californians will have a chance to approve the ballot initiative that limits campaign contributions, sets voluntary spending limits and provides for public funding in elections for the state Legislature.

A bill similar to the Lockyer bill is under debate in the U.S. Senate, and is supported by a clear majority. So far, however, S-2 has been held up by a filibuster lead by minority leader Bob Dole, R-Kan. Two weeks ago, 52 senators voted to end the filibuster, eight short of the 60 required for cloture.

Dole's tactics, intended to turn campaign financing reform into a partisan issue, are bad for his party and bad for the nation. The current Senate bill is an intelligent and fair one, which would do for Congressional elections what has already been done for presidential ones—provide a sane cap for spending.

The two Republican senators who supported cloture, John Chafee of Rhode Island and Robert Stafford of Vermont, have defied the party but served the nation. We wish we could say the same of Pete Wilson.

The Republicans' outdated view seems to be that since they are the party of money, why support a bill that limits campaign spending? The bill can only help the Democrats.

False. As President Reagan's two landslide victories show, spending limits and public financing have not hurt Republicans in the presidential race at all.

The same regulations that have brought spending for presidential elections under control should be extended to Congress.

Election figures leave no doubt about the wisdom of campaign financing reform. In 1972, before spending limits, President Nixon spent $62 million to win the race. In 1984, with limits, President Reagan spent $68 million to win, a huge decrease with inflation factored in.

Since 1977, when Senate Republicans first filibustered against reform, the average cost of winning a Senate seat has gone from $600,000 to over $3 million.

At the current rate of increase, it will cost $15 million to run for the Senate sometime in the 1990s, money largely spent by political action committees and interest groups to purchase influence.

Campaign reform's time has come. It has worked for the presidency, is working in those states that are using it and is supported in the polls. For a handful of Republicans to stand in the way of it is short-sighted, parochial politics, doomed sooner or later to fail.

[From the Scranton (PA) Times, June 10, 1987]

TAKE THE DOLLAR OUT OF SENATE—TIME FOR PAC REFORM

A dark joke in the campaign fund-raising business is that contributors get good access to victorious candidates while those who do not contribute merely get good government.

It is a message that political action committees take seriously and one which threatens our democratic tradition as PAC contributions continue to play a larger role in senatorial elections.

PAC contributions to senate candidates totaled $45.7 million in 1986 and 24 candidates who received more than $1 million each in PAC funds were elected.

Overall campaign spending has skyrocketed, rising from $38.1 million in 1976 to 178.9 million in 1986.

PACs support incumbents over challengers at a ratio of about $6 to $1, making it virtually impossible for many otherwise viable candidates to compete in high-priced races.

This month, the full Senate will consider a reform bill introduced by Sen. David Boren (D., OK) and Majority Leader Robert Byrd (D. WV).

Based largely on the presidential public financing system, Senate Bill 2 would place a cap on the amount of PAC financing a senatorial candidate could accept and limit the amounts that could be spent on a campaign.

It also would provide public financing to qualified candidates just as presidential candidates receive public funds for their campaigns. The estimated cost to the federal treasury would be about $50 million each year.

Opponents of the measure contend that taxpayer dollars should not be used for campaign funding.

But $50 million per year is a small sum for a large investment in democracy, that could go a long way toward limiting the strength of well-financed special-interest groups and restoring basic fairness to the federal election process.

[From the Sioux (IA) Journal, July 4, 1987]

CAMPAIGN REFORM NEEDED

The U.S. Senate is tied up in knots over an issue that to lawmakers is of paramount importance. It's not the Iran-Contra scandal or the budget or trade strategy. It's money—campaign money, to be exact.

Since early June, Senate Minority Leader Robert Dole, R-Kan., and most of his Republican colleagues have been engaged in a filibuster to prevent the Senate from acting on Senate Bill 2, much-needed legislation that would alter the system of election finance.

At issue is a measure that would create voluntary spending limits in Senate elections, provide public funds for Senate general-election candidates agreeing to abide by

the limits and restrict the amount of money that House and Senate candidates may accept from political-action committees, or PACs.

In 1988, if the bill were to pass, general-election limits would range from $950,000 in a low-population state such as Wyoming to nearly $5.5 million in California.

Senate Republicans don't necessarily dispute the need for campaign reform. Dole himself has spoken out about the outrageous expense of running for public office and the undue influence that PACs wield as a prime source of campaign financing. In the past 10 years, PAC contributions to Senate candidates have increased from $5 million to $45 million; campaign spending in Senate elections have increased from $38 million to $179 million. Senators complain about becoming "panhandlers."

In the words of the public-interest lobby Common Cause, "We have seen a monster created, a fundamentally corrupt campaign-finance system for Congress."

Senate Republicans object to the idea of using government money to run congressional campaigns—even though the public financing scheme for presidential candidates is working well. They argue that spending limits in congressional campaigns help incumbents to the detriment of challengers.

The Republicans have offered a compromise. It would cut the maximum amount that any single PAC can give to a candidate, but it would eliminate the sending limit and public-financing components of the legislation.

Campaign reform simply will not happen without spending limits. The Supreme Court has ruled that there must be some form of public benefits in order to establish a system of voluntary campaign-spending limits.

The spending limits contained in Senate Bill 2 are reasonable and voluntary, as required by the Supreme Court. If presidential elections are a reliable guide, Senate Bill 2 will provide for competitive elections. Neither party will be at a disadvantage.

[From the Statesville (NC) Record & Landmark, June 10, 1987]

IN OUR OPINION—OWN "FILTHY LUCRE"

Money is on the mind of Congress these days—money Scandals, to be specific. Congressional investigators are trying to trace the byzantine trail of funds connected to the Iran-Contra affair, and legislation is in the works that would deal with the Wall Street money scandal of insider trading. But Congress is dealing with a money scandal of its own as well—a scandal that involves the way congressional elections are financed.

A growing number of lawmakers are expressing dismay at the amount of money required to run for re-election and the amount of time it takes to raise that money. Chief among them is Senate Majority Leader Robert Byrd, D-W.Va., who complains that his colleagues are spending so much time trying to raise campaign funds that they have no time for Senate business. Byrd and Sen. David Boren, D-Okla., are co-sponsors of legislation to curb political action committees (PACs) and limit campaign spending.

As approved by the Senate Rules Committee, the Byrd-Boren bill, Senate Bill 2, would create a series of voluntary spending limits in Senate primary and general election races. It also would provide public funds for general election candidates who agree to abide by those limits. Spending for Senate races in the 1987-88 election cycle would be set at about $181 million.

The bill also would limit the amount House and Senate candidates may accept from PACs. Initially, the ceilings would range from $190,950 to $825,000 in Senate races, depending on the population of the state involved, and from $100,000 to $150,000 for House candidates, depending on the number of contested elections faced.

The Byrd-Boren proposal faces heavy opposition from Republicans, many of whom view public financing of campaigns as anathema. They have threatened to kill the bill by filibuster, and they are rumored to be working on an alternative measure. The Republicans measure would limit PAC contributions but would not include public financing or spending limits.

Though the Republican measure would effect the status quo only slightly, it's reassuring that they at least recognize change is needed. With spending going up in each of the last five election cycles monitored by the Federal Election Commission, with special-interest PAC contributions to House and Senate candidates reaching a record $130 million in the 1986 election and with the 100th Congress more indebted to special interest than any Congress in the nation's history, the need for significant change is urgent.

Senate Bill 2 will reach the floor of the Senate sometime in June. As it looks now, Byrd has enough votes to pass the bill, but he does not have the 60 votes needed to invoke cloture if the Republicans filibuster. We hope he will push hard to get the necessary votes.

[From the Sturgis (KY) News, June 3, 1987]

CONGRESS PONDERS FILTHY LUCRE

Money is on the mind of Congress these days—money scandals, to be specific. Congressional investigators are trying to trace the byzantine trail of funds connected to the Iran-Contra affair, and legislation is in the works that would deal with the Wall Street money scandal of insider trading. But Congress is dealing with a money scandal of its own as well—a scandal that involves the way congressional elections are financed.

A growing number of lawmakers are expressing dismay at the amount of money required to run for reelection and the amount of time it takes to raise that money. Chief among them is Senate Majority Leader Robert Byrd, D-W.Va., who complains that his colleagues are spending so much time trying to raise campaign funds that they have no time for Senate business Byrd and Sen. David Boren, D-Okla., are cosponsors of legislation to curb political action committees (PACs) and limit campaign spending.

As approved by the Senate Rules Committee, the Byrd-Boren bill, Senate Bill 2, would create a series of voluntary spending limits in Senate primary and general election races. It also would provide public funds for general election candidates who agree to abide by those limits. Spending for Senate races in the 1987-88 election cycle would be set at about $181 million.

The bill also would limit the amount House and Senate candidates may accept from PACs. Initially, the ceilings would range from $190,950 to $825,000 in Senate races, depending on the population of the state involved, and from $100,000 to $150,000 for House candidates, depending on the number of contested elections faced.

The Byrd-Boren proposal faces heavy opposition from Republicans, many of whom view public financing of campaigns as anathema. They have threatened to kill the bill by filibuster, and they are rumored to be working on an alternative measure. The Republican measure would limit PAC contributions but would not include financing or spending limits.

Though the Republican measure would effect the status quo only slightly, it's reasuring that they at least recognize change is needed. With spending going up in each of the last five election cycles monitored by the Federal Election Commission, with special-interest PAC contributions to House and Senate candidates reaching a record $130 million in the 1986 election and with the 100th Congress more indebted to special interests than any Congress in the nation's history, the need for significant change is urgent.

Senate Bill 2 will reach the floor of the Senate sometime in June. As it looks now, Byrd has enough votes to pass the bill, but he does not have the 60 votes needed to invoke cloture if the Republicans filibuster. We hope he will push hard to get the necessary votes.

[From the Tallahassee (FL) Democrat, June 16, 1987]

PAC LIMITS—BYRD-BOREN BILL HAS MERIT

Money and politics do not mix well. When they do mix, all too often democracy suffers. Are we so impoverished, are we so narrow in our vision, that we cannot see that a dollar for democracy is an investment that will protect the future of that democracy?—U.S. Senate Majority Leader Robert Byrd.

So far, not enough U.S. senators have been able to see the value of that investment in democracy. Last week, an attempt to end a filibuster blocking action on a campaign reform bill introduced by Byrd and David Boren, D-Okla., fell eight votes short of the required 60. "I have every confidence that we will find a way to create that majority of 60 votes in due time," Byrd declared.

Another vote is expected this week. Wish Byrd luck. Political Action Committees, or PACs, are taking over federal elections, and they are not moving slowly. One thing that makes it so difficult to get those 60 votes is the fact that incumbents are most often favored by the special interest committees. Today's 100 sitting senators got $64.4 million from PACs during their most-recent elections.

Had the Byrd-Boren bill been law when the ran, that figure would have been slashed by 58 percent, to $27.3 million. A study by citizen lobby Common Cause showed that the 34 senators elected in 1986 got an average of $852,043 in PAC contributions; the reform bill would have cut that to $299,642—a drop of $552,401 per senator.

Florida Sen. Bob Graham would have had his $890,338 in PAC money trimmed by $326,031. The state's senior senator, Lawton Chiles, took no PAC money when he last ran in 1982. Both senators are sponsors of the reform legislation.

Senate PAC contribution limits would vary according to the voting-age population of each state and also would be tied to changes in the Consumer Price Index. Florida's current limit would be $564,307. House candidates could take up to $100,000.

In addition to capping PAC contributions, the Byrd-Boren bill would set up a voluntary system of partial public financing coupled with spending limits. Candidates who wanted to avoid the spending limit and

forgo to public matching funds would be free to do so.

There is no justification for a minority of senators to continue to stifle debate on this important piece of legislation. The filibuster should end and discussion of the merits of the bill begin.

It's time for the nation to make that small investment in democracy.

[From the Temple (TX) Daily Telegram, July 9, 1987]

SLAY THE MONSTER

The U.S. Senate is tied up in knots over an issue that to lawmakers is of paramount importance. It's not the Iran-Contra scandal or the budget or trade strategy. It's money—campaign money, to be exact.

Since early June, Senate Minority Leader Robert Dole, R-Kan., and most of his Republican colleagues have been engaged in a filibuster to prevent the Senate from acting on Senate Bill 2, much-needed legislation that would alter the system of election finance.

At issue is a Democratic-sponsored measure that would create voluntary spending limits in Senate elections, provide public funds for Senate general-election candidates agreeing to abide by the limits and restrict the amount of money that House and Senate candidates may accept from political-action committees, or PAC's.

In 1988, if the bill were to pass, general-election limits would range from $950,000 in a low-population state such as Wyoming to nearly $5.5 million in California.

Senate Republicans don't necessarily dispute the need for campaign reform. Dole himself has spoken out about the outrageous expense of running for public office and the undue influence that PAC's wield as a prime source of campaign financing. In the past 10 years, PAC contributions to Senate candidates have increased from $5 million to $45 million; campaign spending in Senate elections has increased from $38 million to $179 million. Senators complain about becoming "panhandlers."

In the words of the public-interest lobby Common Cause, "We have seen a monster created, a fundamentally corrupt campaign-finance system for Congress."

Senate Republicans object to the idea of using government money to run congressional campaigns—even though the public financing scheme for presidential candidates is working well. They argue that spending limits in congressional campaigns help incumbents to the detriment of challengers.

The Republicans have offered a compromise that, in effect, is no compromise. It would cut the maximum amount that any single PAC can give to a candidate, but it would eliminate the spending limit and public-financing components of the legislation.

Campaign reform simply will not happen without spending limits. The Supreme Court has ruled that there must be some form of public benefits in order to establish a system of voluntary campaign-spending limits.

The spending limits contained in Senate Bill 2 are reasonable and voluntary, as required by the Supreme Court. If presidential elections are a reliable guide, Senate Bill 2 will provide for competitive elections. Neither party will be at a disadvantage.

Dole and his fellow filibusterers need to step aside and give the reform legislation a chance to slay the campaign monster. In doing so, they would be helping restore the integrity of our representative form of government.

[From the Torrington (CT) Register Citizen, June 17, 1987]

THE INCUMBENTS CLUB

When a women's rights activist was once asked what single issue was most important in women, her answer was an insightful one: campaign-financing reform. This is not only because the current system of letting special interests pay for such a large share of campaign costs means that legislators are beholden to them and not to the people, but the system also makes it difficult for challengers—female or male—to break into the old-boy network that is the U.S. Congress.

In that sense, campaign-financing reform is the leading issue not just for women but for any number of groups that are concerned about Congress's failure to be responsive to their needs. As long as campaign bills are picked up to such a great extent by business, labor and professional political-action committees, it is *their* agendas, that Congress will get to first, not the agendas of blacks, the elderly, or the uninsured.

Next to the special interests, the group that thrives most under the existing system is incumbent lawmakers. As The New York Times pointed out Monday, genuinely competitive races for seats in the House of Representatives are increasingly a thing of the past, although the Senate still does get its share of well-fought contests. In the House, though, a record 98.4 percent of incumbents running last November regained their seats. Nor did they have to run very hard. In both the 1986 and the 1984 elections, less than one-eighth of all contests saw the winner getting less than 55 percent of the vote—a dividing line between a closely fought election and a cakewalk.

The campaign-financing system, The Times article noted, plays a big part in the enormous edge that incumbents have. The practice of the special-interest PACs is to get on the right side of the likely winner, almost regardless of his political views, and in most cases that means they steer their money toward the person who already has the office. Last year, the PACs dished out eight times as much money to House incumbents as to challengers.

A bill that would substantially limit the role of PACs and introduce a measure of public financing of campaigns (as in presidential elections) is now before the Senate. Although the measure has the support of more than a majority of the 100 senators, backers have had trouble getting the 60 votes they need to end a filibuster against it.

In New England and New York, senators who are balking at ending the filibuster include five Republicans: Lowell Weicker of Connecticut, Alphonse D'Amato of New York, William Cohen of Maine and New Hampshire's Gordon Humphrey and Warren Rudman. They are standing in the way of legislation that could affect the way this country is governed far more profoundly than any new laws likely to comeout of the Iran-contra hearings.

[From the Torrington (CT) Register Citizen, June 5, 1987]

LET'S BUY CONGRESS BACK

If there were any doubt about the poisonous role that special-interest money plays in Congress, let it just be noted that the biggest-spending lobbying group on Capitol Hill last year was a coalition of electric utilities and coal companies fighting acid-rain legislation. The coalition, by the way, was extremely successful, as another year passed without a meaningful law requiring sharp reductions in the smokestack emissions that cause acid rain.

There is a defense against this kind of spending. The Senate's campaign-financing reform bill would limit the contributions of the special interst's political action committees, put a lid on candidates' expenditures and, at the same time, introduce a degree of public funding. The measure is strongly supported by the citizens' lobbying group, Common Cause, and already has the backing of about 50 of the Senate's 100 members.

This degree of support would seem to assure the bill of fairly clear sailing, but there is a problem. Because the reform proposal is considered such anathema by the special interests and their errand-runners in the Senate, the latter are virtually certain to mount a filibuster against it. To bring that to an end requires not just a 51-vote majority but a vote of 60 senators for cloture.

Even that number would be achievable if senators focused more on the damage that the current system of campaign financing does to the fabric of this country's democracy. In the 1986 election, nearly half of the House of Representatives received 50 percent or more of their campaign funds from PACs. PACs donated a record total of $130 million to both Senate and House candidates in 1986, a six-fold increase over 1976 when they gave "just" $22 million.

Proof that PACs legalized bribes are motivated less by ideology than by a desire to curry favor with incumbents (who are much more likely than challengers to win) can be found in this statistic compiled by Common Cause: In 1986, PACs gave more than $65 million to House incumbents and just $8 million to challengers for House seats.

This is a thoroughly unhealthy situation that would best be corrected by switching to a system in which private financing would play an insignificant role and public funds would be the order of the day. Failing that, the Senate's bill is the best bet. The most important action that chamber takes this year will almost certainly be its response—or lack of response—to this legislation.

[From the Towanda (PA) Daily Review, June 17, 1987]

PAC'S BENEFIT INCUMBENTS TOO OFTEN

A dark joke in the campaign fund-raising business is that contributors get good access to victorious candidates merely get good government.

It is a message that political action committees take seriously and one which threatens our democratic tradition as PAC contributions continue to play a larger role in senatorial elections.

PAC contributions to senate candidates totaled $45.7 million in 1986 and 24 candidates who received more than $1 million each in PAC funds were elected.

Overal campaign spending has skyrocketed, rising from $38.1 million in 1976 to $178.9 million in 1986.

PACs support incumbents over challengers at a ratio of about $6 to 1, making it virtually impossible for many otherwise viable candidates to compete in high-priced races.

This month, the full Senate will consider a reform bill introduced by Sen. David Boren (D. OK.,) and Majority Leader Robert Byrd (D. WV).

Based largely on the presidential public financing system. Senate Bill 2 would place a cap on the amount of PAC financing a senatorial candidate could accept and limit the amounts that could be spent on a campaign.

It also would provide public financing to qualified candidates, just as presidential candidates receive public funds for their campaigns. The estimated cost to the federal treasury would be about $50 million each year.

Opponents of the measure contend that taxpayer dollars should not be used for campaign funding.

But $50 million per year is a small sum for a large investment in democracy, that could go a long way toward limiting the strength of well-financed special-interest groups and restoring basic fairness to the federal election process.

[From the Tucson (AZ) Citizen, June 27, 1987]

WHEN PAC'S TALK, CONGRESS LISTENS

Congress has an expensive habit. It's called re-election, and to feed it senators need $12,000 a day, House members $1,200.

With weekends off and two weeks of vacation, that's how much must be raised each day to pay the $3 million average cost of a Senate campaign, or $300,000 for a House seat.

And when Congress needs a fix, it turns to PACs. Freshman Sen. Harry Reid, D-Nev., recently told syndicated columnist David Broder he was astonished to discover it took 70 to 80 percent of his time just to raise campaign contributions.

Sen. Brock Adams, D-Wash., puts it this way: "I never imagined how much of my personal time—at least 50 percent—would be spent on fund-raising. Most of the time I was not talking to constituents about contributions; I was talking to professionals who control PACs, and lobbyists who were far removed from the voters of Washington state. I was campaigning for money, not campaigning for votes."

Assume for a minute that all those PAC contributions don't buy votes. Suspend disbelief and imagine that PAC-paid junkets to luxury resorts did not sway key members of the tax-writing committee just before they installed lucrative "transition" loopholes for their generous hosts (below).

Still, says Adams, the fear of cold-turkey PAC withdrawal makes Congress shiver.

"Beyond the illusion of 'vote selling' is the reality that Congress is not making the tough decisions that it should make," Adams wrote in a recent Washington Post column. "Too often we seek the easy answer, the compromise that will offend the least number of contributors. We hate to offend because we know that incumbents can collect money from all sides of an issue if only they hedge."

Campaign finance reform is desperately needed. Because the Supreme Court has ruled that campaign spending can't be limited without something in return, public financing must be an element. That's no excuse to bankroll campaigns with tax dollars. Simply use public financing to even the odds if one candidate obeys limits and his opponent does not.

Such public-paid "methadone treatment" won't be cheap, but it might help cure Congress of its costly addiction to PACs.

[From the Tupelo (MS) Northeast Mississippi Daily Journal, June 16, 1987]

ELECTION REFORM—LOWERING THE COST

A vote is scheduled at 4 p.m. today to stop a filibuster against election reforms proposed in Senate Bill 2. It's time to stop the talk and get on with the business of controlling the skyrocketing costs of congressional campaigns, particularly in the Senate.

The bill's lead sponsor is Mississippi Sen. John Stennis. Stennis, the president pro tem, has put his clout and integrity on the line for campaign expense reform. Still, the battle to get the necessary 60 votes is uphill.

Senate Bill 2 has been incorrectly characterized as a partisan bill. It is not. Campaign expense reform is a bipartisan issue that pits the power and influence of individual votes and small contributors against the clout of special interest dollars.

Stennis correctly has labeled the cost of campaigns and the dramatically increased influence of political action committees as a threat to the integrity of the Senate.

The financial facts of senatorial campaigns during the past 10 years support the concerns of Stennis and many other senators:

Senate general election campaigns cost $38.1 million in 1976;

Political action committees, the money of special interests, contributed $27 million to Senate general election candidates in 1984; PAC contributions jumped to $45 million in 1986;

The average cost of winning a senatorial campaign was $3 million in 1986; in California the winner spent $11 million.

Congressional politics, particularly in the Senate, is becoming a possibility only for people with significant personal wealth or access to the riches of PACs.

That's not the way American democracy is supposed to work.

Bitter political battles have been fought to equalize the influence of every elector's vote. The power of special-interest money now threatens to diminish the influence of a single vote and discourage small contributions to political campaigns.

Senate Bill 2 would enact three restrictions that could restore balance and sanity to campaign expenditures:

Senate races would receive partial public financing;

Limits would be placed on PAC contributions;

Voluntary limits would be placed on total campaign expenditures.

The House and Senate were not meant to be delegations representing wealth and special interests.

Senate Bill 2 could reverse the trend toward elitism in Congress.

America needs statesmen rather than political entrepreneurs available to the highest bidder.

[From the Washington Post, July 1, 1987]

U.$. $ENATE

The average Senate reelection campaign now costs $3 million. To amass that much, a senator must raise $10,000 a week 52 weeks a year every year of his term. Let him miss a week for some reason—could it be the press of legislative business?—and he must raise twice that much the next week, three times as much the week after that. If he represents a large state or fears a strong opponent—or wants to scare such an opponent off—he must also raise more than average. And they do.

The system has become obscene. Its defenders argue that the money now in politics is a sign of vigor, a healthy form of participation. Yes, up to a point—but that health point is past. The ceaseless quest for money absorbs the entire Congress, not only in election years. The National Journal recently compiled the amounts that senators not due to run until 1988 or 1990 had raised in 1985-86. By the end of last year four of the senators likely to run in 1990 had already raised more than $1 million; one was only $15,000 away; two more had raised more than $700,000. What notion of good government is served by that?

The Democrats seek to restore a sense of proposition to this process. They would impose spending limits. The Supreme Court has said that to satisfy the First Amendment, spending limits must be voluntary; as a practical matter that means they must be in return for federal funds. But Republicans object to public financing of congressional campaigns. The Democrats have therefore moved successively to minimize the role of public funds. Their latest proposal is that a candidate could get such financing only if he agreed to abide by the spending limits for his state and his opponent did not. The public money would be only an insurance policy.

It was easy for Republicans to block the Democratic bill when it contained a large measure of public finance; they could stand on principle. Now the issue is much more clearly the limits. Hardliners still resist the bill, on grounds that the Republicans, who are better fund-raisers, would be condemning themselves to permanent minority status. But money isn't what will deliver the Senate to the Republicans; nor, in the long haul, can it be healthy for the Republicans to link themselves to this iron lung.

Two Republicans—Robert Stafford and John Chafee—have joined the Democrats in voting to invoke cloture and move a bill. At least half a dozen others have acknowledged the need for restraint. "There is no doubt that campaign spending is out of hand," said Sen. Pete Domenici at one point in last month's debate. "I would be very happy to see some kind of overall limitation," said Sen. William Roth. "I believe there is no surer way to a complete breakdown of our electoral process than to ignore burgeoning campaign costs," said Sen. Daniel Evans. "It seems to me there have to be some limits," said Minority Leader Bob Dole.

The latest bill is fair; the Republicans should agree to bargain on it. The alternative will soon be to change the name on the place. It fast becomes the U.$. $enate.

[From the Washington Post, June 22, 1987]

TIN CUP CLUB

A full Senate term lasts 2,189 or 2,188 days, depending on leap years. The cost of an average reelection campaign is $3 million. Allow for a few days off—Sundays, Christmas, their birthdays—and the average senator has to raise $1,600 a day every working day for six years just to stay in office. That $100 every waking hour, and if the senator is from a populous state or expects a close fight it may be two, three, even four times that. The emblem of the modern Senate is the tin cup.

Left to itself the problem of raising these enormous sums will only worsen, as it steadily and dramatically has for 10 years now. The cost of office has doubled since the mid-'70s, and is now rising at a rate of 20 percent in each election cycle. John Stennis

is the senior member of the Senate; he has watched the place for 40 years. He is hardly the panting reformer; nor has he, over his career, been particular partisan. Much of his allegiance is to the institution itself. He said on the floor the other day, "the cost of election campaigns and the method of financing them has placed the integrity of the Senate in jeopardy." He is right, and the thoughtful people in both parties know it.

The Democrats, led by Robert Byrd and David Boren, propose to deal with this; they would set spending limits. Because the Supreme Court has said that such limits violate the First Amendment except as a condition for receipt of public funds, the Democrats have also proposed public financing. Because the Republicans, who are better fund-raisers, object that public financing would also, in any number of ways, be unhealthy, the Democrats have moved to reduce its role in their proposal, so that the most it could provide would be 40 percent of a candidate's funds. Now they are said to be ready to reduce it further, to make it only an insurance policy. If you agreed to spending limits and your opponent did also, neither of you would get public money. If you agreed and he did not, you would get public money (according to a formula still to be worked out) only if and to the extent that he exceeded the limit. As before, there would also be a limit on the total any candidate could receive from PACs in an election cycle.

Filibustering Republicans objected to the earlier proposals in part on the grounds that they would put the Senate at the trough. This is a much leaner proposal. The recipient wouldn't trigger the federal funds; his non-abiding opponent would. There is no way to shave the public financing any further and keep the system workable. If a candidate who agrees to the spending limits is not necessarily to be subsidized, he must at least be protected. There are Republicans who say that, while they oppose public financing, they would favor spending limits. This goes about as far as ingenuity can to accommodate them. There are lesser features of the bill that they also dislike, but these are subjects for bargaining. The Democrats are making a fair offer. The Republicans should take it, before the miserable, obsessive race for funds consumes them all.

[From the Watertown (SD) Public Opinion, June 11, 1987]

PRESSLER NEEDS TO SUPPORT S. 2

On Saturday, May 30, we criticized opponents of Senate Bill 2, which is designed to bring comprehensive campaign funding reform to the U.S. Senate. In talking to South Dakota's two U.S. Senators, Senator Daschle is a co-sponsor of this legislation and Senator Pressler said he needed to see some amendments to it before he could lend his support. He said at that time he felt that a proposed substitute amendment coming from Senator Packwood of Oregon would rectify some shortcomings S. 2 had.

Well, S. 2 has now been introduced on the Senate floor as has an amendment by Packwood and Senator McConnell of Kentucky. They say their amendment would eliminate PAC contributions to individual candidates. However, an article in *The Wall Street Journal* said about their proposal, "The move was seen mostly as a tactical ploy to protect Republicans from being branded as anti-reform." We can't say this is a strictly partisan proposal because there are a number of senators on both sides of the aisle who are mighty beholding to PACs for their past contributions.

The important thing here is that besides being a tactical ploy, this proposed legislation is a charade and would not accomplish its stated purpose.

The McConnell-Packwood bill would instead simply lead to PACs changing their method of providing money to a congressional candidate and in so doing would open the door to PACs providing unlimited sums to a congressional candidate.

The impact that this bill would have on PAC money is perhaps best demonstrated by what occurred in Packwood's 1986 reelection campaign. In that election ALIGNPAC, a PAC representing insurance interests, gave the senator a $1,000 contribution made out from ALIGNPAC to Senator Packwood. At the same time, ALIGNPAC's also gathered and turned over to the senator $215,000 in checks made out by ALIGNPAC's members directly to Senator Packwood. This controversial practice, known as "bundling," allowed ALIGNPAC to massively evade the $5,000 per election PAC contribution limit and to get credit for providing what was the equivalent of a $215,000 contribution from ALIGNPAC to the senator.

S. 2, the Senatorial Election Campaign Act, would make clear that PACs could not use this kind of "bundling" practice to evade contribution limits. All such contributions arranged for by a PAC would be counted against the PAC's contribution limit which under present law is $5,000 per election per candidate.

The "Mc-Pack" bill also claims to restrict this kind of bundling practice, but in fact it does nothing of the kind. The so-called "anti-bundling" language in McConnell-Packwood merely says that if a PAC gathers and delivers bundled contributions to a candidate, the checks need to be made out by the individuals directly to the candidate. That is of course, the very practice that ALIGNPAC used to provide $215,000 to Senator Packwood. Rather than restricting this kind of PAC bundling, McConnell-Packwood legitimizes the practices as a way for PACs to provide money to a candidate.

This amendment, if passed, would "hog house" the present wording of S. 2. This proposal to prohibit "direct" PAC contributions to a candidate, while legitimizing the practice of PACs bundling and delivering unlimited sums to a candidate, will result in all PACs simply mechanically changing their methods of raising money and providing it to a candidate without any limit on the total amount the PAC could provide. McConnell-Packwood will increase, not decrease, the ability of PAC money to unduly influence members of Congress.

The McConnell-Packwood bill is not campaign finance reform and should be rejected out of hand. After all of this, if Senator Pressler is really for reform, we hope he will support that rejection. If he doesn't, then the opposite is obvious. . . .

[From the Westfield (MA) Evening News, July 3, 1987]

SLAY THE MONSTER

The U.S. Senate is tied up in knots over an issue that to lawmakers is of paramount importance. It's not the Iran-Contra scandal or the budget or trade strategy. It's money—campaign money, to be exact.

Since early June, Senate Minority Leader Robert Dole, R-Kan., and most of his Republican colleagues have been engaged in a filibuster to prevent the Senate from acting on Senate Bill 2, much-needed legislation that would alter the system of election finance.

At issue is a Democratic-sponsored measure that would create voluntary spending limits in Senate elections, provide public funds for Senate general-election candidates agreeing to abide by the limits and restrict the amount of money that House and Senate candidates may accept from political-action committees, or PAC's.

In 1988, if the bill were to pass, general-election limits would range from $950,000 in a low-population state such as Wyoming to nearly $5.5 million in California.

Senate Republicans don't necessarily dispute the need for campaign reform. Dole himself has spoken out about the outrageous expense of running for public office and the undue influence that PAC's wield as a prime source of campaign financing. In the past 10 years, PAC contributions to Senate Candidates have increased from $5 million to $45 million; campaign spending in Senate elections has increased from $38 million to $179 million. Senators complain about becoming "panhandlers."

In the words of the public-interest lobby Common Cause, "We have seen a monster created, a fundamentally corrupt campaign-finance system for Congress."

Senate Republicans object to the idea of using government money to run congressional campaigns—even though the public financing scheme for presidential candidates is working well. They argue that spending limits in congressional campaigns help incumbents to the detriment of challengers.

The Republicans have offered a compromise that, in effect, is no compromise. It would cut the maximum amount that any single PAC can give to a candidate, but it would eliminate the spending limit and public-financing components of the legislation.

Campaign reform simply will not happen without spending limits. The Supreme Court has ruled that there must be some form of public benefits in order to establish a system of voluntary campaign-spending limits.

The spending limits contained in Senate Bill 2 are reasonable and voluntary, as required by the Supreme Court. If presidential elections are a reliable guide, Senate Bill 2 will provide for competitive elections. Neither party will be at a disadvantage.

Dole and his fellow filibusterers need to step aside and give the reform legislation a chance to slay the campaign monster.

[From the Wilkes-Barre (PA) Citizens' Voice, June 9, 1987]

PASS S. 2 TO CUT COSTLY CAMPAIGN

Special-interest Political Action Committees handed over seven and one half million dollars to candidates this year for the Pennsylvania House and Senate.

Candidates Arlen Specter and Bob Edgar alone spent a combined total of almost ten million.

This is too much. It's a waste of money. It's a distortion of the political process.

It's got to be curtailed. It can be. Bill S. 2—a campaign cost cutter—is now before the Senate. Pass it, senators.

[From the Winner (SD) Advocate, June 17, 1987]

CAMPAIGN FINANCING NEEDS CLOSER LOOK

State Senator Tom Daschle is undertaking efforts to reform campaign spending, some-

thing that has needed to be done for quite some time.

Daschle said his recent bid for office cost him over $3.5 million. "I didn't like the two year-long campaign that money made inevitable," he said recently.

"I didn't like the blizzard of television ads that money paid for.

"I didn't like the negativism that seems to appear on both sides in every big money campaign.

"And I hated having to ask over and over and over again for campaign contributions just to stay even with my opponent," Daschle said.

The senator is certainly not alone with these feelings. Millions of Americans across the country are disgusted with the entire election process, where big bucks are used to influence voter opinion.

The money spent by candidates, in an attempt to get elected or re-elected, has jumped 400 percent in the past decade. Daschle says that many Senate candidates, whose elections don't begin until 1990, are already starting their fund raising.

This preoccupation with elections and fund raising does not benefit the American voter. It is a system out of control. It is estimated that by the 2000 it could cost over $50 million to run for the Senate from South Dakota. Daschle supports a bill (SB #2) which would change campaign practices.

It would limit the amount of money a candidate may raise and spend in a Senate race. It would reduce the influence of political action committees. And it would tighten controls on so-called "independent expenditures" such as money spent by out-of-state groups to evade the campaign laws and influence the results of both the primary and general election in South Dakota next year.

We support such efforts. Campaign ethics and methods need closer scrutinizing. Here is a good example: Last week this office received a copy of a recent editorial published in the Argus Leader. The editorial was written by presidential candidate Jack Kemp and mailed to presumably all state newspapers using the Senator's franking privilege. This meant the candidate could disseminate his opinions at no cost to himself.

Why all the interest from a Senator from the 31st District of New York? Why out of the 'ear blue do we suddenly start receiving his correspondence? The anwser is obvious. He is looking for free publicity and is using taxpayers' money to pay for it. This is an abuse we have been critical of before.

Another campaign problem (which grows worse with each election) is with political pornography—that is, the negative advertising we have seen in several past campaigns, including Senator Daschle's. Money has nothing to do with whether this type of advertising appears in the media. It is a method of conducting a campaign that the candidate ultimately controls. Unfortunately, experts are saying that negative campaign advertising is a trend likely to continue in the future.

Daschle believes that now is the time to act on campaign reforms. SB #2 bill is a step in that direction. If you support campaign reform, share your opinions with our elected officials.

[From the Zanesville (OH) Times Recorder, July 6, 1987]

SLAY THE MONSTER

The U.S. Senate is tied up in knots over an issue that to lawmakers is of paramount importance. It's not the Iran-Contra scandal or the budget or trade strategy. It's money—campaign money to be exact.

At issue is Senate Bill 2, a Democratic-sponsored measure that would alter the system of election finance. It would create voluntary spending limits in Senate elections, provide public funds for Senate general-election candidates agreeing to abide by the limits and restrict the amount of money that House and Senate candidates may accept from political-action committees or PACs.

In 1988, if the bill were to pass, general-election limits would range from $950,000 in a low-population state such as Wyoming to nearly $5.5 million in California.

Senate Republicans don't dispute the need for campaign reform. Minority Leader Robert Dole has spoken out about the outrageous expense of running for public office and the undue influence that PACs wield as a prime source of campaign financing. In the past 10 years, PAC contributions to Senate candidates have increased from $5 million to $45 million; campaign spending in Senate elections has increased from $38 million to $179 million. Senators complain about becoming "panhandlers."

In the words of the public-interest lobby Common Cause, "We have seen a monster created, a fundamentally corrupt campaign-finance system for Congress."

Senate Republicans object to the idea to run congressional campaigns—even though the public financing scheme for presidential candidates is working well. They argue that spending limits in congressional campaigns help incumbents to the detriment of challengers.

The Republicans have offered a compromise that in effect is no compromise. It would cut the maximum amount that any PAC can give to a candidate but it would eliminate the spending limit and public-financing components of the legislation.

Campaign reform simply will not happen without spending limits. The Supreme Court has ruled there must be some form of public benefits in order to establish a system of voluntary campaign-spending limits.

The spending limits contained in Senate Bill 2 are reasonable and voluntary as required by the Supreme Court. If presidential elections are a reliable guide, Senate Bill 2 will provide for competitive elections. Neither party will be at a disadvantage.

Senate Republicans need to give the reform legislation a chance to slay the campaign monster. In doing so, they would be helping restore the integrity of our representative form of government.

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, before the Senator yields, will he yield to me?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, I join the Senate majority leader in urging that we be permitting to come to grips with the matter of campaign reform. We have been seeking reform for a long time in this session. We have been seeking to get the matter before the Senate and bring matters to a head with votes on matters pertaining to the legislation we have offered.

We have made great efforts to compromise, and much that made the measure most attractive to me and others has been eliminated by some of these compromises. Many aspects of public financing that I think are vital parts of any reform have been eliminated in an effort to have some give from those who oppose this effort. Thus far, we have not seen any willingness to compromise on a matter that is very important, as the majority leader just noted, to the integrity of the Senate, or to the appearance of the integrity of the Senate.

There is another matter involved, I think, and that is the integrity of the whole democratic system of our Republic. That, too, is at stake.

We have had a situation in our country, historically, where in he first 100 years we had rising participation in our elections, rising from a 3.5-percent turnout of eligible people in the first elections to over 80 percent in the election of 1876, and then it went downward for a variety of reasons, and it has been going down ever since.

One of the latest reasons that has contributed, I believe, to this continuing decline in participation was, first, the invention of television, and then the beginning of its use for campaigning; and, second, as a natural consequence, the need for increasingly large sums of money to buy television time to reach the voters. This has now led to a situation where candidates are told by their advisers, as I was told when I ran last year, that you have to spend over half your time raising money for your campaign, in order to be able to buy television time to reach the mass of voters.

What that leads to is a situation where the candidate spends more and more time campaigning, specifically among those who are able to make major contributions, in order to use that money to reach the rest of the voters. Those voters then are left out of the process. The candidate does not have time to make as many appearances before them as was the case in former days. All they are then involved in, in the process, is to listen to television and to respond to those appeals and to receive direct mail that requests small contributions from people who are not able to make large contributions. This increasing emphasis upon money undermines our system.

We are down to where in the last Presidential election only 50 percent of those voted who might have voted. In the last congressional elections, only 30 percent of those voted who might have voted. In municipal elections in cities, towns, counties, and local districts of one sort or another, it went down to where 12 or 15 percent of the people participate and vote all too often.

I think there is a real threat to democracy implicit in these circumstances. If people do not have a stake, if they are not involved, if they do not participate, if they lose confidence in

the process of democracy, that makes our whole system vulnerable.

Of the 22 major industrial democracies on the face of this planet, we are at the bottom, No. 22, in voter turnout. By comparison, in most European countries, it is 80 percent—in some cases, 90 percent. In the recent elections in India, over 80 percent participated. In the recent elections in the Philippines, over 80 percent participated.

It is a disgrace that in our democracy, the major democracy on the face of the Earth, people are dropping out of the system, and that forebodes danger for the system.

It is a disgrace that in a world where so many have fought and bled and died for the opportunity to vote and to pick their own leaders and to engage in the decisionmaking process of their countries, and are denied that right in many countries, we who have it do not exercise it.

One of the principal reasons it is being exercised less and less is that campaigns cost more and more.

We have to get this matter under control. This issue relates to every other issue we are concerned with, and therefore it is one of the most important issues that can conceivably come before this body.

I am delighted that the majority leader and the Senator from Oklahoma are providing the leadership on this issue. I urge others to join them. I urge those who have concerns about this particular approach, the latest in a long series of efforts to compromise—I wish those who have concerns about the current approach would at least come up with modifications that would make this acceptable, so that we can move this matter forward.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished assistant majority leader for the comments he has just made; and I thank the distinguished majority leader, whom I am proud to join in offering this piece of legislation, for the eloquent statements he has made earlier.

As they have both indicated, we are dealing here with a matter of fundamental importance to the people of the United States, to the future of this country and to the integrity of our constitutional process.

In our Government authority legitimacy rests upon the consent of the governed. It is, therefore, the election process itself which is the heart and soul of the system. Anything that compromises the basic integrity of that election process, anything which compromises the fairness of that election process access to that election process and equal opportunity for those with ideas about service to this country to run as candidates in that process, endangers the health of the democratic process itself.

(Mr. WIRTH assumed the chair.)

Mr. BOREN. I am pleased that we returned to consideration of S. 2. The majority leader's decision to return to this piece of legislation is a signal that the issue of campaign finance reform is not going to go away. It is going to be here for us to face until we deal with it. We may turn from time to time to other matters on our agenda, other important issues, budgetary issues, issues of Presidential appointments, other matters that are fundamentally also important to the country, but we are going to keep coming back to this issue of campaign finance reform, to this issue of protecting the integrity of the election process itself, until we deal with it, and that is appropriate. This issue must not be allowed to slip off the national agenda until we have done something to solve the problem.

We owe it to the next generation to protect the integrity of the Constitution itself.

That is why I applaud the decision of the majority leader to return our attention to this particular piece of legislation.

This is a new compromise proposal which has been offered. It is offered in the spirit and the hope of trying to form a consensus on both sides of the aisle to deal with this problem.

Democrats do not have a higher responsibility to guard the integrity of the election process than do Republicans. Republicans have no greater responsibility than do Democrats. This is not a partisan political issue. It is an American problem and we must find a way to get together as Americans and solve this problem.

During the June filibuster opponents focused upon public financing as a target of their opposition to this bill. This proposal has now been changed to in essence totally remove mandatory public financing as an aspect of the bill.

I want to just very briefly mention the kind of proposal that is now before us.

As under the original S. 2, there are voluntary spending limits which are adopted. For a candidate to fully participate in the system as set forth, a candidate must at filing time indicate and certify that that candidate will live by the spending limits. This is fundamental. There can be no true campaign finance reform without an agreement to limit overall spending. Candidates with the highest offices of public trust should compete on the basis of ideas, issues, and qualifications, and not on the basis of which candidates can raise the most money, for to have true reform, we must have a limit on the amount of money candidates spend in getting elected.

Congress previously acted to put reins on campaign spending, but in the 1976 landmark case of Buckley versus Valeo the Supreme Court found that Congress cannot set mandatory spending limits and, second, that if Congress sets voluntary limits its must provide some inducement as the Presidential system does to encourage compliance with the limits.

In this new proposal, we have set up a standard under which those who accept the voluntary spending limits will have to raise those funds from voluntary contributions from the private sector and not from Government funding. In addition to qualify, candidates must agree that while they accept an overall voluntary spending limit they will also raise a threshold amount depending upon the size of the State, 75 percent of which must come from individual contributions within that Senator's home State.

In addition, they will agree to contribute no more than $20,000 of their own personal funds to their campaign. This again is a provision put in in order to even out the playing field so that those with huge amounts of personal wealth will not be able to have an advantage in the election process.

Finally, the candidates must agree that they will not accept more than approximately 20 percent, under a formula that is set forth, of that voluntary limit from political action committee funds and special interest groups. Instead, they will go to individual contributors, principally, in their home States, to finance their campaigns.

Under the compromise that is now before us, if candidates accept those conditions, they voluntarily agree to hold themselves within reasonable spending limits, if they agree to limitations in terms of spending of their own personal wealth. If they agree to raise a certain portion of their initial funds from instate contributors, and if they agree to limit the amount of money that they receive from special-interest groups, they will receive certain benefits. First of all, they will qualify for the lowest unit broadcast rate for radio and television. That lowest unit rate is now given to all political candidates without regard to whether they accept spending limits or not. In the future that benefit would only be given to those candidates that accept voluntary limits. In addition those candidates who agree to live within reasonable voluntary limits would receive reduced first-class mail rates, 5½ cents per piece or 2 cents below the third-class mail rate.

This would give them a very significant advantage. This would be paid for by doing away with the present benefit that is given automatically to all political parties to use the bulk mail rate. Under the laws and under court decisions, if this is given to one political party, it is deemed to have to be given to all, including the Communist Party and other fringe groups. Doing

91-059 O-89-14 (Pt. 16)

away with that particular advantage will generate more than sufficient funds to offset the cost of giving a beneficial mailing rate to those candidates who accept voluntary spending limits, and so there would be no net cost to the Treasury. In fact, there should be a net gain to the Treasury from these two offsetting proposals.

Nonparticipating candidates, those candidates who will not agree to, in essence, give up their right to try to buy elections, those candidates who will not agree to reasonable spending limits, those candidates would have to carry in all of their advertising, including their direct mail and their broadcast advertising, a disclaimer that this candidate has not agreed to abide by voluntary spending limits. This would put the public on notice that that candidate is still reserving his right to try to decide the election on the basis of who can raise and spend the most money, that that candidate still wants to have the opportunity to buy the election if he or she is not capable of competing. We should compete within the democratic process on the basis of ideas, qualifications and what that candidate wants to do to help his or her country and his or her State through effective representation.

There is a standby proposal that, if a nonparticipating candidate comes within 75 percent of the limit, the candidate must report to the FEC in 5 percent increments of the limit and the participating candidate may begin to raise funds above that limit.

At the point that a nonparticipating candidate exceeds the general election spending limit, the participating candidate, that candidate who accepts the voluntary spending limits, is entitled to a grant equal to 67 percent of the general election limit and is allowed to raise and spend above the limit.

The point at which a nonparticiating candidate spends one-third of the amount of money that would be above the limit—in other words, he spends the entire spending limit plus 33 percent more—the particpating candidate is entitled to an additional grant equal to 33 percent of the general election limit.

In other words, funds raised through the voluntary checkoff on the income tax return and deposited in an account to enforce campaign finance reform would only be drawn upon by the participating candidate if the opponent went over the voluntary spending limit.

I believe that will rarely happen. I believe that the people of this country, who are very disturbed by the amount of spending that is going on, who are disturbed because the cost of running for the U.S. Senate has gone from $600,000 a decade ago to $3 million in the last election cycle—an enormous rate of increase that will propel us toward a $15 million price tag on the average U.S. Senate race if it continues at just the current rate within 12 years—that that alarm is so great that I think there will be strong public pressure, as well there should be, once this process is put in place, to cause candidates to want to abide by voluntary spending limits so that we can return some sanity to the campaign process in terms of the way it is financed.

I believe that that public feeling will be so forcefully expressed—and polls that have been taken all across this country indicate the great alarm that the people of this country have on the increasing amount of campaign spending—that candidates will find that it is to their detriment to try to buy elections, because the people of this country rightfully want that kind of behavior stopped. They want fair competition. They want an open process. They want candidates to compete on the basis of their qualifications.

Therefore, I believe that, once this system is put in place, it is very likely that candidates will begin to abide by the voluntary limits and that there will be no need for any public funds whatsoever to be involved in the process. It will not be the fault of the participating candidate if a single dime of public funds is involved. It will be the fault of the candidate that intentionally breaks the spending barrier.

And so this compromise goes the extra mile in trying to meet the opposition of those who said they were not prepared to vote for cloture to move ahead to vote on this bill, even though, quite clearly, as we debated in the past, a majority of the Members of this Senate favored it. Fifty-three Senators at one time or another went on record in favor of imposing cloture on this bill. But because we want to get above partisan politics, because we want to give due regard to the arguments raised by those on the other side who did not feel prepared to support S. 2 in its original form, we have made this major modification. Where, as previously, the participating candidate who accepted a voluntary spending limit immediately qualified to receive matching funds out of the checkoff, public funds, we have now taken that particular provision completely out of the bill.

If, for example, a spending limit in a certain State happens to be $1 million, that is the voluntary limit, the candidate who accepted that spending limit, that candidate would not get a single penny of public funds. That candidate would have to raise the funds from private contributors.

There certainly is a difference between the way he would raise them under our proposal and the way he now would raise them. He could only get 20 percent from interest groups. He would have to go back home to individual contributors to raise the balance. This will help restore some semblance of balance within the political system.

We had almost half of the Members elected to Congress last time who received more than half of all their political contributions not from the people back home, not from the people at the grass roots, but by organized interest groups largely headquartered right here in Washington, DC. We are endangering the concept of grassroots democracy as this balance is destroyed.

And so, while we would have voluntary spending limits and while candidates would continue to raise their funds through private contributors, we would see, I think, a healthy balance restored with candidates going back to individual contributors in their home States at the grassroots far more often and in a far larger proportion than they are now receiving their campaign contributions.

So, this bill is one that will bring about meaningful campaign reform. It is a proposal that should strike a responsive chord from those who have been opposing the bill in the past, because we have completely removed public financing as a basis for supporting campaigns. We have provided a bill with no net cost to the taxpayers. In fact, by removing the bulk rate privileges for all political parties automatically, we should have some net gain to the Treasury as a result of this piece of legislation.

What we will do if it is passed and if it is accepted in the spirit of bipartisan compromise, as I hope it will be, is restore the right kind of competition to American politics—competition based upon ideas, competition based upon character, competition based upon qualifications, competition based upon a desire to perform public service. We will no longer have competition based upon which candidate can raise the most money or which candidate is willing to accept the most special interest financing.

We have a chance, Mr. President, to take a giant step forward in preserving the integrity of the election process itself with this new proposal that has been offered, not only by myself and by Senator BYRD, but also by Senator EXON, who expressed his own reservations when S. 2 was first brought to the floor. Time and time again he came to the floor to say that he could not support S. 2 in the original form because he had misgivings about public financing. I understand why he had those misgivings. He sat down with us and worked with us to hammer out this new compromise. He is now giving his enthusiastic support to it.

We are gaining in momentum. We are gaining in support. I hope we now have before us, Mr. President, the

blueprint for an ultimate campaign reform package that can pass the Senate with broad support on both sides of the aisle as we join together as Americans to solve a real American problem.

Mr. REID addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I want to congratulate Senator BOREN and the majority leader for their efforts in campaign financing reform and I am especially happy that this bill has now been brought up again. We have sat through weeks and weeks of debate on the trade bill, which is very important. We sat through an extended debate on the debt limit and all the variations that flowed from that, and rightfully so.

But I commend the majority leader for now allowing us to return to this important aspect of American politics and American government—campaign reform.

Mr. President, I have listened with interest over the weeks that this bill, S. 2, was debated to my able colleagues from the other party as they donned their armor of self-righteous indignation and mounted their rhetorical warhorses and charged full tilt against the dragon of campaign reform.

Each evening, after they had debated and spoken on the subject, I am sure they returned from the lists, with verbal lances splintered on the evil public finance giants, and shining swords blunted on the frightening spending limit dwarfs. What wonderful tales they must tell the firesides of their Republican castles; tales of valor, full of sound and fury.

"The arguments" I can hear them say, "we raised the good old solid arguments of days of yore, and they did us proud."

For it is the old arguments that my friends across the aisle have used as weapons in their battle to slay fundamental campaign reforms. Listen to what they say, and I am quoting now:

> The Constitution does not even mention political party, let alone national parties, nor any delegated power or right of this body to take taxpayers' dollars to subsidize political candidates. Deductions from individual taxpayers or not, the dollars still come from the U.S. Treasury.

Again:

> The Constitution does not even mention political party, let alone national parties, nor any delegated power or right of this body to take taxpayers' dollars to subsidize political candidates. Deductions from individual taxpayers or not, the dollars still come from the U.S. Treasury.

Another quote:

> As some of my Republican colleagues in the Senate have pointed out this checkoff system represents nothing more and nothing less than a raid on the Federal Treasury by the opposition party which is apparently in desperate need of campaign contributions.

Another quote:

> Through the $1 tax checkoff scheme these minor parties are not likely to ever pass from the scene. With a guarantee of public funding for their causes, they would achieve longevity, perhaps immortality.

Well, the new proposal, Mr. President, before the Senate no longer talks about public financing. It switched. But these arguments about which I have spoken dealt with that issue and I think it is important, before we leave that issue, to talk about the shallowness of those arguments, because those arguments sounded familiar, those quotes that I was given. They are the weapons with which our colleagues opposed to S. 2 in its original form have fought the battle. They are not, however, as I have stated, very new weapons.

In fact, the three quotes I read you came from opponents, on both sides of the aisle, to the 1971 Act which reformed the way in which Presidential campaigns are conducted in this country.

When this debate just developed—you will recall I asked my colleague, the distinguished junior Senator from Kentucky, if he would analogize between S. 2, and the Presidential electoral system. He was reluctant to do so, and with good reason. Not only has the checkoff system worked, but the candidates from his party have availed themselves of its provisions, and even right to this day continue to do so.

My friend from Kentucky hesitated to attack a system which financed the Reagan campaigns in 1980 and 1984, and which presently finances a number of his distinguished friends and colleagues as they struggle to succeed their current party leader as the architect of Republican philosophy and reason.

The system has worked, and yet the attacks made by its opponents in 1971 were precisely the same attacks they are making today. Like the good conservatives they say they are, my friends from the other party have fallen back on the weapons from the good old days, the lance of rhetoric, the dagger of half-truth, the sword of speculation, and the blunt club of fear.

The time has come, and I think this has been portrayed and certainly emphasized today, in the remarks given by Senator BOREN who certainly is the conscience of the Senate on the issue of campaign reform.

Senator BOREN said, in effect: It is time to call a truce. I agree. Public financing is out. Distinguished Senators like the senior Senator from Nebraska have now joined in this effort and is a cosponsor of this amendment.

I think it is time to negotiate an end to this medieval warfare and, instead, move forward into an age of enlightenment and reason. Because if there were ever an area where it is needed, it is in this area of campaign reform where people running for the U.S. Senate do not have to spend the majority of their time raising money, but they can campaign in the way that the American public thinks that we should campaign, by appearing in cities and towns before groups of men and women interested in bettering our form of government; not in determining how much money can be raised.

I have spoken a number of times on this Senate floor about S. 2, about the need to compromise. Certainly the way has been laid with the speeches made this morning, remarks on this floor, by the majority leader and by the Senator from Oklahoma.

Compromise is something that we must do. I think it necessary that both sides move. We have moved. Perhaps there is more movement that need take place but we have moved decidedly this day. I think we have moved in a reasonable manner. I believe that movement that has been made by the majority leader and the Senator from Oklahoma need to be recognized for what they are, an effort to resolve a complicated issue that certainly is before the American public.

This time now has come for the other party to get off its war horse and act in an equally reasonable and honorable manner.

The American people want this legislation. They want campaign reform. They want an end to the spiraling cost of campaign spending, and the campaigns which begin the day after the last election ended.

My colleagues, the time has come. Let us talk compromise now; so that those who oppose this bill with sword, and mace, and lance, are not trampled under by the votes of the people at the next election, when their weapons of rhetoric will avail them naught against the truth.

I yield the balance of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. SANFORD. Thank you very much, Mr. President, I want to add to the words of my distinguished colleague just completed as well as the comments made by the majority leader and the sponsor of campaign reform; S. 2.

There is a judgment felt widely across the land that far too much money is spent for political campaigns, and the American political system is becoming the worse for it.

This reinforces the public's cynical belief that in the U.S.A. money talks louder than people. Candidates must spend far too much campaign time in fundraising. Excess campaign spending often reaches the absurd and then the obscene. Money can be given to causes much more worthy than the gilding of campaign lilies.

There is a reasonable amount of campaign money that needs to be

spent. It is necessary to communicate a candidate's record and positions. That is the purpose of campaigns. Communication is the heart of campaigns.

I don't know what the reasonable limit is. We can debate that. But one thing certainly is true: the amounts needed are certainly not without limit.

True, as the minority leader suggests, this may not be a burning issue. People are writing fewer letters about this issue than about the Iran/Contra scandal, or the administration's bankrupt and bankrupting agriculture policy. But no political observer doubts that the American public is disgusted and expects us to curtail such excessive spending. The polls show it. The editorials show it.

Excessive spending puts a continuing strain on elected public officials. There are congressional fundraisers in Washington two or three times a week, and often two or three times a night. A senatorial candidate has to stand in line to hold a fundraiser in New York or Los Angeles. Congressional Members must worry about the legislative agenda of this PAC combine or that special interest group. If all that doesn't corrupt decisions, it has the potential to corrupt.

I was not initially able to grasp why so many of our Republican colleagues were so adamant, why they were filibustering to keep the Senate from even voting on campaign spending limits.

They seemed first to pose and posture as if protecting the taxpayer. "The taxpayers don't want to pay for our campaigns," they proclaimed day after day. But that wasn't quite straightforward talk. They know that the money is the equivalent of a voluntary contribution by taxpayers who check their tax forms. The American public understands its right to make voluntary contributions. That argument didn't fly.

Then the distinguished Republican leader told it all. Taking the floor after most of the Republicans had for the fifth time blocked a vote on the bill that would regulate spending, he gave the American public the official straightforward and honest reason for the Republican fear of campaign expense reform.

The Republicans need more money than Democrats in order to win. That is what he said. If they re not permitted to spend more than Democrats, they can never expect to win, they say.

He said the Republicans don't want any, and he said, "not any," limits on campaign expenditures. Fortunately, all Republicans do not agree with him, but the leader has put out the official word.

That comes awfully close to saying that they think they can buy elections. "If we spend enough money, we can win," they contend, so they want no limits whatsoever.

Now, at last, the issue is clearly joined. The Republicans want and need to use money to win. The Democrats expect to use issues and performance to win.

The Democrats want to stop obscene levels of campaign spending. The Republicans do not.

The American public wants to stop obscene levels of campaign spending. The Republicans do not.

The American public understands, now, that this is the great, clear issue.

Now the distinguished and able Republican leader, Senator DOLE, has said that his Republican colleagues will stand firm on spending all they want to spend so they can win. He especially pleads for the need to outspend Democrats in one-party States.

That plea has to be greeted with a wry smile. What is a one-party State? Kansas? Would the Republicans be satisfied to put a lid on spending in Kansas? Would they permit the Democrats to spend more in Kansas in order to catch up?

The American public does not want to be told that elections will go to the highest bidder. The American public does not want to believe that elections are for sale.

That is the clear dividing line on S. 2, the bill to put reasonable limits on campaign spending.

My distinguished colleague bemoaned the fact that in some States registration of Democrats over Republicans is 2 to 1, 4 to 1, or even more. The question is, why? Well, the Democrats did not reach that advantage anywhere by spending huge sums of money on television spots. They earned the Democratic registration by standing for those issues people believe in. They stand for people and their opportunities in life. That is why more people want to be called Democrats.

If the Republicans want to increase their registration they can better represent the vision that most Americans have for their country. That is better than trying to buy an increase in representation.

Americans do not approve of finding tricky ways to avoid treaties, or of continuing to pile up tremendous new nuclear capabilities, with the risk of blowing us all off the face of the Earth.

Americans do not believe in leaving one-fifth of the children of America in poverty, outside the gates of the American dream.

Americans do not believe in running the public business in secret and in violation of the laws of the land, and lying about it when caught.

Americans do not believe our farmers and industrial workers should be abandoned by some muddleheaded concept of free trade.

The Republicans cannot buy their way out of the mess they have made in the last 7 years—nor should they be able to.

This free land is based on free elections, and we have worked hard over the years to keep our elections clear of manipulation and corruption.

S. 2 is another attempt to cut down on manipulation and corruption.

Excessive campaign spending corrupts. There is no question about it. Excessive TV spots that attack and distort are campaign manipulation—no question about it.

No, Mr. Republican Leader, the people of the United States are not going to put their Senate seats on the auction block.

If the Republicans want to earn the respect and support of Americans, let them earn it the old-fashioned way. Let them work for it by working for the people.

The division on this election reform bill is clear: most Republicans want money to speak. The Democrats want people to speak.

And speak the people will. The political offices of the United States of America are not for sale.

I hope the citizens of the United States will start watching closely this action on the Senate floor. All-out Republican war has been declared.

They are fighting to kill the bill, to strangle it before we can even have a vote on it. Watch them closely. Some Republicans will vote in favor of spending limits. Others will not. Those who think money is more important than people will vote to bury S. 2.

In the final analysis, that is so often the big difference between our two political parties. And nothing would better exemplify that difference than how Members vote on this bill. Money first or people first. The difference is clear.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TO PROHIBIT THE IMPORTATION OF OBJECTS FROM THE R.M.S. "TITANIC"

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, earlier today an order was entered for a time limitation of 10 minutes on a bill to be introduced by Mr. WEICKER dealing with the importation of objects from the *Titanic*.

According to the order, I was authorized to proceed with the matter after consultation with the distinguished

Republican leader. That consultation has occurred.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. WEICKER] be recognized to call up his bill and that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration once he does so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WEICKER. Mr. President, I believe the bill is at the desk. If so, I ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1581) to prohibit the importation of objects from the RMS Titanic.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill will be considered as having been read the second time and the Senate will proceed to its immediate consideration.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. WEICKER. Mr. President, I will be very brief in my discussion of this legislation.

The United States and France cooperated in a very successful way several years ago in the discovery of the Royal Mail Ship *Titanic*. The principal scientist in that venture was Dr. Robert Ballard, of the United States. Dr. Ballard, coming from Woods Hole Oceanographic Institute, made the initial discovery, and then proceeded to photograph the wreck and report it to the world.

Now, what was originally a scientific endeavor dedicated to marine research, to unearth the remnants of history, has degenerated into a salvage operation by the French.

I think it is important to point out that the United States, through Dr. Ballard, could have done more than a year ago exactly what the French are now doing. We have the hardware and the knowledge and the will to retrieve artifacts from the *Titanic*. To the credit of this Nation, we have chosen not to do so, leaving it, rather, as a marine memorial. Unfortunately, such was not the case with the French.

Now, I think it important here again to point out that it is not the French Republic that is doing this in the name of the Government of France. The French are contracting out their equipment and their services to commercial ventures located both in the United States and in Great Britain, and perhaps even elsewhere.

It is true that what they do is not illegal. Under international law they have the right to this act of salvage. But it was the hope of this Nation, as expressed in a bill passed by the Senate and the House over 1 year ago and signed into law by the President, that future activity on the *Titanic* would be done in the spirit of international cooperation.

It, in effect, requested of our Department of State that they contact the British and the French to see if guidelines could be set out relative to any salvage of artifacts from the *Titanic* or, indeed, any endeavor relating to the *Titanic*. Our State Department was unsuccessful in that effort, having contacted the French many times during the course of the year—the latest, of course, being recently when facts surfaced relative to this particular salvage operation.

So I think it can be safely stated as a matter of historical record that what started out as a venture in the name of science and history by the United States and France has degenerated into a commercial venture on the part of the French.

Now, as I indicated, there is little that can be done vis-a-vis international law, but I think what we can do is to take one step further the spirit of the initial discovery denying to the French any profit from its commercialization. Therefore, this bill now before the Senate bans the import for the purposes of commercial gain any object from the *Titanic* into the customs territory of the United States.

The bill defines the term "R.M.S. *Titanic*" as the wreck itself or cargo and contents scattered on the ocean floor around it, the so-called debris field, and it calls for termination of the ban when an international agreement to which the United States is a party governing any exploration and salvage of the *Titanic* enters into force.

The bill does not ban import for nonprofit purposes such as an exhibition at the Smithsonian or other educational nonprofit institution. To me this is a well-tempered response to the ill-advised venture of the French.

I again want to express the pride I feel for the scientists of my country in their eschewing the commercial profits which could have been generated from their activity. As one who has been deeply interested in marine research over a long period of time, heretofore French activity has been a positive example to the world, as evidenced by the work of Jacques Cousteau.

I think this, indeed, just completely reverses all the good will that has been gained by Mr. Cousteau, all the knowledge that has been disseminated among the people of the world by Mr. Cousteau and places the French in a very unenviable position of being in the field of commercial ventures, in effect desecrating what U.S. law designated as a maritime memorial.

It is not the desire of the United States to claim this as our own. It is a desire of the United States to see that it is handled properly by international agreements, which can only be arrived at by France, Great Britain, and the United States—indeed, anybody else who cares to join.

The oceans have too few friends in terms of the commitments of various nations around the world. The money we spend on oceans reseach is far too little. It is only a matter of time before the world is going to have to turn to these oceans for food and fuel. I hope that matters such as the *Titanic* would instill in all of us an urgency to understand the oceans and use that knowledge to explore and to develop their resources in the best possible way. When the Earth does turn to the oceans for its food and its fuel, do not forget it has to be a resource that lasts millions of years rather than just a decade or two to satisfy our most immediate desires.

That is why I again urge international cooperation. As a proud lay member of that community, one who himself has spent days on the bottom of the ocean, I hope that we would use our resources together and not apart and that the end result would be a tribute to science and history and not to a few bucks that can be made in a few short months.

This bill, then, obviously makes it still possible for the plunderers to vend their objects throughout the world, but they will not have as one resource this most bountiful of nations.

Mr. President, I hope the bill will pass.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 1581

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SEC. . (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no object from the R.M.S. Titanic may be imported into the customs territory of the United States for the purposes of commercial gain after the date of enactment of this act.

(b) For purposes of this section, the term "R.M.S. Titanic" means the shipwrecked vessel R.M.S. Titanic, her cargo or other contents, including those items which are scattered on the ocean floor in her vicinity.

(c) The provisions of this section shall terminate upon the entry into force of an international agreement to which the United States is a party governing any exploration and salvage of the R.M.S. Titanic.

Mr. WEICKER. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. BYRD. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. WEICKER. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished majority leader for his courtesy in allowing me to bring this matter to the attention of the Senate at this time.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Connecticut.

HAPPY BIRTHDAY TO SENATOR STENNIS

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I note the presence in the Chamber of Mr. STENNIS.

I call attention to the fact that this is a very important birthday in the life of a highly revered Senator—the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS].

Mr. STENNIS is chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate. He is also the President pro tempore. This is a happy event in his life—the birthday of our esteemed senior Member of this body, senior from the standpoint of service, a man who has been in the Senate now for many, many years.

I know that my colleagues will join me in extending our best wishes to Mr. STENNIS and in wishing him many happy returns for the day.

I shall try to recall a verse which I think typifies what this man's life and service in this body are to the body, to ourselves, and to the country.

I think we all can see much in the service of Senator STENNIS here to attempt to emulate, much to inspire, much to guide us, much to attract us.

As we look upon the service of this man, we can see a service that is marked by high integrity, by honesty, by strong character, and by devotion to the Senate.

The Senator from Mississippi has been a great leader in this country and a leader in the Senate. He has been on the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate for many years. He has helped to guide us and counsel us with respect to arms control matters and with respect to national defense matters.

We have all gained much from working with JOHN C. STENNIS. He has certainly been an inspiration to me, and I count myself fortunate in having JOHN STENNIS as my friend.

Mr. President——

MY NEIGHBOR'S ROSES

The roses red upon my neighbor's vine
Are owned by him, but they are also mine.
His was the cost, and his the labor, too,
But mine as well as his the joy, their loveliness to view.

They bloom for me and are for me as fair
As for the man who gives them all his care.
Thus I am rich, because a good man grew
A rose-clad vine for all his neighbors' view.
I know from this that others plant for me,
That what they own, my joy may also be.
So why be selfish, when so much that's fine
Is grown for me, upon my Mississippi neighbor's vine.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I say to the Senator from West Virginia, you warm my heart, you expand my gratitude. I appreciate your kind and generous words more than I can fully describe.

I appreciate, too, what you have done for our country, what you have done for this body, the U.S. Senate.

I cannot recall the exact date, but I remember when you came here. I remember the first caucus you went to and some of the things you said in that meeting. I said to many then, "He's a comer; he's a comer." I am not a prophet, nor the son of a prophet, but that was one time I hit the nail on the head.

We are all grateful to you and appreciate very much what you mean to this body and to us as individuals, year after year. I hope you will continue to be here for a long while.

I thank you again for your kind words.

SENATORIAL ELECTION CAMPAIGN ACT

The Senate continued with the consideration of S. 2.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I am here to speak briefly, not more than 10 minutes.

I have listened carefully to the debate and prior debates regarding the important issue of campaign finance reform. I have joined in that debate, and for the third time I feel compelled to come to the floor and speak.

As my colleagues know, I am not given to making speeches just for the fun of it or for the privilege of it. I try to have something to say that might be helpful regarding the problems that surround the office we hold.

I believe that this issue to which my remarks will be addressed, this matter of elections, is so important to constitutional democracy and to the institution of the U.S. Senate that I feel compelled to speak out.

In the past I have spoken only to the need for reforming the current system of campaign finance and to make that reform without delay. But today, Mr. President, I must comment on the substance of these reform proposals and the arguments made against them.

Several years ago, I supported strongly an amendment that would have striken a provision providing for expenditure of Federal funds, taxpayers' money, in connection with the Presidential campaigns. I did not like the idea and I still do not like the idea, in a sense of fairness, of taking money that someone has earned and paid in taxes and giving it out to another person as a part of his cost of getting elected to office. I do not like that idea standing alone. I think it is unsound.

But the money we are talking about today is not of that category. It relates to graver things than merely paying a fee. I am speaking now to a provision to limit the total amount of expenditures made by Senate candidates in each State. This was, and I believe still is, the overriding goal of campaign finance reform.

I am gravely concerned at the extent to which we are developing these election campaigns into a kind of a running fundraising contest carried on in innumerable places over the Nation. The people doing the work are good. I do not challenge their purpose. I simply believe that is destroying the spirit and the feel of the local nature of the particular campaign.

The current method of campaign financing is putting local decisions in the hands not of the people who live in the area, in the vicinity, in the State, but it is putting elections in the hands of money from far away. It comes from another State. It comes from another area of the country. It comes from people who live perhaps thousands of miles from that voting precinct. To make just a small contribution as a matter of token support might be all right, on a voluntary, strictly voluntary basis without anything expected in return. That would have no kind of a wrong attitude about it or any suspicion about it. Something like that is nice enough to help a person along, especially if he is a friend. But when it comes to raising millions of dollars from throughout the Nation, contributed by people or companies that do not personally know the candidate; much less know him well enough to have confidence in him or her, or have a faithful judgment of their ability to cope with the known problems that are going to confront them, even before they are sworn in and certainly as long as they are in office; I just do not believe that we can let that practice continue to operate. We cannot continue to operate that way and continue to maintain integrity of our local elections.

We are driving the local people away from elections, because they do not believe in those practices. They do not believe in the possibility of having their local elections taken over by some person or group that they do not know and about the purposes of which they know nothing. It creates a suspicion that these groups are not all good.

I am not trying to berate or run down or raise questions about any individual. I am thinking in terms of a pattern of conduct. The Constitution of the United States says that Members of this body shall be elected by the people, by the people of the respective States. Now we went more than 100 years, during which the legislators from each State elected the Members of this body. But that was changed through a constitutional amendment. I remember just as a boy when it arose at the insistence of the people, because they wanted to exercise that political power themselves at their own voting precincts and in their

own voting places and under their own election managers, rather than to continue to relate it to a faraway city or some other process. Finally a few years ago, we hit on this system of campaign finance that has rapidly deteriorated. I am not accusing anyone of being a crook—what I am saying is this is taking the heart, the soul, the feeling, and the self-respect away from these people who live and vote at these precincts. This system is taking elections far, far away, to wherever this money came from, and it is creating conditions that cannot avoid affecting and changing the election process at the expense of the local people.

That is the substance of my plea.

Now the substance of this amendment here today is an invitation to hold down and circumscribe and directly control the amount of this outside money. There were provisions in here trying to meet this matter with money out of the Treasury, but this latest proposal leaves that language aside and provides that if any candidate spends more than allowed under the terms of this law, then the other side shall be paid out of the Federal Treasury a sum equal to two-thirds of the State expenditure limit.

That will keep the matter cleaner and will tend to reduce campaign spending because the man that has the overrun will be building up a sum of money for his opponent to draw from the Treasury.

(Mr. ADAMS assumed the Chair).

Mr. STENNIS. That is not an invasion of the money that is in the Treasury. This is an effort to keep elections clean, to keep it in the hands of the people who are to be served by these candidates, whichever one is elected, and thereby avoid what has come to be a new problem in elections.

Now I am not suggesting that elections everywhere in every State or every precinct is filled or touched with this evil, this wrong, this pattern that destroys in effect a lot if not all of the purity of the election.

Furthermore, if the spirit and interest is lost by the local people, with whom this right belongs, and I submit it is exclusively theirs, if there is something wrong with them then you kill the spirit of the entire election. We must not let that happen.

There are those who have worked very hard on this issue. And as for those who do not see a need for reform, I do not accuse them of having a bad motive; of course not. It is always a problem to work out a plan for elections. But, if we do not continue until we find a way here through some law that we can agree on we are riding hard for a fall of almost the worst possible kind. I think that those of us who are here now who can see these things that are going on in many places, can interpret what the real meaning of these developments is. At the same time have the real power here as Members of this body to stop that unfaithful and that questionable method of campaign financing that we have dropped into and, keep these elections clean and unpolluted and not subjected to being taken over by outside interests.

I wish that everyone, everyone in America, every citizen, could have an opportunity of visiting Philadelphia, PA, as was our privilege a few weeks ago when about 40 of the Members of this body and about 100 Members of the House of Representatives, all gathered together at Philadelphia, PA. There we were, escorted around that great city and into the historical buildings. Everything is in its place like it was when the Constitution of the United States was written, where the Declaration of Independence was written, and where all these other things connected particularly with our early history happened.

It was my privilege to be among those that were there and went through these very places I have described. And it was a great thrill to me. They said, "Where do you want to sit? In the chair George Washington sat in when the Constitution was being written, or do you want another chair?"

I said, "Give me Mr. Washington's chair." And I had the privilege of occupying if for at least 30 minutes.

But the thrill comes from the overall satisfaction, satisfaction that there in that very building and in those rooms, in the premises there, that the standards, the standards that has proven so satisfactory to us as a whole and so productive to us as a whole successfully for 200 years. We have taken space that was a wilderness then, except for a relatively small percent of that that constitutes our 50 States now—then we had only 13—and it has grown into more than 260 or 270 million people.

It gives you that feeling of strength, thanksgiving, realization of the possibilities, but it makes you think, too, that we have got to keep elections clean, we have got to keep them on a high level. I do not think there is anything, anything, about our entire system of government that is quite as important as the preservation of high standards and clean standards in our elections and to keep those elections strictly in the hands of the people. They will make some mistakes. They will make some outstanding mistakes, at times. But as a whole, there will be satisfactory products, results obtained and the average service rendered by those elected under this system will be the average for the people. It will have standards of conduct, it will have standards of principles, and the best will work out as a whole for the benefit of the people and the strength of the Nation.

I am not a wise person by any means, but when it comes to observation and experience, I have served 402 people, think of that, by observation and experience, I have some knowledge of the high purposes and the high standard of conduct and the effectiveness of the work of these people over the years in the growth of our Nation.

So there is your proof. And I feel confident—I am not referring to any individual—but I feel confident if we continue to neglect these standards for our elections, our election patterns, if we continue to neglect these, then we are riding for a fall. And if we fall in that department, reform may not come quick enough.

So I hope that we will continue to take this matter quite seriously and in some fashion work out a simple plan that will carry with it the high purposes and the fine production that has brought us these results of the very highest kind.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair suggests the absence of a quorum.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the Chair.

TIME LIMITATION AGREEMENT—NOMINATION OF ALAN GREENSPAN, OF NEW YORK, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, as in executive session, I put the following request which has been cleared through the distinguished Republican leader, and I make the request at this time with his approval.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, as in executive session, that on the nomination of Alan Greenspan to be a member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, vice Paul A. Volcker, resigning, there be a time limitation of 30 minutes to be equally divided between and controlled by Mr. DOLE and Mr. PROXMIRE, and that at the conclusion of the 30 minutes, or the yielding back thereof, a vote occur on the nomination of Mr. Greenspan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, it will be the intention of the leadership to go to the nomination today at about 4:30, or between 4:30 and 5 p.m., and a vote

then would occur roughly 30 minutes thereafter. It will be a rollcall vote. the yeas and nays will be ordered later in the day.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

SENATORIAL ELECTION CAMPAIGN ACT

Mr. DECONCINI. Mr. President, I rise to discuss the election reform bill, S. 2.

Some of my colleagues have stood on this floor and advocated abolishing all political action committees. Not only is this not a good idea but, in my judgment, it is a terrible idea.

In supporting S. 2, I support aggregate limits on PAC giving. I support aggregate limits because I believe it brings balance to fundraising. However, abolishing PAC's would deprive many citizens of an opportunity to actively participate in campaigns and would likely not stand a court challenge. If you attempted to do that.

Mr. President, that is not what S. 2 is all about. I think many who have supported an effort to abolish political action committees are using it as a subterfuge because they do not want to have real election reform. They know we are not really going to do that.

We have talked a good deal about the outrageous spending of PAC's and their inordinate influence. But let me point out that all PAC's are not multimillion dollar operations. Many PAC's are small, well-run groups which truly represent their members' views and allow different ideas to be brought and heard, the chance for many voices to participate.

Let me take a few minutes of the Senate's time to tell you about one such PAC in my State of Arizona. The Salt River project is a water and power utility serving central Arizona. Salt River project's PAC is known as PPIC. PPIC had 229 member employees in 1986, 189 of whom made contributions to PPIC. The average contribution was $120.81 for a total in 1986 of $22,834.56, to be exact.

So this is not an outrageous PAC that we ought to be targeting to eliminate.

PPIC made contributions to 105 candidates in 1986. Only eight of those contributions were for amounts of $1,000 or more, and most were for a few hundred dollars.

In addition to funding candidates, PPIC has an active voter education program. They hold candidate forums and provide nonbiased detailed information on Federal and State candidates running for office.

PPIC has set out for itself lengthy and detailed ethical guidelines for the operation of their PAC. Among the guidelines is an assurance of confidentiality for all members so that there can be no pressure to give and no sanctions for not giving to the PAC. The advisory committee which makes the decisions on where to give contributions is made up of members representative of the membership. Importantly, the guidelines go on to assure that PPIC will honor not only the letter of the law but the spirit of the Federal, State, and local election laws as well. Finally, PPIC explicitly states "PPIC contributions will not be contingent on the promise of a vote or action on a specific topic, issue, bill or regulation."

Mr. President, as I believe I have illustrated, PAC's are not inherently evil. They are part of a good, sound, healthy political process. What is evil is the level of PAC giving which we have seen in recent years. By enacting aggregate limits on PAC giving we insure that voices like those of the Salt River project employees are still heard, in an effort to join together in what I think is a positive approach.

Let me add, Mr. President, there are many other such political action committees. Political action committees were not instituted primarily or initially to simply raise a bunch of bucks to try to influence Members or candidates on how they might vote on issues. They were put together many years ago by labor and environmental groups. They were put together to educate their members as well as raise money.

Some may scoff at that, saying, "Senator, do not tell me that the AFL-CIO PAC was put together to educate their members, or the environmental PAC was put together to educate their members, or the Salt River PPIC to educate their members. They were not. They were put together to get money to buy influence."

Well, that is not true. One of their main goals is educational. Unfortunately, we have seen many political action committees that have been converted to influence peddling, but still there are many of them, as I have pointed out in this statement, that do other things, that do educate their members, that educate the public by public forums, that print monthly periodicals and other information that is circulated among employees.

What is better than an employee, a registered voter talking to his neighbor or his relatives about some political issues, and that is what the education part is all about. Second, what is better than for that employee to feel that "I make $20,000 or $30,000, I can't afford to give $100 to every legislative candidate that I like. I might like 10 or 12 of them—or to the U.S. Senate nominee or U.S. House nominee—but I can give $125 to this political action committee which will then put that together with some other contributions and give a contribution to some candidates who I think are honest and are going to do a good job."

That is what political action committees are all about, Mr. President. I think it is unfair to give them a bum rap because some here on this floor oppose S. 2.

HAPPY BIRTHDAY, SENATOR STENNIS

Mr. DECONCINI. Mr. President, I want to congratulate the senior Senator from Mississippi on his birthday. It is a happy day for him, indeed it is a happy day for all of us. Senator STENNIS was kind to this Senator when I came here some 11 years ago. He had been a colleague and contemporary of Ernest McFarland. Governor McFarland had served in this Senate with the Senator from Mississippi and I know that Senator McFarland called the Senator from Mississippi before I came here, along with his senior colleague, Senator Eastland, and introduced this Senator to them over the phone. I remember going to see the Senator from Mississippi and how he recounted to me the conversation he had with former Senator McFarland and the hospitality and warmness both Senators from Mississippi extended to me when I first came to the Senate.

Senator STENNIS reminds me very much of my father; he was a man of principle, a man who understood the strength of an institution and the importance of an institution. But the Senator also realizes that life changes and that you have to look to the future with the younger Members of this body as Senator STENNIS did for me when I first joined this body.

I wish the Senator a happy birthday and thank him as one Member for always considering the younger generation. Now I have to look to younger generations coming along and share this institution, not only its history, precedents and love that the Senator has for it but also the leadership to consider the direction it should go. It is a tribute that the Senator has served so long in this body and now serves as the able chairman of the Appropriations Committee. If I had a hat on, I would take it off to the Senator and if I could applaud right now, I would applaud. But I wish him God's blessings in prosperity and continued leadership in this body.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DECONCINI. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator very much for his kind and generous words and say, too, that I remember quite well the good impression we had of the Senator when he came to the Senate. But the happiest thought of all is how he has blossomed, risen to a place of high responsibility and has

had an outstanding role to play. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. President, I join in the comments made by my distinguished friend from Arizona about our good friend, the senior Senator from Mississippi. He has been an inspiration to all of us, and I congratulate him on this special occasion in his life.

It is not unusual that he would be on the floor having come to talk about the matter of great importance to our form of government, our constitutional form of government, being one of those who has encouraged me all along the way in trying to do something about campaign finance reform. He said to me, "I am concerned about what is happening in this institution from my perspective and I am concerned about what will happen to our country if the people who go to that ballot box back in those voting places all across this country lose control of their own government. We are going to have terrible problems."

His concern has been a major factor in altering me to the problem we are trying to deal with in the bill that is before the Senate at the present time. But it is not just in that area of endeavor. It has been in many, many others; that simply by watching the Senator from Mississippi, watching the example and observing the example that he sets for all of us, I have been led to try to do what I thought was right on a number of issues.

We are asked very often, can people serve in public life for a long time and have a great impact and still keep their personal standards of integrity, still have their character intact, still live by the standards of ethics that we would want to see in all those with whom we must work and have dealings.

I do not know that it would be appropriate to refer to the Senator from Mississippi as professor, but he has been a professor who has taught all of us in this Senate about personal integrity, about love for our country, about the courage of conviction, about courtesy, about kindness, about concern for his fellow human beings.

I wish him well and special congratulations on this day and thank him as one of his many pupils for the lessons he has taught this Senator as I know he has taught many, many others.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I warmly thank my friend for his generous remarks. Along with the rest of the membership and people of this Nation, I am indebted to him for the fine and outstanding work he has done with regard to this knotty problem with which we are dealing. I believe he is going to improve the law in a very meaningful way without being extreme. More power to the Senator. I am going to back him.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Mississippi.

Let me say in his coming to the floor again and again, if there are any days I get discouraged and wonder are we going to make it across that line and finally make the kinds of changes that are going to be needed to restore the integrity to the election process again, make sure that the people have control of their own government, elections are decided on issues and qualifications and not on the basis of who can raise and spend the most money, if at any time I am fainthearted or wonder if the fight is worth it, I look around and there is the Senator from Mississippi on the floor with an encouraging word, ready to continue that fight until we ultimately win.

I would say also that the distinguished majority leader would be another one who continues that kind of encouragement and that kind of tenacity. With the Senator from Mississippi and the Senator from West Virginia saying we are going to keep this matter on the national agenda until we finally do something that will help this system and will help this country, I have every confidence we are going to get it done. I thank the Senator from Mississippi for his encouragement.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BOREN. I will be happy to yield to my distinguished leader.

Mr. BYRD. I also thank the Senator from Mississippi, but I think we all have to say Senator BOREN is our leader in this matter. He is the one who has persistently pressed ahead, worked hard on the legislation, knows it up side and down, down side and up, inside and out; it was his idea to begin with, and I continue to look to his leadership and his guidance as we press forward with this matter, and I hope for an ultimate conclusive victory for democracy.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished leader for his kind words. That is exactly what is at stake, the integrity of the political process, making sure that the people retain control of their own government at the grassroots and that we do not end up putting the highest positions of public trust in this country on the auction block for a decision based upon who can raise the most money. That is not what the people want. That would be a dereliction on our part of our duty to uphold the constitutional process.

We are going to continue and will keep coming back again and again, until we finally forge the agreements that will make it possible to move ahead in this area.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I would like to add my voice of praise and commendation to the distinguished Senator from Mississippi, JOHN STENNIS, on this occasion of his birthday.

I remember that about 2 years ago, I, along with a large number of Senators, went to his hometown, De Kalb, MS. There, the people of De Kalb and surrounding areas had gathered to help him celebrate his birthday.

There was a great outpouring of love and affection by friends and neighbors who had known him and his father and others before him, in his hometown. There is nothing like hometown folks who know an individual.

De Kalb is not a big place. It is a small community, a little smaller than the community I live in. Those people are the salt of the Earth. They know an individual for his character and his integrity.

The great outpouring of love and affection that was displayed by his hometown and home area people was evidence of the fact that he stands tall with the people who know him best.

So it is a pleasure to be here today. I have so many things I could say about him that I might be accused of filibustering if I talked a long time.

He and I have much in common. We are from the South. We have backgrounds that go back generation after generation.

I have enjoyed very much the tales he has told us about his early years, how his father would raise cotton and then take it over into Alabama and ship it down to Mobile in those days.

He and I had the privilege of being judges. Not too many Members of the Senate today served on the bench. That gives you a different perspective, and I think a better perspective, of individuals and of human nature.

So I am delighted to participate in this occasion, and I wish you a happy birthday.

I had the pleasure of speaking at that birthday celebration, and I ended my speech with an old Irish prayer, and I would like to see if I can remember it, to wish you well on this birthday. The old Irish prayer goes like this:

May the road rise to meet you.
May the wind always be at your back.
May the sun shine warm on your face
And the rains fall soft on your shoulders,
And may the Good Lord hold you in the hollow of his hand during the remainder of your days.

We admire you, we respect you, we love you, Senator JOHN.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator warmly for his fine words and his generous spirit. I claim that being his neighbor has contributed a lot to me. Knowing the Senator from Alabama gives me great strength.

BICENTENNIAL OF THE CONSTITUTION

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, September 17, 1987, will mark the Bicentennial of the Constitution of the United States. Many will doubtless remember

when we celebrated the 200th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence just over 11 years ago. Well, I believe that the Bicentennial celebration of the Constitution is equally, if not more important. As Senators know, the Constitution is the frame work and blueprint for our government—the oldest government that has been in continual existence anywhere in the world. It combines our individual rights and liberties with a governmental structure unique for this then fledgling Nation, but sufficient to provide order and security to protect those individual rights and liberties.

The upcoming bicentennial offers each of us an opportunity to study, examine, and appreciate the Constitution. Without a working knowledge among the citizens of this Nation of our charter of liberties, our government would soon perish, because ours is a "government of the people, by the people, and for the people." Its functioning and survival depends entirely upon the capacity of all people to understand and to participate in our constitutional system. Our government is, therefore, only as strong as the understanding and will of the people who comprise it. To help promote this understanding, I wish to address the history and fundamental nature of our Nation's Constitution.

By fighting the Revolutionary War in 1776, our forefathers had established America's independence from England. They had proclaimed that "all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." Undoubtedly, many of you have at some point in your lives been asked to memorize this section of our Declaration of Independence. But, at the time independence was declared in 1776, our forefathers had no actual government which would ensure that these rights would survive. In the history of the world, many peoples have momentarily grasped freedom only to let it slip through their fingers. Our forefathers were in a similar precarious position. Although they had obtained the rights which all mankind inherently strives and struggles for, our forefathers were in danger of losing them without a government which would secure these basic freedoms and protect their safety.

On November 15, 1777, Congress adopted the Articles of Confederation. These articles of government were finally ratified by the States in 1781, as the Revolution neared its end. At this time, after years of war, struggle, and sacrifice, our forefathers' new Republic—the United States of America—was finally self-governing.

Yet this government was highly ineffective. Its primary fault was that the National Government was not strong enough to address issues and problems which faced the country. When it was devised, many of the Nation's leaders were suspicious of a centralized government. They were fearful that a government which wielded too much power would become a tyranny, similar to the British Crown they had opposed so fervently. And each of the Thirteen Colonies refused to surrender the power it had gained by winning the Revolutionary War. So, although the 13 States were joined what was called "a firm league of friendship with each other," each State retained its own "sovereignty, freedom, and independence." Essentially, the United States was comprised of 13 individual nations. Each State worked independently to satisfy its own ends. For example, each State issued its own currency. Each maintained its own army, and each individual State was responsible for regulating its own trade and commerce.

You can, perhaps, imagine the confusion which resulted from the diverging laws and regulations that were adopted by the various States. Because of differences in currency, $1 in one State had a relative value of only 50 or 75 cents in another. How was the price for a product in one State to be determined when it was being purchased with currency from another? Also, each State had different laws governing trade. Often, one State would not allow goods from a bordering State to be offered for sale. This was absolute and complete protectionism. Each of these factors led to an economic depression which fostered dissatisfaction in the new Republic.

Furthermore, though there was a national Congress which met regularly and had the power to conduct diplomacy, declare war, and deal with Indians, there was no President to execute laws or to personally oversee relations with other nations. Neither was there any national court system. And because taxation was viewed as one of the greatest powers that could be held by Government, it was reserved by the States. When the National Government needed money, as it did at this time to pay the enormous debt it had assumed during the Revolutionary War, it was bound by the Articles of Confederation to appeal to the States, which would then collect revenue directly from individual citizens. Often, however, the States did not comply with these requests.

The national debt was compounded by a large private debt owed by United States individuals to British merchants. The British refused to surrender forts along the Ohio River in accordance with the Peace of Paris until after the debts owed to British merchants were paid. With this excuse, they continued to enjoy the lucrative fur trade, and to retain the allegiance of Indians. Likewise, the British merchants refused to trade with the Americans until they were paid. And, other nations, such as France, refused to give the United States Government any additional credit until the money owed them was paid. This debt, both that held by the National Government, and that held by individuals, led to a lack of credit which also contributed to the economic depression that plagued the farmers, merchants, and bankers of the young nation.

Additional problems resulted from the foreign occupation of lands which were adjacent to U.S. territories. The Spanish King claimed the lands which stretched west of the Mississippi. Yet, their agents would not allow American explorers and fur trappers to navigate or chart the rivers in this area. They would even use the Indians as a tool, stirring them up to fight against U.S. explorers and settlers. As I have mentioned previously, the British still occupied the Ohio River Valley, and they, too, manipulated Indian sentiments against American trappers and explorers.

Because the Government established by the Articles of Confederation was not strong enough to adequately resolve the problems facing the young Republic, many of our forefathers believed that a change in the articles would facilitate the operation of the National Government. But a substantive change in the articles required unanimous consent by each of the States. And there was always an objection by at least one State to any proposed change.

The summer of 1786 was an especially frustrating time for America. The country was being hurt by an economic depression that stifled commerce and farming. Armed conflicts had even taken place between States over various trade restrictions. The Indians, stirred up by the Spanish and British, were, again, posing a dangerous threat to settlers. Additionally, pirates in the Barbary states of North Africa had seized American ships and sold their crews into slavery. Even if Congress had agreed to pay the tribute demanded by the pirates for free navigation into the Mediterranean, there were not enough funds in the National Treasury to do so. No relief for any of these problems appeared to be in sight. Any legislative action by the National Congress was vetoed by one or more of the States.

Finally, national leaders hoped that a meeting which was scheduled to take place in the fall of 1786 at Annapolis, MD would provide answers to the many commercial problems which faced the Nation. However, a total of 12 delegates from only 5 States arrived in Annapolis on September 11, 1786, to discuss commercial matters. Representatives from other States either were not sent or had not yet arrived. After 3 days the delegates to what has

become known as the "Annapolis Convention" decided that it would be fruitless to continue. With such poor attendance, nothing substantive could be accomplished. On September 14, immediately prior to adjourning, the Annapolis Convention drafted and adopted a resolution asking each State to send representatives to a new convention which would assemble in Philadelphia in May 1787. This meeting would not be limited to commercial matters, but would address all issues necessary, as they wrote, to "render the Constitution of the Federal Government—the Articles of the Confederation—adequate to the exigencies of the Union." Thus, the foundation for a Constitutional Convention had been set. However, at this time, very few of the Nation's leaders believed that the Articles of the Confederation should be fundamentally changed or rewritten.

But in the fall of 1786, conditions were so bad in parts of America that many citizens resorted to arms in order to solve their problems. In Massachusetts, a revolt was led by a man named Daniel Shays, who had served as captain in the Revolutionary War. Shays was a natural leader. After the war, he had been regarded as a hero, and personally knew George Washington and other national leaders. As conditions in Massachusetts worsened, he led dissatisfied farmers in a rebellion against the Massachusetts government. These farmers where angry over the exorbitant land taxes, the high cost of litigation, and the high salaries of officials. Shays' rebellion was considered a grave threat to the entire Union by leaders in every State, for Captain Shays had a wide appeal among people in each State who had experienced similar frustration. George Washington expressed sentiments common among the Nation's leaders when he said:

> It was only the other day that we were shedding our blood to obtain constitutions under which we now live—constitutions of our own choice and making—and now we are unsheathing the sword to overturn them.

Shays' rebellion lasted from the fall of 1786 until February 2, 1787. Shays and his men were finally defeated by Gen. Benjamin Lincoln, a Revolutionary War hero for whom the town of Lincoln, AL, was named. However, the concept of a revolt greatly concerned Americans everywhere. Many people feared that our glorious young Nation would dissolve into tyranny or anarchy—that they would lose the freedoms and liberties for which so many had bravely fought, shed blood, and died. The main result of Shays' rebellion was to enlist support among people in every State for a stronger, more centralized National Government.

Rather than to stand by idly as the Union disintegrated into an anarchy, a few bold men began to consider the upcoming Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia as a forum in which to rewrite the Articles of the Confederation. It could provide the means by which to give the National Government more power and so meet the needs of a growing nation. Foremost among these farsighted saviors of our freedoms and liberties were, perhaps, James Madison, who is known as "the Father of the Constitution," and Alexander Hamilton.

For many months prior to the meeting of the Constitutional Convention, James Madison, a 36-year-old attorney from Virginia who had also served in the National Congress, busied himself by studying various forms of government that had been instituted during the history of the world. By the spring of 1787, when he was chosen to represent Virginia as a delegate to the Constitutional Convention, he was, by far, the most knowledgeable source on forms of government in the United States. Perhaps he, more than any other, realized the true importance of the convention when he said that its action "would decide forever the fate of republican government." Likewise, Alexander Hamilton had long been an advocate for a Constitutional Convention. In 1786, he had written a proposal for what he termed as "a convention of the States for the purpose of strengthening the Federal Government." When the convention was finally called, delegates naturally looked to him for leadership.

The Constitutional Convention assembled at Independence Hall in Philadelphia, PA, from May 25 through September 17, 1787. Fifty-five delegates, including Madison and Hamilton, represented 12 States. Rhode Island was the only State which sent no delegates. People there believed that the Convention was unlawful, that it would meddle in the affairs of the States, and that the smaller States would lose their representative power. There were other notable figures who were not present. Thomas Jefferson and John Adams were away on other Government duties. Patrick Henry was appointed, but refused to serve because he opposed a strengthened National Government, and Samuel Adams and John Jay were not appointed by their States. Still, as you know, many of the Nation's most prominent, respected leaders were in attendance at the Convention. George Washington was elected President, and Benjamin Franklin served at the age of 81.

When the Convention began, the delegates had been charged with the "sole and express purpose of revising the Articles of Confederation." Later, however, a majority of the delegates decided against simply revising the articles, and on June 19, 1787, voted to replace them with a new Constitution. Yet, though the delegates knew that the Articles of Confederation were an unsuitable and unworkable form of government, they could not immediately agree on a definite replacement. The disagreement among the delegates was so great that Benjamin Franklin proposed that the Convention begin its meetings each day with a prayer. On June 27, 1787, he said that—

> I have lived, Sir, a long time, and the longer I live, the more convincing proofs I see of this truth—that God governs in the affairs of men. And if a sparrow cannot fall to the ground without his notice, is it probable that an empire can rise without his aid?

Franklin's proposal was overwhelmingly adopted.

Finally, two major alternatives to the Articles of the Confederation were offered for consideration. The first plan, the Virginia plan, presented by Edmund Randolph of Virginia, proposed a bicameral legislature—two separate houses—with proportional representation of the States in both chambers. As you can imagine, this plan would have benefited States with large populations. The Virginia plan provided for a president who was chosen by the legislature, a judiciary, and a council comprised of the executive and the judiciary branch which possessed a veto over legislative enactments. Because the president was chosen by the legislative branch, it was feared by some that the president would pledge loyalty to the legislature instead of to the people. Additionally, the smaller States did not support representation based on population. They believed that each State should have an equal vote in all matters. In order to solve many of these problems, William Paterson proposed the New Jersey plan. His plan was a modification of the Articles of Confederation which would have given Congress the power to tax, to regulate foreign and interstate commerce, and which would have established an executive and a supreme court. This plan was favored by the smaller States because it would have provided for equal representation among the States in the national congress.

After long debate, the Connecticut delegates suggested a compromise which settled the problem regarding representation in Congress. Their plan incorporated provisions from both the Virginia plan and the New Jersey plan. Known as the Great Compromise or the Connecticut Compromise," it adopted the bicameral congress as proposed by the Virginia plan, but with provisions of the New Jersey plan. The Congress would be divided between an upper chamber, in which the States would have equal representation, and a lower chamber, in which representa-

tion by the States would be determined by population. Thus, this plan was agreeable to representatives of both large and small States. This agreement dispensed with one obstacle which faced the delegates, but there were many more rivers to cross.

In addition to the bicameral Congress, the delegates eventually agreed to the creation of an executive, and to the formation of a Federal judiciary. In this way, the government was divided into three separate branches. The delegates assigned certain powers to each individual branch of government so that no one entity would possess a disproportionate share of power. No one branch of government would wield total control. Rather, a system of checks and balances was instituted which would ensure responsible government. All money bills would originate in the House of Representatives, but could be amended in the Senate. The Congress would still have the power to declare war, to raise and maintain armies, and to provide and maintain a navy. Proposed legislation would have to be passed by both Houses of Congress, and agreed to by the President. The President would also have the authority to enforce the laws, to negotiate treaties with foreign nations, subject to the approval of the Senate, and would be designated as the Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces. The judiciary would have the authority to settle disputes between States, and between individuals. The agreement reached by the delegates also provide the National Congress with the authority to levy and collect taxes. It would additionally be solely authorized to coin money, and to regulate commerce both with foreign nations and between the individual States. With these new powers, the National Government would be able to address, and solve, many of the problems which faced the nation.

The Constitution that was agreed to by 39 of 55 delegates to the Constitutional Convention was an attempt to establish "a more perfect Union." Indeed, these are the first words of the Constitution they wrote, which begins:

> "We the People of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defence, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.

Though the Constitution had been written, agreed to, and finally signed by a majority of the delegates on September 17, 1787, it had not yet gone into effect, and was by no means law. There were many noteworthy opponents of the strong centralized government for which the Constitution provided. Before it was to become the law of the land, 9 of the 13 States had to agree to its provisions through the ratification process. Thus, an important debate began among the citizens of each State. Both supporters and opponents began to discuss every aspect of the document that had resulted from 9 weeks of consideration in Philadelphia. Few people understood the importance of the Constitution as fully as George Washington, when he warned that:

> Should the States reject this excellent Constitution, the probability is, an opportunity will never again offer to cancel another in peace—the next will be drawn in blood.

Few States were as crucial to the ratification of the Constitution as was the acceptance by New York. In anticipation of the narrow vote which would occur there, Alexander Hamilton and James Madison, the two who had provided such leadership during the Convention itself, were joined by John Jay in drafting a series of essays which argued the need for and necessity of the ratification of the Constitution. Their essays, which are now known as the Federalist Papers were published under the penname of Publius, a derivation of the Latin word which meant the public. These essays attracted attention far beyond the borders of New York and were instrumental in the ratification of the Constitution. Since that time, they have provided guidance and insight into the intentions of the delegates, and the reasons behind many of their actions. The State of New York ratified the new Constitution by a narrow margin of only three votes.

Finally, New Hampshire was the ninth State to ratify the Constitution, putting it into effect on June 21, 1788. It was, in the words of Lord William E. Gladstone, a British statesman who served for 4 terms as Prime Minister of the British Empire:

> The most remarkable work ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man.

Though the Constitution had, indeed, been ratified and was finally in effect, people in every State demanded that certain freedoms and liberties be put in print—not just implied. Thus, 12 amendments were submitted to the people by the First Congress on September 25, 1789. Of these, 10 were ratified and went into effect on December 15, 1791. These 10 amendments to the Constitution comprise the Bill of Rights.

The 10th amendment is of particular importance to the States of the Union. Where the Constitution preempts specific powers to the Federal Government, it merely implies that the States would possess those which had not been reserved. This implication could, conceivably, have been the source of some conflict regarding whether the States actually held these powers. The 10th amendment dispels any question and places in the Constitution the basis for the powers held by the States. It reads that:

> The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.

One thing of which we should all be forever mindful is that the power given to Government by the Constitution originates from the people. Therefore, the ultimate responsibility for the success of our system rests with the people. If the Constitution is to endure, if it is to continue protecting our rights, all citizens should take an active part in the government of our communities, State, and Nation.

Our hold on democracy, on freedom, and on liberty is at times tenuous. Our rights have been threatened many times during our 199-year history. But, remembering the words of President Grover Cleveland at the time of the Constitution's centennial commemoration will help to give the resolve necessary to face future challenges. He said:

> If the American people are true to their sacred trust, another centennial day will come, and millions yet unborn will inquire concerning our stewardship and the safety of their Constitution. God grant they may find it unimpaired.

As we approach the 200th birthday of our Constitution, I want each person to consider what they can do in this year of the bicentennial of our Constitution. I want to give each of you a challenge. Every high school, every church, each mayor and every town council should, themselves, form a council or commission to commemorate and celebrate the bicentennial of our Constitution. In this way, a thorough understanding of the precepts and workings of our charter of liberities and government will be available to all. Each person will serve as an ambassador for the celebration.

After the Constitutional Convention adjourned on September 17, 1787, Benjamin Franklin was approached by a woman on the street as he left Independent Hall. "Well, Doctor," she said, "what have we got—a republic or a monarchy?" "A republic," he answered, "if you can keep it."

On September 17, 1796, 9 years to the day after Dr. Franklin was questioned on the street, George Washington gave his Farewell Address after serving as America's first President. In it, he stated that "the independence and liberty you possess are the work of joint councils and joint efforts, sufferings, and successes." Because you will inherit the stewardship of our republic, you must likewise act in joint efforts. You may also suffer hardships. But I assure you—if, as I know you will, you guard and protect our Constitution, you will be rewarded with successes. And someday, as Benjamin Franklin wished in the year of his death:

God grant, that not only the love of liberty, but a thorough knowledge of the rights of man may prevade all the nations of the earth . . .

SENATORIAL ELECTION CAMPAIGN ACT

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CONRAD). The Senator from Washington.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I rise today in support of S. 2, the campaign reform bill.

Unfortunately, we have spent many weeks during the course of this session working to produce simply a consideration of S. 2, so that we could amend this bill and so that we could proceed forward with a campaign reform measure.

Many of us who were involved in the last campaign can only say to those who will be involved in the next campaign that our strenuous efforts on the passage of S. 2 and campaign reform to bring limits to the enormous expenditures which have occurred in the past are not something that we do in order to simply produce a record of the agony that we suffered in the last campaign, which was building toward a great crescendo, particularly in the months of October and November.

Rather, it is to say to those who will run next time and even more importantly to the American people that this process is rapidly going out of control.

We have reached a point with instant communication, with the ability of people to raise large sums of money, with the willingness of some people to spend large sums of their own money that we are converting the political process, and particularly in races that are involved in statewide elections, into a system that will do no more than convert the Senate of the United States into an institution that is controlled by wealth.

This is not why the Senate of the United States was created. In the debates in the Constitutional Convention leading to the final Grand Compromise in July 1787 we have a clear record that what was to be accomplished was a compromise between States of smaller populations and those of larger populations to create instead of a unicameral legislature such as existed in the Parliament and in the parliamentary governments of various portions of the European continent but instead to create a system that could properly unite our States that were small with those that were large and even more important to provide a system of movement into the western portions of the country where new States would be formed that originally would have small numbers of people but would feel that they were part of the Union and as part of the Union they would know that their rights were protected in the Senate of the United States which goes two by two rather than by population.

If this body had been intended to be one, as was originally envisioned by Alexander Hamilton and others, that would be appointed for life or to be like a House of Lords, that compromise would not have been adopted. It would be a great tragedy at the end of the 20th century if we were to change the condition and the complexity and the basis on which the Senate was founded to one that had been rejected by the original Founding Fathers. The Founding Fathers had a definite purpose in mind and it was not to create a House of Lords.

I think some of us that have just completed campaigns probably feel more strongly about this than those who have not been in a campaign for even as short a period as 2 years ago. The escalation factor of expenditures in the number of outlets necessary is multiplying every day. I can remember a time when it was only necessary in my State, which is a relatively medium-size State, eight congressional districts, we only had to determine really two media markets. Now there are four. And if you begin to consider cable outlets you are close to 10. Each now requires an expenditure of money. That expenditure of money, if it becomes overwhelming in behalf of either candidate in the campaign, can mean that you do not become a credible candidate at all.

What we are talking about in this campaign reform bill is not to prevent people from establishing their measure or establishing what they really are or taking measure of the other in the campaign, what we are trying to say and do is to be certain that people who run for office with a credible purpose are heard and that these people are recognized as being viable candidates. If you are not a viable candidate, no amount of work by volunteers, no amount of effort by individual candidates, no amount of effort by small contributors will offset the fact that you are not known to be a candidate.

I think this last election was a most unusual one. There were a series of people elected to the U.S. Senate that were elected through very sophisticated new campaigns involving the bunching of money, spending it at exactly the right time, and really a series of minor miracles which I can guarantee you, Mr. President, will be corrected for and is being corrected for at this very moment in every campaign shop with money in the entire United States. They will never be caught unaware again. And since they will not be caught unaware, it means that the pressure on those to give money will become more and more every day that goes by.

I am simply hopeful, Mr. President—and I know that the Senator who is the Acting President now shares this belief with me because we were two of that group who had a very unusual experience of being able to challenge and were told that we could not do this because of the relatively small amount of money that we had. But when we look at that relatively small amount of money, the amount of money that I spent, which was called relatively small, was more than had ever been spent in the race for the particular seat that I happened to run for. We spent more money than the candidate had spent for that election in 1980. My opponent spent three times as much.

This is the basic problem that we are trying to correct. It is not just to level the playing field, but it is to make the playing field available. I am very concerned that in the next election and the one that follows, if this escalation continues, the younger candidates will drop out. The candidates who have a message will be overwhelmed. The candidates who have money will coast to victory. And, as we look around this body, the people who will be speaking, the people who will be addressing the issues of the day will all address them from the same perspective. A body that addresses all issues from the same perspective drops out a remarkable number of the American people. We do not want that to happen.

Therefore, I hope we will move to consideration of S. 2. I hope that at least the motion to proceed will be adopted. I think we might state at this point that if it is not, this Senator, and I know a number of others, will be supporting procedural reforms that say that at least on the motion to proceed it should be able to be presented to this body in a minimum period of time. Then if Members wish to amend, filibuster, spend their time, that procedural step is over and the bill itself can form.

It is impossible to correct a bill or to form it or to answer arguments on individual or perhaps technical mistakes within a bill when it is not officially before the body. If it is not here where it can be amended and debate can take place, it cannot be perfected.

So I hope that people will vote for cloture, that we will proceed with this bill and, if not, that they will support reform so that a motion to proceed can be immediately adopted and, thereafter, the Senate can work its will.

Mr. President, I appreciate the time that has been spent by Senator BOREN.

CONGRATULATIONS TO SENATOR STENNIS

I also on this day want to offer my congratulations to Senator STENNIS, who has been a friend for over a quarter of a century. He is a symbol of gal-

lantry in the U.S. Senate. We all wish him very well on his birthday and many happy returns of the days to come.

Mr. President, I simply hope, with his remarks and that of many of the rest of us, that those that are listening will understand that this is not a partisan measure with S. 2. This is not a measure that does anything other than give the American people a chance, and particularly those from the smaller States, to have a fair voice. And that fair voice is important. This country must never divide into States large or small or into regional coalitions, because the whole purpose of the Constitution was to create a union of States, not a division of States.

With that, Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. President, we have been discussing today S. 2, the measure to reform the campaign finance laws. As has been made clear, there are several of us who have joined in presenting S. 2 initially, including the distinguished majority leader and myself and almost 50 Members of the Senate.

We have been endeavoring to find a way to move this legislation forward; to move it forward because we sincerely believe that it deals with one of the most pressing items on the national agenda and that item is: What do we do to contain the ever escalating cost of campaigns?

Just 9 years ago when I first ran for the U.S. Senate, the average cost of winning a U.S. Senate seat, the average amount spent by a winning candidate was $600,000. I thought that was an alarming amount of money to spend in a State the size of my State, for example, approximately 3 million people 9 years ago; $600,000.

And since that time, we have seen the cost of campaigns go up and up and up, skyrocketing virtually out of sight. In some States, we have seen campaign spending for the U.S. Senate elections—not a Presidential election, but U.S. Senate elections—go as high as $25 million. And even in the average-size State, just the average-size State, a State about the size of my State of Oklahoma, the average winning candidate in the last election cycle spent not $600,000, not $1.2 million, not $2.4 million, but $3 million in getting elected to the U.S. Senate.

Mr. President, where is this all going to end? As I have recounted to my colleagues on the floor previously, I was speaking to a group of students recently just as I was speaking to a group over at the Dirksen Building, a group of interns, college students who are serving here and working here in congressional offices this summer. Just this afternoon, I was talking to them. I was talking to them about this problem. Many of them expressed great concern about what is going to happen to the political process in this country; what is going to happen to the idea that every young person who dreams of performing public service will have an opportunity to enter into that profession, will have an opportunity someday, if he or she is willing to work hard, has good ideas, good character, and is well qualified, to have a chance to run for office and to serve in the U.S. Senate or the House of Representatives someday. What is going to happen to that dream if we allow the cost of the campaign to continue to escalate?

I was talking to a group of high school seniors and asked them if they would like to serve someday in the Senate. A lot of hands went up, that they were interested in that. Then I said, thinking 12 years ahead and in no way exaggerating, but just looking at the rate of increase in campaign costs over the past 12 years, going from somewhere around $.5 million up to $3 million, and I just project that same rate of increase with no exaggeration at all, no change, just the rate of increase in the last 12 years, projecting forward 12 years, the figure was $15 million that came out as the estimate of what it will cost to run for the Senate 12 years from now when those high school seniors will be qualified by age to seek service in the Senate.

I asked these students, "Those of you who are thinking about running for the Senate, have you started thinking about how you are going to come up with the $15 million it is going to take when you are old enough to run to try to serve in this body?"

I will never forget the expressions on their faces, the expressions of feeling let down. "What has happened to our system? What is happening to our country? What is happening to those of us who might have a dream of public service in the future?"

Mr. President, we cannot let that happen. Look at how it has already distorted what is going on in this institution, how the massive amount of money that is required to run for office is already distorting the institutions of Government including the U.S. Government, of which we are all a part.

Just at the current time, with the $3 million figure, stop and think about it. That means that if you are going to raise $3 million to be ready to run for reelection, and if you just got elected this year, you have 6 years to get ready to raise that $3 million that it is going to take. You have to raise that figure a little bit because of the current rate of increase means that 6 years from now it will be more like $6 million than $3 million.

Let us assume that it stays the same. That will mean you have to raise $10,000 every single week of your entire 6-year term to raise the $3 million necessary to run for reelection to the Senate, $10,000 each and every week.

Mr. President, with all of the problems we have in this country, problems with our trade imbalance, problems of millions of American jobs lost because we are no longer competitive in the world market, problems, challenges to the United States and our national interests and a highly volatile situation in the Persian Gulf, for example, as we meet today, problems in our own hemisphere, what to do about the growing influence of those hostile to the United States and our system of government in Central America, not halfway around the world but in our own back yard, how do we form a bipartisan consensus about this? Problem after problem. What do we do about the arms negotiations? Are there opportunities presenting themselves of which we should be taking advantage? Problems that our constituents elected us to solve. Great issues of the day that we should be thoughtfully considering. And in the midst of all that, those of us who are elected to the Senate, who should be spending our time solving the problems that our citizens sent us here to solve, must reflect on how we will raise $10,000 this week, $10,000 next week, $10,000 the week after that, and $10,000 the week after that, so that at the end of 6 years, we will raise the $3 million now required in just the average-size State to run for election in the Senate.

People did not send us here to be full-time, year-round fundraisers. They sent us here to concentrate our abilities and interests on solving those problems that are facing our country. Something must be done about it, Mr. President.

That is one of the reasons why those of us who introduced this legislation felt compelled to do something. That is why we feel so strongly that something has to be done. That is one of the reasons. Spending is out of control. It is taking the time and effort and energies that should be going into solving the Nation's problems. It is creating also the appearance of undue influence by money in the political process.

We must not allow the people of this country to believe that the highest positions in the public trust in our country are for sale on the auction blocks

to those who can raise the most money to run an election.

I am convinced that is one of the reasons why the United States now has the second lowest percentage of voting of any country in the Western World. Think about that. What a record it is. It is not a record of which we can be proud.

I heard our colleague Jennings Randolph not too long ago. He retired as a Member of this body after many years of distinguished service dating all the way back to the first 100 days of Franklin Roosevelt's administration. For 30 years, Senator Randolph, starting back in 1940, introduced the amendment to the Constitution to allow 18-year-olds to have the right to vote, 30 years of effort to introduce it and reintroduce it every 2 years before it was ratified and enacted.

He was talking just this last week to a group of interns about his disappointment in the small percentage of those who had been given the right to vote having actually taking up the right. Imagine, there is only one other country among all the Western democracies that votes at a lower percentage than the United States.

Here we are with the greatest opportunity to influence what goes on in our world, the most powerful Nation on Earth, the freest Nation, and we take for granted the reason that we do not exercise our right to vote. I am convinced that part of that disillusionment keeping people away from the ballot box is their feeling that, back at the grassroots, one lone citizen cannot make a difference, that it is money, massive amounts of money, raised increasingly from special interest groups that will determine the outcome of elections anyway so why go to the polls to vote.

We cannot afford that kind of disillusion with our political system. We have to do something about it. We have to restore some balance. It is not only the amounts of money being spent but where the money is coming from that is alarming. More and more and more of that money is coming not from the people back home, not from individual contributors back at the grassroots in that Senator's home State or that Congressman's home State, but by organized special interest groups, largely run by lobbyists here in Washington, DC.

I say that not in derogation. Every group has a right to be represented by Washington representatives. Many of them are of great integrity and honesty and are here to explain the people they represent. But the money is being controlled by people here, not the people back home. Forty percent of all Members of Congress elected last time received over half of their contributions from outside of their home States instead of from people back home. The percentage of total campaign spending coming from the small contributor of $100 or less in the home State or district has shrunk in half over the last 10 years and the amount coming from special interest groups has skyrocketed.

In 10 years we have gone from $12 million to well over $100 million in political action committees and the amount keeps going up and up and up.

What happens to the concept of grass roots democracy?

As one leader said not too long ago representing one of these special interest groups, he said, "I was talking to a Member of Congress the other day and he said that he got 80 percent of his money not from the people back home but from the people here in Washington. You can have fundraisers here in Washington raising several thousand dollars in one night."

He quoted the representative as saying, "Isn't it a wonderful thing that you can raise all you money right here in Washington?"

"I used to be so embarrassed; I had to go back home to people I knew, people who were voters in my own district and I had to ask them to give me a campaign contribution." He said, "Isn't it wonderful that all that has changed; now we can raise all the money here in Washington, DC and we don't have to bother the people back home by asking them to support our campaigns anymore." He said, "What do you think about that, Senator?" I said, "Well, I am grateful that the Constitution at least requires that we have to trouble the people back home to vote in the elections or we could just solve the whole thing and let the people here in Washington, DC run it all, raise the money and have the election both."

We at least leave a little place for the people back home at the grassroots.

But something has to be done about it, in all seriousness. It is out of balance. What about this money coming from the special interest groups, the political action committees, be they of business, be they of labor, be they of single issue groups? Where do they invest their money? That is the term they usually use, investing their money in the political process. Do they give it equally to challengers and incumbents alike? No, they do not. You will find that about 82 percent of all that money is going to incumbents. They do not care if they are Democrats; they do not care if they are Republicans. They are incumbents. They are there. They are chairmen or ranking members of those crucial committees and subcommittees where they need the doors opened to have their story told. People are just human. I do not think any Members of this body would be subject to being directly influenced by campaign contributions.

But what happens if there is only 30 minutes left or 1 hour left or 5 hours of time before a crucial decision can be made in a committee and someone knocks on the door and wants to see that Member, somebody who represents a group that has given $10,000, and someone else is knocking on the door, a constituent from back home, who has never been able to give but $5? What happens? Who gets the access? These groups end up giving 80 percent of the money to incumbents because they are there, they need to deal with those subcommittees. They are going to be there for the 2 years or 4 years or 6 years left in their term. They do not know if that challenger is going to win or not. And then what happens? Suppose they bet on the incumbent because they want the access. What happens if that incumbent loses to the challenger? Most of these groups are pretty fast afoot. You will find group after group, all of a sudden they give to the challenger who has won to help pay off his deficit. And we have scores of them. Millions of dollars are given to both sides. If they happen to give to the incumbent and the incumbent got upset, they quickly get on board with the challenger now that he is here and has office doors that need to be opened.

So there needs to be a balance struck. We need to allow the people at the grass roots to have more input, and that is why S. 2, and the substitute for S. 2 as now pending, provides that to qualify under our system as it is being set up, you qualify for certain benefits if you accept voluntary spending limits. You also have to raise a certain amount of your campaign contributions from small, grassroots contributions of $100 or more back in the home State or the home district, so that we make sure that we keep alive that concept of grassroots democracy and keep some balance to the process.

So, Mr. President, there are reasons for our concerns, deep concerns. There is justification for very strong concern about what is going on.

We cannot allow the cost of running for the United States Senate to run all the way up to $15 million in an average size State. It is a disgrace we have allowed the situation to develop where a Member of the Senate has to spend every week raising an average of $10,000 every, single week without exception for 6 years in order to have a chance to be reelected.

That is a disgrace. It is a disgrace. We should not allow a system to continue where more and more of the money is coming from special interest groups that are giving out that money not on the basis of the total record of a Senator, not on the basis of his or her record for honesty and integrity or the stands on issues but on a little narrow range of issues, not the whole

voting record, the three or four votes that are of interest to that interest group that year on which they rate us. They say, "Well, we will give the $10,000 only to those who are at least 75 percent with us on those three or four votes.

It is fragmenting us at a time we need to be coming together as Americans to deal with these serious problems, trying to determine what is best for the people of this country. Campaigns are being more and more financed by special interests at a time all of us need to be challenged to look at what is right for all of this country in the years ahead. We cannot ignore it. We must do something about it.

And so we introduced S. 2, and S. 2 said if you accept the voluntary spending limit—the Supreme Court has said we can no longer apply a mandatory limit. The Supreme Court decision of Buckley versus Valeo said you can no longer put a direct limit on how much candidates can spend. What is the only way you can do it? It has to be a voluntary limit, the Supreme Court said. How are you going to get candidates to accept the voluntary limit? You have to give them incentive, a package of benefits to encourage them to accept it.

As was said in some movie, you have to think of some kind of offer they simply cannot refuse to entice them into a situation where they will voluntarily accept these limits. So when we introduced S. 2 we said if you will accept the voluntary limit when you file, to get our campaign spending within some kind of reasonable level, you will then be eligible to get a certain amount of money from the voluntary—and you will raise it only 20 percent from PAC's, the rest from individuals, and you will raise a certain threshold amount from inside your home State from small contributors, then you will qualify for public funds from a voluntary checkoff pool, checked by people on their income tax return. That is the incentive to get you to accept the voluntary spending limits.

There were those on the other side of the aisle—and I understand why they said what they said because I myself have had a lot of misgivings about public financing—who said, "We cannot support that because you have taxpayer's dollars in there. You have public financing in that. We do not want public financing." I understand that.

That is why we are joining together, Senator EXON from Nebraska, who himself had those strong misgivings about public financing, who said he could not support a bill with public financing, Senator BYRD, myself, and others, to offer a substitute. No longer do we automatically give those candidates who accept the voluntary limits public funds.

Here is the way S. 2 would now work as we envision it under the new compromise proposal which was offered. Fifty-three Members of the Senate indicated we want to shut off debate; we want to vote on this bill; we want to have campaign reform. There was a filibuster and we were blocked, the majority was blocked from acting upon its desire to have true campaign reform. Those who conducted the filibuster said, "The reason we cannot accept this bill is that there are public funds in it." And so in the spirit of compromise, we said we will come forward and change this bill.

Let me say this is a sincere effort. If those who oppose where we are now have difficulty with this particular formulation, I hope they will come to us, talk to us, see if we can have a meeting of the minds because we must not take this item off the national agenda until we have dealt with it. We owe it to those who elect us. When we took an oath to uphold the Constitution, surely we undertook a responsibility to protect the integrity of the election process. That is a responsibility that we must not shirk.

This particular issue is not going to ge away. I can promise my colleagues it is not going to go away, as far as this Senator is concerned, until we deal with it. It does not have to be 100 percent a bill that this Senator would write if he could write the bill for all of the Senators. Of course not. We have to take into account the desires of the other Members of the Senate. But we must have meaningful campaign reform.

I can promise my colleagues if we do not do it now, if we do not do it next month, this Senator is going to be back. And I have heard the majority leader say the same thing. We are going to bring this bill back; we are going to bring this proposal back; we are going to bring back true finance reform again and again and year after year after year until we finally do something about it.

I have no doubt that we will do something about it. This is an issue that is not going to go away. Those who think they can just hide their heads in the sand and it will all go away and we will not have to worry about it anymore are wrong.

The problem is not going to go away. As long as the problem is there, those who want to do something about it are not going to go away. We are not going to go away until something is done about it.

The people back home are going to have an opportunity to judge the Members of the Senate on whether or not they want a system of elections that allows people to complete on the basis of ideas and ideals and hopes and plans for this country and qualifications, or whether or not those people for whom they are being asked to vote want to have competition based upon who can buy elections and raise the most special interest money and obligate themselves. It is always necessary to think about obligations you are making when you have to face the task of raising $10,000 every single week you serve in public office.

It is not going to go away, Mr. President. The people are going to ultimately insist on something being done. The only question is, will we have to wait until a major scandal takes place that shakes this country to its roots before something is done, or are we going to take action before that happens, to restore trust and confidence?

So we have come with a new proposal. The new proposal says, for example—say, a State has a $1 million voluntary spending limit. I file for office and accept a $1 million spending limit and say I will live by that. What do I get in turn to encourage me to do that? I get lower mailing rates.

You say, "Is that going to cost the taxpayers money?" No. Right now, all political parties, even the Communist Party and fringe parties, automatically get the bulk mailing rate. We are going to take it away from them. It will raise more money than it will require to finance this bill.

We are going to give that mailing rate only to those candidates who accept the spending limits. It will probably be a saving to the taxpayers and an incentive to the candidate who accepts it.

Second, candidates who do not accept spending limits will have a disclosure on their ads, like "The Surgeon General warns that smoking is hazardous to your health." It will be on television, radio, and direct mail: "This candidate does not accept voluntary spending limits."

So the people who are asked to vote for him or her will make the playing field fair. If Members of this body do not think the people care to have fair ground rules, do not think the people care about the massive cost of running for office in this country, fine. Let them have the courage of having that stamped on every ad and every letter. I will live by that. People make their judgments. All we are asking is that the people be informed about the candidates' view on spending.

So those are two of the incentives.

Right now, also, broadcasters have to give the lowest rate on television and radio advertising to all political candidates. We provide that they only give it to candidates in the future who accept voluntary spending limits.

Then we provide that if I have to raise $1 million, which is the spending limit, I have to raise all that privately. I have to raise it not from the Government, as in the original bill, but I have to raise it privately. I have to raise a threshold amount from small contrib-

utors in my home State, cannot take more than 20 percent from PAC's, mainly individual contributors in my home State.

Then, as a standby enforcement mechanism, when public funds do come into play—in an unlikely case—No. 1, if I raise my $1 million and stay by the spending limit but my opponent decides to go over the spending limit, then, as an enforcement tool, I can draw money up to an additional $1 million from that fund, to offset the spending by my opponent.

I do not think it will happen. If you know your opponent is going to break the barrier, will you do so? I do not think it will happen. But it stands there like a guillotine, to sweep down as a punishment if someone wants to try to buy an election.

The other time it might come into play is if you are attacked by a so-called indpendent group and they start running ads against you on television, that group will be on notice that the candidate who has been attacked may draw money from the voluntary checkoff on tax returns. I do not think money will be spent there, either, because why would a group make an attack on a candidate if they knew that he, in essence, would get free time to respond to that attack?

It is necessary to have a device like that. In the original bill that we had 2 years ago, the Boren-Goldwater bill, we had a provision that said the TV station had to give equal time if someone was attacked. The broadcasters said: "We don't think it's fair for us to be the total enforcement mechanism, the judge of all this, the financier of all this." That was taken out of the bill by a vote of the Senate. But we have to put something in its place to discourage the flow of money. There has to be something to keep that from happening.

So we offer S. 2 sincerely in the spirit of compromise. I think my colleagues know that if I were ranked on my record for being partisan, I would probably be at the bottom of the list. On occasion after occasion, I have not hesitated to cross party lines to do what I thought was right. While I am proud of my party affiliation, my first responsibility is to be a good Senator for this country and to be an American first.

Sam Rayburn often said he thought that if you were going to be a good Democrat, you had to be a good American first, and I cannot think of a better definition that came from one whose party loyalty was never in question.

In this situation, all those on both sides of the aisle are called upon to be good Americans first. We cannot afford to let this break down along party lines. We cannot allow party concerns to prevent us from effecting meaningful campaign reform.

This Senator has no interest in proposing a bill simply to help one party or the other. If this Senator were wise enough to write a bill that he would be sure would be absolutely neutral, that is what I would do. That is my goal. I am not for campaign reform to help one party, even my party. I am for campaign reform to preserve the integrity of the election process.

We have now presented a bill that does not have public funds in it, but it does have spending limits, voluntary spending limits, so that we can get spending under control. It is time for that.

I send this message to my friends on the other side of the aisle and those in both parties who have hesitated about supporting campaign reform in the past: We are ready to do something good for our country. Join us.

If, for some reason, you do not think this new proposal, which we offer in the spirit of compromise, is all it should be, if you think it can be improved, offer your suggestions to us; tell us what our own improvements would be. But join us, for the sake of the country and for the sake of the integrity of the election process, in an effort to do something that will help our country. Join us in an effort to do something so that the young people I have talked to, who want to perform public service, can attain the hope and dream of being a part of this political process directly some day, so that they can keep alive their hopes and dreams of coming here and helping our country in this arena, in which policy is worked out. Do not foreclose that opportunity, and do not deprive the people back home, at the grassroots, of the sense that they, themselves, can make a difference in their own political process.

When the people begin to believe that they cannot make a difference—when they lose heart—the vitality of this entire political system and the vitality of this country we love so much will be sapped. We must not allow that to happen.

I urge my colleagues to reflect upon the compromise which will soon be officially offered to the Senate for S. 2. I urge them to put aside party considerations and to join us in taking this reasonable and balanced step toward meaningful campaign financing reform

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SHELBY). Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I am ready to call up the nomination of Mr. Greenspan to be a member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. The distinguished Republican leader has control of half the time on the other side of this nomination.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, with the Republican leader's approval, I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session to consider the nomination of Mr. Alan Greenspan, and that the time under the control of the Republican leader be transferred to the control of the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. BOND].

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nomination will be stated.

FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Alan Greenspan, of New York, to be a member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the majority leader yield me time on this nomination?

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin has control of 15 minutes of the time.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I yield such time as I may require and I will be as brief as I can.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Greenspan nomination as Chairman of the Fed is difficult for this Senator.

First. There is nothing in the Greenspan experience either in his long record of service to money center banks, or his role as an advocate for the Nation's largest and most powerful corporations, or his service as Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers in the Ford administration that shows independence. Mr. Greenspan, through no fault of his own, follows three towering and proudly independent Federal Reserve Board Chairmen: William McChesney Martin, Arthur Burns, and Paul Volcker. The willingness to oppose and, if necessary, fight the unwise policies of those who hire him has never been demonstrated by Mr. Greenspan in any capacity. With his accession can the Fed kiss its prized independence goodbye?

Second. At a time when the country, including financial institutions, are moving toward widespread mergers

and increased concentration, Dr. Greenspan testified last week that he doesn't even support the Sherman Antitrust Act of 1890, that has been for nearly 100 years the country's basic antitrust statute. This is specially pertinent. Here's why: The Federal Reserve is the agency that more than any other can deny or approve bank mergers. With the accession of Alan Greenspan as the country's preeminent bank regulator and the ruling force that will permit or deny bank mergers, the country may be poised on the verge of a transformation of the American financial economy into its greatest concentration since the turn of the century.

Third. Most significant of all, Mr. Greenspan supports the abandonment of this country's long-term policy of separating banking and commerce. He does, indeed, favor the requirement of a so-called Chinese wall designed to keep the two apart. This Greenspan position puts him into direct opposition on this critical issue with retiring Chairman Paul Volcker. Chairman Volcker told our banking committee just last week that he vigorously opposes the merging of commercial firms with banks. Mr. Volcker contended that the Chinese wall does not and cannot effectively insulate a bank from the firm that owns it. Volcker contended there would be no reason for a commercial firm to acquire a bank if the commercial firm were fully and effectively separated from using it or managing it.

And there are four strong points to be made in Alan Greenspan's favor. First, he brings to the Federal Reserve Chairmanship a clear commitment to follow monetary policies that will counteract inflation. The Federal Reserve Board has been our country's main bulwark against inflation. Of all the prospective Chairmen the Reagan administration might have been realistically expected to appoint—except for Chairman Volcker—Greenspan promises to be the most willing to pursue anti-inflationary policies.

Second, the President has at least one vacancy to fill on the Fed Board. For several years it has been clear that this President has not followed the past practice of previous Presidents of consulting the Fed Chairman and relying heavily on his advice in appointing other members of the Board. It is likely in view of the trust of the President and his economic advisers in Mr. Greenspan they will once again rely significantly on the Chairman in appointing other members. This will make the Board more cohesive and more likely to follow Greenspan anti-inflation policies.

Third, if Dr. Greenspan were denied approval it is unlikely that the administration would appoint a better qualified Chairman.

Fourth, Mr. Greenspan has excellent personal qualities. He is intelligent. He is respected by the business community that knows him and his work. He is an extraordinarily civil and decent man.

So with misgivings, with reluctance, this Senator will vote on balance for the confirmation of Alan Greenspan as Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board.

Mr. President, because this is of such absolutely vital importance—the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board had been called the second most powerful man in America—I ask for the yeas and nays on this nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. President, I am pleased to rise in support of such a distinguished nominee as Alan Greenspan to be a member of the Board and Chairman of the Federal Reserve. I have known and admired Alan Greenspan since his days with the Ford Administration and have every reason to believe that he will be a fine Federal Reserve Chairman.

During Mr. Greenspan's confirmation hearing before the Banking Committee there was quite a bit of discussion about why anyone would want to take the job of Fed Chairman at this time. We talked about the enormous responsibility that Alan Greenspan has agreed to undertake. He will have to contend with an irresponsible fiscal policy that we foisted upon the country, trade deficits, budget deficits, lingering recession in some parts of our economy, the Third World debt crisis, record numbers of bank failures, an outdated legal structure for our financial system. In addition, the Federal Reserve will probably continue to serve as a convenient scapegoat for all sorts of groups seeking easy answers or trying to avoid responsibility. Yet, Alan Greenspan answered the questions that the Banking Committee put to him in a clear and forthright manner. He demonstrated the qualities that we would like to see in a Federal Reserve Board Chairman: A sound grasp of economics, a willingness to take political heat from both Congress and the White House, the ability to make hard choices on very complex problems.

The Congress has certainly not made the Fed Chairman's job any easier, and we have not been able to deal with the fiscal problems which contribute to the deficit.

As for Mr. Greenspan's independence, as our distinguished committee chairman has pointed out, Mr. Greenspan has raised questions about the economic consequences of laws that this Congress has adopted in the past in antitrust and in financial institution regulations.

I admire his independence. I hope that he will continue to question the economic impact of laws that we are considering because sometimes the laws that we pass do not conform to the laws of economics.

There is, however, no question in my mind that he will follow the law, though he may question the economic soundness of particular provisions. Furthermore, and finally, I am confident that Alan Greenspan is up to the heavy responsibility that faces the Chairman and that he will measure up to the very high standards of his predecessor. I applaud his willingness to tackle these issues, although I might question his good judgment in being willing to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am happy to yield the time he may require to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. I certainly thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I am planning to vote in favor of the pending matter about the new officer in this role.

I want to say a word of appreciation for the services of the retiring Chairman, Paul Volcker. I did not know Mr. Volcker before he came here. I had very little association with him during the tenure he served here. So there is nothing personal one way or the other about this.

But I certainly admired him as an official in his poise, his deliberateness, his high sense of obligation to his duty and to his very fine knowledge and understanding, as it seemed to me, about his mission and about the economy and what should be done or what we should try to do about it.

It is a little out of my calling, but I called him up once and told him I would like to have breakfast with him, and he invited me to come over. I did not want to take his time, otherwise, I was very much impressed with the things that he said. All of those bad years we went through, with the high interest rates and other things, it was not any individual's fault, particularly, but he gave us an understanding of it. I am glad to be able to commend him highly and thank him, too.

I yield the floor. I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, I rise to support enthusiastically Dr. Alan Greenspan as a nominee to the position of chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. We are truly fortunate to have a man of Dr. Greenspan's stature to succeed Paul Volcker. Because Dr. Greenspan

is no stranger to many of my colleagues, I will refrain from reciting the entire litany of his professional and academic accomplishments—all of which are achievements that recommend him to the position for which he is under consideration. Most important of all, however, is that he is a native New Yorker.

A review of Dr. Greenspan's biographical sketch reveals that he is a very busy man. In addition to his position as chairman and president of Townsend-Greenspan, he currently is a member of the President's Economic Policy Advisory Board, Time magazine's board of economists, senior advisor to the Brookings Institute, and a consultant to the Budget Office. He currently sits on the boards of 7 major corporations and is a member of numerous other councils, commissions and noncorporate boards.

Considering that he will have to sever many of these associations, it appears that Alan may be viewing the position as Fed chairman as a way to reduce his tremendous workload. At his confirmation hearing I assured Dr. Greenspan that if anything his workload would increase. As America's central banker he will be the ringmaster of the three-ring economic circus which is confronting the American and world economies. In one ring we have an increasingly weak dollar that threatens to push the inflation rate out of control if not properly monitored. In the center ring we watch both U.S. and foreign economies growing at a slow rate that could easily slip into a global recession that could even more easily occur should interest rates climb too high. And in the third ring we watch the spectre of the entire world financial system walking the unstable high wire of nonperforming Third World loans.

In short, his job will not be an easy task—since, to a large extent we are entrusting him with the fate of the dollar, the course of U.S. interest rates and quite possibly the prosperity of the world economy. Of all the distinguished bankers and economists who could have been considered, I believe that he is the best successor to the Fed chairmanship that the President could have chosen. Further, I would suggest to those who feel his nomination will turn the Fed into an arm of the administration that they do not know him very well. The Alan Greenspan that I know is not one who avoids the tough policy decisions for the sake of political expedience.

I am confident that his tenure as chairman will be most successful. I say this not only because he is a friend but because his academic and professional training has prepared him for this position. Therefore, I urge my colleagues in the Senate to swiftly confirm Dr. Greenspan, so he can get to work on the difficult tasks that we all know need to be done.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, this vote to confirm Dr. Alan Greenspan as chairman of the Federal Reserve Board has tremendous significance. Few people in Government have as much influence over the conduct and course of economic policy as the chairman of the Federal Reserve. And this position is particularly important now, amid growing concerns about the stability of our economy and the crucial role that monetary policy will play.

The challenges facing the Federal Reserve at present are enormous, Mr. President. This country's budget and trade deficits are at staggering, unprecedented levels. Our dependence on foreign capital to finance these deficits has produced massive accumulations of foreign debt, transforming the U.S. from the largest international creditor to the world's largest debtor. And of utmost importance to an agricultural State like mine, real interest rates have remained extraordinarily high. Recent rises in interest rates have understandably sent shock waves through interest-sensitive sectors, raising fears that the economy's growth could subside and that unfavorable exchange rates could return.

By his actions affecting interest rates and the availability of credit, the chairman of the Federal Reserve will have a profound effect on the stability of our economy over the next 4 years. But the Fed will also face considerable cross-pressures during this period. It will be urged to pursue expansionary policies to assure that the fiscal restraint required to reduce the budget deficit does not produce a slowdown of the economy. Meanwhile, concerns about any resumption of domestic inflation as well as international considerations could make the Fed reluctant to lower interest rates and allow further declines in the value of the dollar.

I am very concerned about how the next Fed chairman will view these choices. High real interest rates and an overvalued dollar are literally life-or-death issues for my area of the country. Agriculture export markets were savaged by the extreme appreciation of the dollar from 1980 to 1985. Exchange rates have clearly improved since then, but the dollar is still overvalued—especially in relation to the currencies of most of our leading agricultural competitors. If anxiety about inflationary pressures, which strikes me as misplaced at present, precludes any serious consideration by the Fed of the need to lower interest rates and let the dollar fall, the chances of strengthening growth and revitalizing sectors like agriculture are poor.

The condition of American agriculture remains extremely vulnerable. In spite of signs that the farm recession may be abating, net farm income—in real dollars—is predicted to decline in 1987. In fact, net farm income in real dollars has been lower in the 1980's than at any time since the beginning of the Great Depression. The farm recession has caused considerable difficulty for rural financial institutions—and driven many small bussinesses into bankruptcy as well.

Mr. President, I recognize that Dr. Greenspan's economic qualifications are impressive, and that he has a distinguished record of past public service. But I am deeply troubled by what I judge to be major downside risks to the stability of our domestic economy in the next several years. Dr. Greenspan genuinely inherits an economic mess—the legacy of the Reagan administration's disastrously misguided policies. Without assurance that he use his influence to chart a substantially different course, I cannot support his nomination.

Mr. KARNES. Mr. President, I rise to urge my colleagues to support the nomination of Alan Greenspan for the chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. As a member of the Senate Banking Committee, I have participated in the process of reviewing Dr. Greenspan's qualifications and have seen his ability to respond in a very thoughtful and responsible manner to the many questions that the committee asked.

Observers of the Federal Reserve and its outgoing chairman regard Mr. Volcker as a man whose political and economic intuition and skill have made him the best chairman in the Fed's 74-year history. Mr. Volcker's successor, Alan Greenspan, whose political and analytical skills are formidable, is probably the best choice that could have been made to carry on the critical role of the Federal Reserve in this Nation's fight against inflation and improving economic prosperity for all Americans.

As Dr. Greenspan has said himself, Mr. Volcker will be remembered for the economic and social pain that reducing the rampant inflation required. Home builders flooded the Fed with postcards mailed to protest the harsh impact on the housing market of the highest interest rates the country had seen since the Civil War era. Farmers, anxious to buy land to take advantage of soaring land and commodity prices, complained. Businessmen went into shock when the prime lending rate at commercial banks, to which the cost of their loans were tied, reached 21.5 percent at the beginning of 1981. Now he is being credited in large part for the dramatic decline in inflation that we have had. Dr. Greenspan has publicly stated he would have made the same decision. He further stated that the long-term costs of allowing the inflation to continue would have been

far greater than the short-term costs we paid.

Mr. President, I have had the opportunity to sit down and chat with Dr. Greenspan at length in my office. We spoke of monetary policy and its effect on important industries such as agriculture, the heart of economic activity in the Midwest. I feel confident from our discussions that Dr. Greenspan will pursue policies of low inflation and steady economic growth that will benefit agriculture as well as the rest of the economy. Mr. President, I submit that Dr. Greenspan can make the difficult decisions that come before the Federal Reserve and will continue the assault against inflation that Mr. Volcker has so successfully begun.

Dr. Greenspan must prove to the financial markets that he is a worthy replacement for the outgoing Fed chairman. He will also face political pressures by those who think that he should be more accommodating during next year's Presidential campaign. In the Ford administration, Dr. Greenspan strongly supported the Fed's tight credit policies despite the deep recession those policies helped engender in 1974 and 1975. Dr. Greenspan has been an outspoken backer of Mr. Volcker, often echoing the Fed chief's warnings about the dangers of a precipitous decline in the dollar. Dr. Greenspan stated recently:

> Under Paul's chairmanship, inflation has been effectively subdued. It will be up to those of us who follow him to be certain that those very hard-won gains are not lost. Assuring that will be one of my primary goals.

In a striking endorsement of Mr. Volcker's policies, Dr. Greenspan added: "There are very few people in this profession who are more impressive than he and who seem to do the right thing at the right time almost every time." Mr. Volcker has stated himself that he was "very happy" that Dr. Greenspan was going to take over the Board of Governors. Dr. Greenspan will be able to draw authority from his popularity in financial markets which is considerable. Dr. Greenspan is a man of considerable knowledge and experience and will do an excellent job in one of the most important positions in this country. Mr. President, I wholeheartedly endorse the nomination of Dr. Greenspan and look forward to the benefit of his economic knowledge and expert counsel as we proceed to address the economic issues before us.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I yield back the balance of the time on this side.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, there will be no further rollcall votes today after this rollcall vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been yielded back. The question is on the confirmation of the nomination. The yeas and nays have been ordered and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CRANSTON. I announce that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BIDEN], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. PRYOR], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SIMON] are necessarily absent.

Mr. SIMPSON. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. GARN], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. HEINZ], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL], and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. STAFFORD] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. HEINZ] would vote "yea."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 91, nays 2, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 225 Ex.]

YEAS—91

Adams	Gore	Murkowski
Armstrong	Graham	Nickles
Baucus	Gramm	Nunn
Bentsen	Grassley	Packwood
Bingaman	Harkin	Pell
Bond	Hatch	Pressler
Boren	Hatfield	Proxmire
Boschwitz	Hecht	Quayle
Breaux	Heflin	Reid
Bumpers	Helms	Riegle
Burdick	Hollings	Rockefeller
Byrd	Humphrey	Roth
Chafee	Inouye	Rudman
Chiles	Johnston	Sanford
Cochran	Karnes	Sarbanes
Cohen	Kassebaum	Sasser
Cranston	Kasten	Shelby
D'Amato	Kennedy	Simpson
Danforth	Kerry	Specter
Daschle	Lautenberg	Stennis
DeConcini	Leahy	Stevens
Dixon	Levin	Symms
Dodd	Lugar	Thurmond
Dole	Matsunaga	Trible
Domenici	McCain	Wallop
Durenberger	McClure	Warner
Evans	Melcher	Weicker
Exon	Metzenbaum	Wilson
Ford	Mikulski	Wirth
Fowler	Mitchell	
Glenn	Moynihan	

NAYS—2

Bradley	Conrad

NOT VOTING—7

Biden	McConnell	Stafford
Garn	Pryor	
Heinz	Simon	

So the nomination was confirmed.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the nomination was confirmed.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nominee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, if nobody else wishes to speak while the Senate is in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate return to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. THURMOND addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. President, parliamentary inquiry. What is the present parliamentary situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is back on S. 2.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed as if in morning business for a period not to exceed 3 minutes.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold briefly until I can get some consent business done?

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I will yield to the majority leader.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the following consent agreement I believe has been advanced to the point now that I might be able to present it.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate considers the conference report on H.R. 27, the Federal savings and loan recapitalization bill, there be a time limitation of 2 hours thereon, to be equally divided between Senator PROXMIRE and Senator GARN; provided further that no motion to commit the conference report be in order, either with instructions or without instructions; and provided further that at the conclusion of yielding back of the time, the Senate proceed to vote on the conference report.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, we have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the distinguished Senator from South Carolina.

MEASURE PLACED ON CALENDAR

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when H.R. 2893, a bill to reauthorize the Fishermen's Protective Act is received in the Senate, it be placed directly on the calendar.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, we have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXTENSION OF CERTAIN PROTECTIONS UNDER THE BANKRUPTCY CODE

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I would inquire of the distinguished acting Republican leader, the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], if Calendar Order No. 280 has been cleared on his side of the aisle.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, it has been cleared.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I thank the acting leader.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar Order No. 280.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the bill.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1577) to extend certain protections under Title 11 of the United States Code, the Bankruptcy Code.

The bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed; as follows:

S. 1577

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Public Law 100-41 is amended by striking out "September 15, 1987" and inserting in lieu thereof "October 15, 1987".

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill passed.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I move to lay the motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND]. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Hawaii [Mr. MATSUNAGA] for his courtesy in yielding.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

"HAUOLI LA HANAU," JOHN STENNIS

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. President, the majority leader has noted the birthday today of our most distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Mississippi and indeed the senior member of this body in service, age—and wisdom—JOHN CORNELIUS STENNIS, our President pro tempore!

The Senator hails from a State for which I hold great fondness. I recall the warm hospitality accorded to me and my comrades-in-arms by the people of Hattiesburg, MS, when as members of the 100th Infantry Battalion (Separate) we were stationed at nearby Camp Shelby, during the summer of 1942, shortly after the outbreak of World War II. More recently it has become home to my daughter, Diane, following her marriage to a native of Mississippi.

The Mississippi Senator's Phi Beta Kappa key is evidence of his early wisdom which has gained increasing luster with the years. He has served the people of Mississippi as a State legislator, district attorney, judge and jurist, and, for the last 40 years, as a member of the U.S. Senate. His has been, and continues to be, a distinguished record. His wisdom is complemented by that of his constituents in continuing to return him to this august body. In the language of my native State: "Hauoli La Hanau," John Stennis. "Happy birthday!"

HAPPY BIRTHDAY TO SENATOR STENNIS

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, it has come to my attention that today is the birthday of Senator JOHN C. STENNIS, of Mississippi.

I have known Senator STENNIS for many years. When I was Governor of South Carolina, from 1947 to 1951, I recall that he visited our State, I believe, at the request of Senator Maybank. Senator Maybank. Senator STENNIS spoke at that time and made a very fine impression.

As the years have gone by, I have had the occasion to work with him since he has been in the Senate, and it has been a joy and a pleasure.

I might say that in the summer of 1922, he and I attended the same ROTC camp, Camp McClellan, in Alabama, the home State of the Presiding Officer (Mr. SHELBY). I did not know Senator STENNIS at that time, but I appreciate him because he did pursue ROTC and finished ROTC as a high-ranking cadet.

I do not believe he was in a war after that, but he served his country well, as chairman of the Committee on Armed Services and chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

He is a man whom I think we could all emulate. He is a man of character, he is a man of courage, he is a man of compassion, and he has fine professional qualifications.

I congratulate Senator STENNIS upon his birthday. My suite in the Russell Office Building is next to his, and we see a lot of each other. Our staffs work closely together.

Although he is a Democrat and I am a Republican, we think very much alike. He is what you might call a conservative Democrat, and conservative Democrats are very much like Republicans. A lot of them ought to be on the Republican side—for example, even the Presiding Officer at this time.

I am proud of the friendship I have had with Senator Stennis. I am proud of the service he has rendered his country, and the Senate is better off because he has been here for these past number of years.

I hope he has many more years in the Senate, and I wish him well in all his undertakings.

APPOINTMENT TO NATIONAL COMMISSION ON INFANT MORTALITY

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, pursuant to Public Law 99-660, announces the selection, made jointly by the Senate majority leader and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, of Diane E. Watson, of California, to serve as a member at large of the National Commission on Infant Mortality.

HARTWICK COLLEGE TURNS BACK CLOCK

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, from our hillside farm in Delaware County, we look across the Valley of the Susquehanna—still, at this point in its journey, little more than a trout stream—at the great green hills of Otsego. There stands dour Crumhorn, which Sir William Johnson characterized as a "worthless piece of land created by the Almighty for wild beasts and rattlesnakes" and one on which Timothy Murphy, the hero of Saratoga had a close encounter with a roaming band of Senecas. Off to the Southwest, however, are the gentler hills of Oneonta, on one of which will be found the beautiful red stone buildings of Hartwick College. It has been there as Hartwick Seminary since 1797, but with unusual diffidence it has until just this past Saturday been content to describe itself as having been founded in 1928. I can attest that the original vellum charter issued by the Board of Regents 131 years earlier is even now on display in the President's office, and I rejoice that after due and deliberate consideration President Philip S. Wilder, Jr. and the trustees have officially changed the date of the college's founding to 1797. Thus Hartwick enters the select group of 33 American colleges that were founded before the 19th century. Almost all, we might add, as Seminaries.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the report of this event from this morning's Oneonta Star, and I am sure the Senate will join with me in welcoming Hartwick to the precious company of the ancient institutions of our land.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Daily Star, Oneonta, NY, Aug. 3, 1987]

HARTWICK COLLEGE TURNS BACK CLOCK

TRUSTEES OFFICIALLY CHANGE DATE OF COLLEGE'S FOUNDING TO 1797

The Hartwick College Board of Trustees has adopted 1797, the year Hartwick Seminary was established, as the college's founding date, putting the college in an elite group of 33 colleges that were founded before the 19th century.

The college was actually started 131 years later, in 1928, by the seminary. But in 1947,

the seminary went out of business, leaving the heritage to the college.

Philip S. Wilder, Jr., Hartwick College president, wanted the college's founding date to show its complete ancestry. Saturday, he announced the new founding date at the annual reunion of Hartwick Seminary alumni, whose status as alumni of Hartwick College is clarified by the change in date.

"It appears that the founding date was not changed in 1947 out of solicitude for people who felt they had brought the college into being in Oneonta 20 years earlier.

"There is no longer any reason to refrain from correcting the record. The survivors of the 1928 contingent support a change," Wilder said.

"Normal procedures in the consolidation of two corporate entities call for the use by the resultant organization of the founding date of its earliest constituent part," he said.

Hartwick's ancestry was noted on a historical marker given to the college by the state Education Department in 1950, "describing the present institution as 'founded in 1797 as Hartwick Seminary, chartered as Hartwick College in 1928,'" Wilder said.

Planning has already started for the college's bicentennial in 1997, he said.

The new founding date took effect Saturday, Aug. 1.

RETIREMENT OF JAMES RESTON

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, there cannot have been many Members of the Senate or persons active in government in Washington and elsewhere in the Nation, and indeed in capitals the world over, who failed to note with a kind of sad happiness that James Reston, at age 77, after 48 years with the New York Times, has decided it was time to get on with his vegetable garden at Fiery Run, VA, and very important town meetings in Nantucket, which demand more of his attention than they have received in the past, as well as like matters, leading him to make the decision to stop writing the two or three columns a week he has written for 30 years.

It will not be by any means the end of his writing, but the end of that iron routine to which he submitted for so very long and with such great example.

In the age when I think we might say Americans still could read and still would read, there has not been a more influential pen in this capital. He was fair. He was persistent. He was incapable alike of vindictiveness or unfairness.

He was the perfect example of a profession at its height in this city, as it had not ever been before and which I will never experience again.

The story goes that President Eisenhower once asked, with the kind of asperity he could summon on occasion, "Who is this man who is telling me how to run my Government?" I think it would have been fair for those of us who have watched Mr. James Reston, watched his work, and watched the reaction of other Presidents, to say to Mr. Eisenhower: "Mr. President, he is not telling you how to run your Government. He is telling other people how you run it"—a different and important point. It is that assessment that has mattered so much.

I know Presidents whose day was made when they found that Reston had approved what they were doing in the morning. Presidential output doubled before the day was out.

It is in that spirit that the Washington Post prints a lovely tribute, "James Reston Between Jobs," in this morning's edition, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JAMES RESTON BETWEEN JOBS

Up in New York at Brand X, James Reston published his last regular op-ed page column yesterday. Mr. Reston pointed out that he had been a reporter for the New York Times for 48 years now and has been writing two or three columns a week for the past 30. He thinks that's about enough, at least of the regular column regimen. "I'm off for a while," Mr. Reston explained—invoking all those made-to-be-dashed fantasies busy people always have about at last finding time to work on the vegetable garden—but he did say he planned to return to the paper to write "when I please." We know Mr. Reston well enough to believe, not just to hope, that the writing and reporting will continue to preempt concern for the well-being of the rutabagas. Mr. Reston is first and foremost, primarily and hopelessly a journalist. His vegetables should not get their hopes up too high.

You cannot name anyone who has had a more pronounced and pervasive effect on the national news business than Scotty Reston, an unassuming, straight-arrow one-time sportswriter. In postwar Washington, through a period of greal political transformation, when the country was accepting (grudgingly in some respects) a larger international role and an expanded role for the federal government in domestic affairs, and when the role of journalism itself was being transformed, Mr. Reston was at the center of events—a hugely influential figure in establishing new terms of coverage and new standards of commentary.

He has been in enough fights over the years, and he hasn't always been victorious, or, for that matter, always right. But he has always been honorable and important, and he has always been a great worrier about the champion of the press. He worries about its standards, its obligations and its performance. He champions its right to do the job, to be there. Most notably, Mr. Reston has always been suspicious of the lazy, the flashy and the self-promoting in our business, and he tried to pass on these aversions to the large number of young journalists he more or less raised up in his day.

We could offer some more reasons, but we don't think any more are required, for expressing the hope that Scotty Reston will not stray too far or too frequently from journalism—where he belongs—into the fray with weeds and cabbage borers, which is a lost cause anyway.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BREAUX). The Senator from Iowa is recognized.

AID TO THE CONTRAS

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I want to talk this afternoon about the request for aid to the Contras that will be coming our way from the White House, which I assume will come to Congress shortly after we return from the August recess.

Mr. President, we are already seeing the drums being beaten on this subject. Ads are appearing on television put on by certain right-wing groups promoting aid to the Contras. A half hour documentary will air on television soon, again paid for by private individuals and groups around the United States who support aid to the Contras. And 30-second ads are already appearing on major television stations throughout the country supporting aid to the Contras.

Aside from the Contras themselves—I will have more to say about that later—what really concerns me now, Mr. President, is the Senate procedure that will rule consideration of aid to the Contras.

Two years ago, the Senate under the Republican leadership pushed through what expedited procedures for aid to the Contras. According to this procedure, the President of the United States on this issue, aid to the Contras, controls the floor of the Senate of the United States. That is not the way the Constitution meant for it to be. Under this procedure, the President sends his request for aid to the Contras to the Senate. It is referred to committee for 15 days, at the end of which any Senator can bring that request on to the floor of the Senate, ahead of all other legislation. The Senate gets 10 hours of debate, 5 hours equally divided, and within those 10 hours all amendments must be offered, debated and disposed of. At the end of 10 hours there is an up and down vote on the aid to the Contras.

Mr. President, I think that should strike my colleagues and the American people as very odd. On an issue of such major importance as aid to the Contras, which ranks at the top with all other issues dealing with national security, especially security in the Western Hemisphere, we are limited to 10 hours of debate, 5 on each side. Furthermore, this request does not go through the normal processes of being referred to the Foreign Relations Committee so they can call witnesses to discuss about it, and the committee to amend it. Even if the Foreign Relations Committee were to vote down in committee aid to the Contras, as I said, by expedited procedures, any Senator at the end of 15 days can bring the resolution to the floor, and it then would take precedence over any other piece of legislation.

Mr. President, right now, right this very minute, the President of the United States and his advisers can tell

you within 24 hours when the vote will occur on the Senate floor on aid to the Contras.

So they control the timing of it. What is so important about that? What is important is I believe that the administration, knowing when the vote on aid to the Contras will occur, can orchestrate events in Central America to effect the outcome in Congress.

I fear that the administration can orchestrate and will orchestrate a major military engagement between the Contras and the Sandinistas. Or perhaps the Contras could provoke a border skirmish with Nicaragua that could possibly lead to an encounter with Honduran or possibly American troops. In light of the disclosures of the Select Committee on the Iran-Contra Affairs, these events cannot be ruled out of the question.

And on this point, I was very disturbed to read in Friday's Washington Times an interview with National Security Adviser Frank Carlucci. When asked about the contra issue, Mr. Carlucci is quoted as saying in the Washington Times:

> The freedom fighter effort is on target, he said. "There will be results that will influence Congress when the time comes."

Because of expedited procedures, this Senate will vote on Contra aid. What does he mean when he says that there will be results that will influence Congress when the time comes? Well, what could those results be? A major Contra offensive? A border skirmish drawing in Honduran troops? A battle requiring the intervention of U.S. troops?

Right now, Mr. President, the CIA is airlifting troops to the Nicaraguan rebels. Does this mean some kind of altercation with one of our aircraft carrying CIA personnel? Does it mean drawing in some American troops that are now stationed near the Nicaraguan border?

Mr. President, I do not have any inside information about any of these examples by, I repeat, I do not rule them out of order.

We have learned from the Iran-Contra hearings that this administration was prepared to turn our Government inside out, break the law, undermine our Constitution, in order to keep the Contras alive. So I ask rhetorically: Is it possible that this same administration would use the Contras to provoke an incident to win a few votes in Congress to continue aid to the Contras? Of course, it is possible, and not only possible, I think, probable. I think the National Security Adviser, perhaps in a moment of unguarded, realistic answers to a reporter's inquiries, dropped the ball when he said that "There will be results that will influence Congress when the time comes."

Well, Mr. President, we need to proceed with caution in the next 2 months, as Congress prepares to consider the President's request for Contra assistance.

I share with the President his conclusion that our Nicaraguan policy is important both to domestic policy and to our international relations. Accordingly, Congress should give this issue the lengthy consideration it deserves.

We can debate for days and days, weeks on end, our trade policy. And it is important to us and we should have debated it at length because it is that important. We can debate all summer long campaign finance reform. There is a filibuster on right now by the Republicans to keep us from voting on defense authorization for the security of our Nation.

So we do debate things at length here that are very important to our country and they should be debated at length on the floor of the Senate. Not 10 hours. Not 5 hours on one side and 5 hours on another side.

The request for Contra aid ought to come to Congress and be considered like any other request for aid to any other country. It ought to go to the appropriate committees; it ought to be authorized, and then it ought to come to the Appropriations Committees. Under expedited procedures, we do not have that power. We do not have the normal functioning of the U.S. Senate as we do under all other legislation.

Mr. President, I would hope that our leadership will take every means possible to finally eliminate expedited procedures. It has no place in this body and it especially has no place when it concerns an issue of so much importance to the American people; we, the Senate of the United States, should not be told by the White House when the vote on this matter will occur here and how it will occur.

Well, Mr. President, because of the fact that we only have 5 hours for those of us who oppose Contra aid to debate this issue, I intend to address this week, Mr. President, a number of the issues related to the expected Presidential request. I will be taking the floor several times this week for lengthy discussions on who the Contras are, who the leadership of the Contras are, their relationships with the old Somoza government and the human rights record of the Contras. And in fact, I will use the administration's own Commission on Human Rights to show how the Contras have acted when they are dealing with the civilian population of Nicaragua.

I would hope that this would not be necessary to take the time of the Senate this week but, under expedited procedures, what else can we do? Those of us who believe that the record ought to be clear and ought to be laid out in full as to the whole background of the Nicaraguan situation have no other course.

I think it very odd that Lieutenant Colonel North gets 2 weeks on television to give his side of the Contra story, while we get 5 hours on the floor of the Senate—5 hours, including amendments and all else.

Well, I think the issue deserves more than that and that is why, Mr. President, I will be taking the floor several times this week, as I said, to talk about the Contra issue, who they are, their human rights record. I intend to name names and lay it in the RECORD for the public to see. I do not know what the effect or influence it will have, but I believe that the public has a right to have put in the RECORD the other side of the story, a full and complete exposure of the Contras and our Contra policy; of the distortions and the duplicity of this administration for the last 6 years in dealing with the issue; of the attempts made by many people, some in this administration, many on the floor of the Senate and in the other body, to reach a peaceful solution to end the conflict in Central America and open up the political process in Nicaragua; and how these efforts have come to naught because this administration was intent on only one thing: aiding the Contras to overthrow the Government of Nicaragua.

Mr. President, expedited procedures have no place on the floor of the Senate; they have no place, especially dealing with an issue of such concern to the American people.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the article appearing in the Washington Times last Friday be printed in full in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CARLUCCI CITES CONTRA GAINS, COMPLAINS MEDIA IGNORE THEM

(By Jeremiah O'Leary)

The Nicaraguan resistance is scoring an increasing number of military successes over the Marxist Sandinistas, but the news media in this country are ignoring them, National Security Adviser Frank C. Carlucci said yesterday.

Nevertheless, attitudes in Congress are shifting in favor of continued military assistance to the resistance and will be further abetted by additional rebel victories, Mr. Carlucci said in an interview yesterday with editors of The Washington Times.

"The freedom fighter effort is on target," he said. "There will be results that will influence Congress when the time comes."

Meanwhile, President Reagan is expected to make an address to the nation to press his case for assistance to the resistance before he leaves Washington for a 25-day vacation in California on Aug. 13.

A senior U.S. official said the speech will be made after Congress adjourns the first week in August, but the exact date for the address and the forum for it have not been decided.

Mr. Carlucci said Mr. Reagan has made no final decision on how much money to seek from Congress.

Mr. Carlucci said Mr. Reagan intends to push the issue of aid to the Nicaraguan resistance in a series of speeches.

But he complained: "One of the problems is that we consistently seem to be speaking with two voices to the rest of the world.

"Everyone is casting an eye on congressional foreign policy as opposed to administration foreign policy," Mr. Carlucci said. "We need a bipartisan policy toward Latin America, and I think things are now moving.

"If the Sandinistas begin to get a sense of bipartisanship as opposed to a Democrats vs. Republicans policy, I think we'll begin to get results," he said.

Mr. Carlucci said Congress has a problem about making crisp, sharp decisions on foreign policy and often gets into the implementation of foreign policy instead of oversight.

But President Reagan intends to take his case to Congress, use his veto powers during the recess and "press his own foreign policy forcefully," Mr. Carlucci said.

He also recognized the impact of Lt. Col. Oliver North's testimony before the congressional Iran-Contra investigative committees.

"There is no question that Ollie North influenced public opinion in a positive manner," Mr. Carlucci said. "He had the ideal forum at the hearings. President Reagan hasn't had that kind of forum."

Mr. Carlucci said Mr. Reagan's speeches on this subject "don't get the attention they merit" in the media.

The military successes of the resistance, along with the U.S. economic boycott of Nicaragua and pressures from other Central American countries to negotiate, are "putting a squeeze on the Sandinistas", he said.

"Add to that their own economic mismanagement, and I think there is a reasonable possibility of producing the kind of internal change which people in the region think is desirable," Mr. Carlucci said.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum is noted. The clerk will please call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Ms. Emery, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session, the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

At 1 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Berry, announced that the Speaker had signed the following enrolled bill:

S. 1198. An act to authorize a certificate of documentation for the vessel F/V CREOLE.

The enrolled bill was subsequently signed by the President pro tempore [Mr. STENNIS].

At 5:38 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Berry, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 27) to facilitate the provision of additional financial resources to the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation and, for purposes of strengthening the reserves of the Corporation, to establish a forebearance program for thrift institutions and to provide additional congressional oversight of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board and the Federal Home Loan Bank System.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, August 3, 1987, he had presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bill:

S. 1198. An act to authorize a certificate of documentation for the vessel F/V CREOLE.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, which were referred as indicated:

EC-1643. A communication from the Assistant Vice President (Employee Benefits) of the Farm Credit Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the financial reports of the Ninth Farm Credit District Retirement Plan dated December 31, 1986 and February 28, 1987; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1644. A communication from the Benefits and Risk Manager of the Farm Credit Banks of Louisville, transmitting, pursuant to law, the financial reports of the Farm Credit Institutions in the Fourth District Amended Retirement Plan for fiscal year 1986; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1645. A communication from the general counsel of the Department of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to issue regulations requiring that wages and salaries of Federal employees be paid by electronic fund transfer or any other method determined by the Secretary to be in the interest of economy or effectiveness, with sufficient safeguards over the control of, and accounting for, public funds; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1646. A communication from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, notice of revisions to a Privacy Act system of records; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1647. A communication from the Secretary of the United States Postal Rate Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the final rule entitled "Amendment to Domestic Mail Classification Schedule: Extension of Collect on Delivery Services, 1987"; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1648. A communication from the Chairman of the Council on Environmental Quality, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Council under the Government in the Sunshine Act for calendar year 1986; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1649. A communication from the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Office under the Freedom of Information Act for calendar year 1986; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-1650. A communication from the Executive Secretary of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Board under the Freedom of Information Act for calendar year 1986; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-1651. A communication from the Secretary of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, notice of final annual funding priority—Rehabilitation Long-Term Training Program (Rehabilitation Counseling); to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

EC-1652. A communication from the Secretary of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, final regulations—Formula Grants to Local Educational Agencies and Tribal Schools; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

EC-1653. A communication from the Secretary of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, final regulations for the Education Department General Administrative Regulations; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

EC-1654. A communication from the Secretary of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, final regulations for the Student Support Services Program; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

EC-1655. A communication from the Secretary of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, final regulations for the Upward Bound Program; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

EC-1656. A communication from the Secretary of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, final regulations for the Talent Search Program; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

EC-1657. A communication from the Director of the Office of Management and Budget transmitting, pursuant to law, certification of the necessity for apportionment of additional funds for Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty, Inc. resulting from the lower value of the dollar in foreign currency ex-

change rates; to the Committee on Appropriations.

EC-1658. A communication from the President of the United States transmitting, pursuant to law, a request for supplemental appropriations for D.C. for fiscal year 1987; to the Committee on Appropriations.

EC-1659. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense transmitting, pursuant to law, notice of the intent of the Navy to exclude certain records from examination by the Comptroller General; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1660. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of the Army transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the emergency disposal of a suspected chemical artillery projectile at Dugway Proving Ground, UT; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1661. A communication from the Secretary of Transportation transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to implement Annex V, Regulations for the Prevention of Pollution by Garbage from Ships; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1662. A communication from the Under Secretary of Commerce transmitting, pursuant to law, notice of intent to convert the weather observation function at Dulles International Airport, VA to performance under contract; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1663. A communication from the Secretary of Transportation transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations under the Hazardous Materials Transportation Act of fiscal year 1988 and 1989; to the Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation.

EC-1664. A communication from the Secretary of the Interior transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on a small reclamation project at Middle Creek Dam Rehabilitation Project, MT; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-1665. A communication from the Deputy Associate Director, Minerals Management Service, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on 25 refunds of excess oil and gas royalty payments to certain corporations; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-1666. A communication from the Deputy Associate Director, Minerals Management Service, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on 25 refunds of excess oil and gas royalty payments to certain corporations; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-1667. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the administration, impact, and cost of the Utilization and Quality Control Peer Review Organization program; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-1668. A communication from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States within the 60 days previous to July 29, 1987; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-1669. A communication from the Director of the Office of Management Analysis, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on a new Privacy Act system of records; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1670. A communication from the Administrator of the Panama Canal Commission transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on 9 new Privacy Act systems of records; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1671. A communication from the Acting Assistant Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on a new Privacy Act system of records; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1672. A communication from the Chairman of the D.C. Council transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of D.C. ACT 7-64; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1673. A communication from the Chairman of the D.C. Council transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of D.C. ACT 7-67; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1674. A communication from the Chairman of the D.C. Council transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of D.C. ACT 7-68; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1675. A communication from the Chairman of the D.C. Council transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of D.C. ACT 7-65; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1676. A communication from the Chairman of the D.C. Council transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of D.C. ACT 7-66; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1677. A communication from the Chairman of the D.C. Council transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of D.C. ACT 7-70; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1678. A communication from the Chairman of the D.C. Council transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of D.C. ACT 7-69; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1679. A communication from the Chairman of the D.C. Council transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of D.C. ACT 7-63; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1680. A communication from the Chairman of the D.C. Council transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of D.C. ACT 7-61; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1681. A communication from the Chairman of the D.C. Council transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of D.C. ACT 7-62; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1682. A communication from the Chairman of the D.C. Council transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of D.C. ACT 7-59; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1683. A communication from the Chairman of the D.C. Council transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of D.C. ACT 7-60; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1684. A communication from the Executive Director of the Federal Labor Relations Authority transmitting, pursuant to law, the Authority's 1986 Government in the Sunshine report; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1685. A communication from the Plan Administrator of the Farm Credit Retirement Plan Production Credit Associations' Retirement Plan, Farm Credit Banks of Jackson, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual pension plan reports for the plan year ended December 31, 1986; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1686. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution (Administration), transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual pension plan reports of the Smithsonian Institution and the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Cheolarships, and Reading is Fundamental; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1687. A communication from the Acting Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Commission under the Government in the Sunshine Act for calendar year 1986; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1688. A communication from the Acting Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the National Archives and Records Administration for fiscal year 1986; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1689. A communication from the Attorney General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a certification under section 303 of the Bankruptcy Judges, United States Trustees, and Family Farmer Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-1690. A communication from the Attorney General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a certification under section 303 of the Bankruptcy Judges, United States Trustees, and Family Farmer Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-1691. A communication from the Attorney General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a certification under section 303 of the Bankruptcy Judges, United States Trustees, and Family Farmer Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-1692. A communication from the Attorney General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a certification under the Bankruptcy Judges, United States Trustees, and Family Farmer Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-1693. A communication from the Attorney General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a certification under section 303 of the Bankruptcy Judges, United States Trustees, and Family Farmer Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-1694. A communication from the Attorney General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a certification under section 303 of the Bankruptcy Judges, United States Trustees, and Family Farmer Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-1695. A communication from the Attorney General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a certification under section 303 of the Bankruptcy Judges, United States Trustees, and Family Farmer Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-1696. A communication from the Chief Immigration Judge, Executive Office for Immigration Review, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the suspension of deportation of certain aliens under sections 244(a)(1) and 244(a)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-1697. A communication from the Acting Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the opinions of the Department on H.R. 1226 and S. 223; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

EC-1698. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report on the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program for fiscal year 1986; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

EC-1699. A communication from the Secretary of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, final regulations for the International Research and Studies Program; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

EC-1700. A communication from the Secretary of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, final regulations for the Undergrad-

uate International Studies and Foreign Language Program; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

EC-1701. A communication from the Secretary of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, final regulations for the Educational Opportunity Centers Program; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

EC-1702. A communication from the Secretary of Education, transmitting pursuant to law, final regulations for the Business and International Education Program; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

EC-1703. A communication from the Secretary of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, final regulations—Drug Free Schools and Communities Program—Training and Demonstration Grants to Institutions of Higher Education, and Federal Activities Grants Program—General Provisions; Training and Demonstration Grants to Institutions of Higher Education; and Federal Activities Grants Program; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

EC-1704. A communication from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Financial Audit-Veterans' Administration's Financial Statements for Fiscal Year 1986"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC-1705. A communication from the Director of the Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Department of the Army's proposed letter of offer to Morocco for defense articles estimated to cost in excess of $50 million; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petitions and memorials were laid before the Senate and were referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM-274. A resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the State of Illinois; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

"HOUSE RESOLUTION No. 620

"Whereas, A recent study by the National Academy of Sciences indicates that the current method of slaughtering chickens and the federal inspection of chickens does not offer adequate protection for consumers against salmonella poisoning; and

"Whereas, According to the U.S. Department of Agriculture's own estimate, 37% of the chicken offered for sale is suspected of being contaminated with salmonella; and

"Whereas, To protect consumers, the U.S. Department of Agriculture needs to strengthen its inspection methods and procedures for chicken and to insure that the chicken slaughtering industry be further required to take the necessary steps to reduce the instances of contamination of chicken by salmonella; therefore, be it

"Resolved, by the House of Representatives of the Eighty-fifth General Assembly of the State of Illinois, That we urge the U.S. Department of Agriculture and the Congress of the United States to pass legislation and implement a plan to provide adequate inspection of chicken at the slaughter stage with random testing to detect salmonella bacteria and to establish a consumer education program on safe handling and preparation of chickens; and be it further

"Resolved, That a suitable copy of this preamble and resolution be presented to the Secretary of the U.S. Department of Agriculture and to the Chairman of the Senate and House Agriculture Committees of the U.S. Congress.

POM-275. A resolution adopted by the Senate of the State of Alaska; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs:

"SENATE RESOLVE No. 17

"Be it resolved by the Senate:

"Whereas the state, through its royalty share of Alaska North Slope crude oil, receives approximately 6,500,000 barrels of oil per month, all of which is sent through the Trans-Alaska Pipeline; and

"Whereas the Export Administration Act of 1979 (50 U.S.C. 2401-2420) essentially prohibits the export of crude oil transported through the pipeline and requires the action of President Reagan and the United States Congress to lift the prohibition; and

"Whereas, under the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6212), Alaskan crude oil that does not go through the pipeline is subject to the export restrictions of 15 C.F.R. 377.6, and these restrictions can be lifted by the federal administration without Congressional action;

"Whereas the United States trade deficit in 1986 totaled $169,800,000,000 of which $58,600,000,000 was with Japan; $7,100,000,000 was with Korea; $15,700,000,000 was with Taiwan; and $6,400,000,000 was with Hong Kong, and the deficits with Korea, Taiwan, and Hong Kong are the fastest growing trade deficits; and

"Whereas the growth of this trade deficit is attributable to ever-shrinking exports by the United States; the exports of the United States declined by nearly $12,000,000,000 between 1984 and 1986 while imports rose by only $1,700,000,000 during the same time period; and

"Whereas the United States exports only about $3,600,000,000 in petroleum products, but these products are in high demand by those Pacific Rim nations with whom the United States has large and growing trade deficits; and

"Whereas the recent shipment of Canadian Beaufort Sea oil to Japan by Gulf Canada Corporation proves that seasonal transportation of Alaska North Slope crude oil to Pacific Rim markets is possible without using the pipeline; and

"Whereas a dock exists at Kuparuk that can handle oil-carrying barges that could transport the crude oil to oceangoing tankers and eliminate the need for the oil to go through the pipeline; and

"Whereas Japan's Ship Research Institute is now prepared to build a full-size model of a 200,000-ton Arctic icebreaking tanker after nine years of study and design; and

"Whereas the current glut of oil on the West Coast and the lower prices for oil worldwide have not only shut down many small stripper wells across the country but have virtually stopped all exporation and drilling of new wells; this situation will deplete United States energy reserves, which will in turn threaten national security; and

"Whereas, in March 1987, the United States Department of Energy reported to the President of the United States the results of a department study that concluded that permitting the export of Alaska North Slope crude oil would "improve the energy security of the United States"; and

"Whereas the export of Alaska's royalty share of Alaska North Slope crude oil would help ease the West Coast glut, create new markets for Alaska oil, assist in the development of an export market for the state for other products, create conditions more conducive to increased oil exploration, and decrease the total United States trade deficit;

"Be it resolved That the Senate respectfully requests the Governor to immediately begin exploring the steps necessary to

"(1) export Alaska North Slope crude oil by water via Kuparuk to Pacific Rim and other foreign nations rather than through the Trans-Alaska Pipeline; and

"(2) obtain the approval of the President of the United States for lifting the export restrictions on the export of Alaska North Slope crude oil that is not transported through the Trans-Alaska Pipeline.

"Copies of this resolution shall be sent to the Honorable Ronald Reagan, President of the United States; the Honorable George Bush, Vice-President of the United States and President of the U.S. Senate; the Honorable George P. Shultz, Secretary of State; the Honorable James A. Baker III, Secretary of the Treasury; the Honorable Donald P. Hodel, Secretary of the Interior; the Honorable Malcolm Baldrige, Secretary of Commerce; the Honorable John S. Herrington, Secretary of Energy; the Honorable Robert Ortner, Under Secretary for Economic Affairs of the U.S. Department of Commerce; the Honorable Bruce Smart, Under Secretary for International Trade of the U.S. Department of Commerce; the Honorable Louis F. Laun, Assistant Secretary for International Economic Policy of the U.S. Department of Commerce; the Honorable Orson G. Swindle III, Assistant Secretary for Economic Development of the U.S. Department of Commerce; the Honorable Judith A. Brady, commissioner of natural resources; and the Honorable J. Anthony Smith, commissioner of commerce and economic development."

POM-276. A resolution adopted by the Executive Committee of the Republican National Party of Puerto Rico relative to the admission of Puerto Rico as a state; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

POM-277. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Illinois to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

"HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION No. 111

"Whereas, The United States desires to maintain its lead in high energy physics research, a position which has recently been threatened by European and Soviet discoveries; and

"Whereas, Europe and the Soviet Union are expanding their high energy physics facilities and will soon move ahead of the United States in accelerator power; and

"Whereas, The United States Department of Energy has announced it will construct a Superconducting Super Collider (SSC), which would operate at twenty times the intensity of any present accelerator, allowing scientists to explore the basic structure of matter at levels hitherto closed to human investigation; and

"Whereas, Illinois is the home of the Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory, which presently has the most powerful atomic accelerator in the world; and

"Whereas, The present Fermi facility could serve as an injector for the SSC, saving the federal government between $350 and $500 million in construction costs; and

"Whereas, Studies conducted by the Illinois Department of Energy and Natural Re-

sources indicate the construction of the SSC in Illinois makes economic, geological, and environmental sense; and

"Whereas, The Chicago area near the Fermi Laboratory features the research, engineering, construction, and other facilities to accommodate easily the hundreds of new scientists, technicians, and engineers needed to staff the $4 to $6 billion SSC project; and

"Whereas, The construction of the SSC in Illinois will create jobs for Illinois citizens and improve the economic environment of the State; and

"Whereas, The Illinois General Assembly has shown its strong support for the SSC by appropriating substantial funding for the Illinois effort to win the project and by enacting substantive legislation to acquire the land; therefore, be it

"Resolved, by the House of Representatives of the eighty-fifth General Assembly of the State of Illinois, the Senate concurring herein, That we hereby applaud the United States Department of Energy in its decision to build the SSC and further urge the Congress of the United States to authorize the construction of the Superconducting Super Collider; and be it further

"Resolved, That we urge the United States Department of Energy to give favorable consideration to locating the SSC in Illinois; and be it further

"Resolved, That suitable copies of this resolution be presented to the United States Department of Energy, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives and each member of the Illinois Congressional delegation."

POM-278. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Illinois; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works:

"HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 73

"Whereas, Coal production is a major Illinois industry providing fifteen thousand jobs, over one billion dollars in overall economic benefit to our State and is the lifeblood of many communities; and

"Whereas, Illinois coal is a source of economical energy for millions of electric utility customers in Illinois and nearly 20 other states; and

"Whereas, In response to federal clean air act standards, Illinois has significantly reduced air pollution from coal at a cost of hundreds of millions of dollars to electric utility customers; and

"Whereas, The State of Illinois has invested over fifty million dollars in research and development projects designed to further reduce air pollution from coal; and

"Whereas, The United States House of Representatives has before it a measure which in an attempt to solve the acid rain problem could cut Illinois coal production by up to two-thirds of 1985 levels, cost 4,000 lost mining jobs and cause a $600 million loss to the State economy; and

"Whereas, Such federal acid deposition legislation would cost Illinois utility customers millions of dollars per year without offering any meaningful support for the costs of new pollution control equipment; and

"Whereas, What we need to do is to develop more cost-effective pollution control methods, a need which is widely recognized in the United States and Canada and is the subject of the major recommendation of the recent Drew Lewis-William Davis Report; therefore, be it

"Resolved, by the House of Representatives of the eighty-fifth General Assembly of the State of Illinois, the Senate concurring herein, That we express our feeling that federal acid legislation would levy disproportionate costs on the State of Illinois and result in job dislocation in the State; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Governor and the members of the Illinois Congressional Delegation be urged to work for meaningful federal support of new clean coal technology development which would solve the problem without economic disruption; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to Governor James R. Thompson, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, and the members of the Illinois Congressional Delegation."

POM-279. A resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the State of Illinois; to the Committee on Finance:

"HOUSE RESOLUTION NO. 101

"Whereas, The House of Representatives of the State of Illinois advocates a change in the law which would correct the unbalanced system of distribution of Social Security benefits; and

"Whereas, Congress intended Social Security benefits to be roughly 50 to 60 percent of the final working year's pay for a low income worker, and about 30 percent for the worker who made the maximum salary taxable under Social Security rules; and

"Whereas, In 1972, Congress created an inflation adjustment mechanism which made the benefits too generous and would cause the system to go broke; and

"Whereas, In order to correct their mistake, in 1977 Congress devised three separate formulas for computing Social Security retirement benefits, one formula applies to people born in 1916 and earlier, the second formula applies to people born in 1922 and later and the third formula applies to people born in the five years in between, the 'notch'; and

"Whereas, Those retiring individuals who were born in the years of the 'notch' will receive benefits that are considerably less than those born before them; and

"Whereas, What is needed is a bill which would correct the 1977 overcorrection and establish a uniform formula to compensate for the extension of the Social Security system beyond its budget; and

"Whereas, People born from 1917 to 1921 receive lower Social Security retirement benefits than people with similar earnings who were born earlier, and this injustice can be corrected; therefore, be it

"Resolved, by the House of Representatives of the eighty-fifth General Assembly of the State of Illinois, That the Congress of the United States is hereby urged to find a legislative solution to correct the imbalance in the system of distribution of Social Security benefits and to ensure that the Social Security system is once again able to provide equal retirement benefits to all deserving individuals; and be it further

"Revolved, That a suitable copy of this preamble and resolution be presented, respectively, to the President of the United States, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, and to each member of the Illinois Congressional Delegation.

POM-280. A resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the State of Illinois; to the Committee on Finance:

"HOUSE RESOLUTION NO. 361

"Whereas, The projected decline in the federal deficit which the Congressional Budget Office has published is predicated upon continuing growth in the Social Security trust fund, which is pulling in large and growing annual surpluses; and

"Whereas, By the early 1980's. the trust fund surplus is expected to reach $70 billion; and

"Whereas, In the 1985 Balanced Budget Act, lawmakers said that Social Security trust fund surpluses would count toward reducing the deficit; and

"Whereas, By the middle decades of the next century, however, the annual trust fund surpluses will begin to decline and will turn to deficits, and, if the government has depended on them to mask an imbalance in its finances, it will then find itself overcommitted; and

"Whereas, These funds should not be used now to decrease the deficit; for taxpayers will then be stuck with a huge bill when the baby boomers retire; therefore be it

"Resolved, by the House of Representatives of the eighty-fifth General Assembly of the State of Illinois, That we urge the United States Congress not to use Social Security funds to balance the budget; and be it further

"Resolved, That a suitable copy of this preamble and resolution be presented to the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, the President of the United States Senate, and to each member of the Illinois Congressional Delegation."

POM-281. A resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs:

"RESOLUTIONS MEMORIALIZING CONGRESS TO ISSUE A STAMP COMMEMORATING THE ONE HUNDRED AND NINETY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF GEORGE PEABODY

"Whereas, on February eighteenth, nineteen hundred and ninety, there will be observed the one hundred and ninety-fifth anniversary of the birth in the city of Peabody, Massachusetts, of George Peabody, the first great American Philanthropist who bestowed so much of his great wealth for the education of the poor and in general for the benefit of mankind, and who probably as much as any individual helped by his financial ability to make this country the Greatest Nation in the world; and

"Whereas, it seems fitting and proper that the name of George Peabody be immortalized forever by having a stamp issued, if possible, on February eighteenth, nineteen hundred and ninety; therefore be it

"Resolved, That the Massachusetts General Court respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to provide for the issuance of such a stamp; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be forwarded by the Clerk of the House of Representatives to the President of the United States, to the Postmaster General, to the Presiding Officer of each branch of Congress and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth, to the citizens Stamp Advisory Committee, U.S. Postal Service, C/O Stamp Development Branch, 475 L'Enfant Plaza, SW., Washington, D.C. 20260.

POM-282. A resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs:

"RESOLUTIONS MEMORIALIZING CONGRESS TO ISSUE A STAMP COMMEMORATING SAMUEL OSGOOD AS THE FIRST POSTMASTER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES

"Whereas, Samuel Osgood was a patriot, soldier, statesman and financier with roots in North Andover, Massachusetts; and

"Whereas, Samuel Osgood was named by President George Washington as the first Postmaster General of the United States; and

"Whereas, it seems fitting and proper that the name of Samuel Osgood be immoralized forever by having a commemorative stamp issued in 1989, the two hundredth anniversary of that post, or a stamp published in the regular line of stamps; therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the Massachusetts House of Representatives respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to provide issuance of such a stamp; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of these resolutions be forwarded by the Clerk of the House of Representatives to the President of the United States, to the Postmaster General, to the Presiding Officer of each branch of Congress and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth, and to the Citizens Stamp Advisory Committee, U.S. Postal Service, c/o Stamp Development Branch, 475 L'Enfant Plaza, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20260."

POM-283. A certified act of the Virginia General Assembly amending the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Regulation Compact; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

POM-284. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

"RESOLUTIONS MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO PERMIT THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS TO REGULATE EMPLOYEE WELFARE BENEFIT PLANS

"*Whereas*, more than six hundred thousand citizens of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts lack any health insurance coverage, more than one third of whom are children, and many thousands more are seriously underinsured; and

"*Whereas*, the numbers of uninsured citizens pose a serious health hazard to those individuals and families, creating serious economic difficulties for the uninsured as well as for hospitals, social service providers, employers who provide health insurance, and the Commonwealth; and

"*Whereas*, increasing numbers of employees are now covered by employer-insured health plans which place these workers beyond any protection or regulation by the Commonweath to ensure adequacy and quality of services; and

"*Whereas*, section five hundred and fourteen of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 has been interpreted to prohibit any State government from regulating employer insured health benefit plans; and

"*Whereas*, since the adoption of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act Statute, the numbers of employees who are covered by employer-insured health plans has grown dramatically, estimated in the year nineteen hundred and eighty-six to be greater than forty percent of all insured workers; and

"*Whereas*, this prohibition has had a deleterious effect not only on access to health services but also on the quality of health services received by these workers because of a lack of State supervision and regulation; and

"*Whereas*, Congress has previously granted an exemption to the State of Hawaii to permit that State to regulate all health insurance provided by employers, and as a result of that exemption, more than ninety-eight percent of all Hawaiians are covered by health insurance; and

"*Whereas*, on November fourth, nineteen hundred and eighty-six, more than one million Massachusetts citizens voted in favor of a non-binding resolution calling on the Congress of the United States to establish a national health service to provide adequate health care for all citizens, sixty-seven percent of those voting; now therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the Massachusetts General Court calls upon the President and the Congress of the United States to provide an exemption for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts to the provisions of section five hundred and fourteen of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to permit the Commonwealth to regulate employer based health insurance plans; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of these resolutions be forwarded by the clerk of the House of Representatives to the President of the United States, the Presiding Officer of each branch of Congress, and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth."

POM-285. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Illinois; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources:

"SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 49

"Whereas, We applaud the initial action of the Congress in 1965 to create the Older Americans Act; the action in 1973 to expand it; the action in 1978 to coordinate it; the action in 1981 to streamline it; the action in 1984 and the present action in 1987 to reaffirm it; and

"Whereas, Moreover, in making this call to the Congress for action, we endorse and transmit for consideration the positions of the Illinois Council on Aging, positions developed following public hearings by the 31-member statutory body charged with this responsibility; and

"Whereas, These positions with respect to the reauthorization of the act are as follows:

"(1) to support a three-year reauthorization—October 1, 1987 through September 30, 1990;

"(2) to support statutory provisions upgrading the status of the Administration on Aging Commissioner to that of an Assistant Secretary reporting directly to the Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services;

"(3) *not* to support raising the eligibility age for receiving services from 60 to 70 years;

"(4) *not* to support the imposition of a means test for determining eligibility for service;

"(5) *not* to support the consolidation of Titles III-B, III-C-1, and III-C-2;

"(6) to support statutory provisions for a 1991 White House Conference on Aging with funding for the planning thereof;

"(7) to support setting specific authorization levels for all Titles of the Act and annual funding that is increased by at least 5% above the rate of inflation; and

"(8) to support strengthening statutory provisions of the Act and regulations in all of the Titles to foster increased representation and participation in governance and in policy and program determination by minorities, with consideration of language and cultural diversity; therefore, be it

"*Resolved, by the Senate of the eighty-fifth General Assembly of the State of Illinois, the House of Representatives concurring herein.* That it call upon the Congress of the United States, its Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources, and Subcommittee on Aging, its House Committee on Education and Labor and Subcommittee on Human Resources, and upon the President of the United States, to take prompt action to reauthorize the Older Americans Act as an expression of the Nation's continuing commitment to goals and objectives for assuring the well-being of the elderly; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That suitable copies of this preamble and resolution be presented to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, the chairpersons of the aforementioned committees and subcommittees, the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, and to all members of the Illinois Congressional Delegation, the latter being urged to support this resolution and to enter it as testimony in the appropriate committee hearings."

POM-286. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Illinois; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs:

"HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 34

"Whereas, The term 'veteran' is presently defined by Section 10(2) of Title 38, United States Code, which reads; The term 'veteran' means a person who served in the active military, naval or air service, and who has been discharged or released therefrom under conditions other than dishonorable; and

"Whereas, historically, the term 'veteran' has been reserved for individuals who have served in the uniformed services of the nation and have taken the oath to bear arms in defense of the Republic; and

"Whereas, To be designated as a veteran is an appellation of honor properly bestowed on those who have earned it and not on anyone else; and

"Whereas, A veteran is entitled to substantial rights and benefits provided exclusively to them by the nation in recognition of service rendered in support of the national interest; and

"Whereas, A considerable number of people did serve and support the war effort during various periods of conflict, but did not serve on active duty in the military, naval or air service, and did not take the oath to bear arms; and

"Whereas, An effort is being made by some of these people to persuade the government to include them in the classification of 'veteran' with all rights and benefits appertaining thereto; and

"Whereas, By allowing the classification of 'veteran' to include such people it would diminish the significance of the honor that is attached to the honor; and

"Whereas, It is essential that the present definition of 'veteran' in Section 10(2) of title 38 be maintained; and

"Whereas, There is an attempt to turn America's wartime disabled veterans away from the VA health care they need and have earned in an attempt by the Office of Management and Budget to balance the budget; and

"Whereas, America's sickest and poorest veterans would have the door to VA health care slammed in their face if the Office of Management and Budget's cuts prevail; and

"Whereas, We are responding to the Office of Management and Budget's plan to cut $928 million from the VA health care budget for fiscal year 1988, and their request for an immediate cut of $160 million from VA health care for the current fiscal year, which would bring the total cut to more than $1 billion in the near term; and

"Whereas, The proposed cut in the budget would result in the loss of more than 9,000 VA medical care jobs and a drastic curtailment of services nationwide, which would refute America's sense of duty to her wartime disabled veterans and represent a fundamental failure of the Office of Management and Budget to consider the wishes of the citizens it serves; and

"Whereas, As in the past, Congress is not going to let the Office of Management and Budget cut a billion dollars out of the VA budget, and during the 100th Congress, Congressman G. V. 'Sonny' Montgomery (D-Miss), Chairman of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, stated 'it's as simple as that, the OMB, once again has made recommendations that ignore the express wishes of Congress, and we, in turn, have a fundamental duty in this instance to ignore OMB's recommendation'; and

"Whereas, Senator Alan Cranston (D-Calif), who is Montgomery's counterpart in the Senate, said, 'OMB seems determined to submit a fiscal 1988 budget that is just as outrageously bad and unfair to veterans as the Administration's fiscal 1987 budget was' and that budget was soundly defeated by Congress, with proposed deep cuts in a variety of VA services restored by both the House and Senate; and

"Whereas, Thomas K. Turnage, VA Administrator, appealed the Office of Management and Budget's plan, and he noted that such cuts 'would seriously damage the VA's ability to meet its mission';

"Whereas, The budget recommendations reflect the Office of Management and Budget's continuing contempt for America's disabled veterans; and

"Whereas, Most recently the Office of Management and Budget rejected VA plans to pay profoundly deaf veterans disability compensation commensurate with their loss of hearing and even though VA officials and the Congress both agree a serious disparity exists in the compensation paid this category of vets, the Office of Management and Budget flatly rejected it; and

"Whereas, The federal funds involved in compensating the deaf veterans were small, but the impact would have been great on this small number of disabled vets, who have also earned the right to lead quality lives; and

"Whereas, All the veterans organizations are united in their opposition to civilians being granted veterans status, and also to any and all proposed budget cuts affecting the disabled veteran; therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the eighty-fifth general assembly of the State of Illinois, the Senate concurring herein, "That we oppose the efforts of any person or groups of persons to acquire designation as 'veterans' on the basis of service rendered to the United States during a period of war or armed conflict, such service not having been rendered in the active military, naval or air service of the United States; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a suitable copy of this preamble and resolution be presented to President Ronald Reagan, the President Pro Tempore of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to each member of the Illinois delegation to the United States Congress."

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. KENNEDY, from the Committee on Labor and Human Resources, with an amendment:

S. 1441. A bill to reduce the incidence of infant mortality (Rept. No. 100-137).

By Mr. HOLLINGS, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, with amendments:

S. 1485. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to provide various protections for passengers traveling by aircraft, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 100-138).

By Mr. MOYNIHAN, from the Committee on Environment and Public Works, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 1550. A bill to complete the Federal Triangle in the District of Columbia, to construct a public building to provide Federal office space and space for an international cultural and trade center, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 100-139).

FEDERAL TRIANGLE DEVELOPMENT ACT

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, on Wednesday last, the Committee on Environment and Public Works took up S. 1550, as reported to it from the Subcommittee on Water Resources, Transportation, and Infrastructure.

This bill is entitled the "Federal Triangle Development Act" and it provides for the construction of a public building complex at 14th Street between Constitution and Pennsylvania Avenues that will mark the completion of the 25-year program for the redevelopment and reconstruction of Pennsylvania Avenue, the avenue of the Presidents, the great thoroughfare that leads symbolically from the Capitol building here to the White House building there. This was a thought that came to President Kennedy's mind as he drove down in the Inaugural Parade on January 20, 1961, which he thereafter turned over to the Secretary of Labor, for whom this Senator had the opportunity to serve as an assistant at the time.

Mr. President, the report which I will now send to the desk gives in great detail the project that we now propose. I simply make the important point for the purposes of the committee that in this new building, which will be the largest office complex in Washington, two-thirds the size of the Pentagon itself and accordingly the second largest of the Federal buildings, that in one great stretch of imagination and enterprise we will take the Treasury Department from 38 buildings to 4 in the city of Washington; we will take the Justice Department from 26 buildings to 3; and the State Department from 16 buildings to 3. We will put up an extraordinary monumental building, worthy of this site, the last site remaining on Pennsylvania Avenue. It will cost no Federal funds to build. Instead, after 30 years of renting, our lease payments will pay for the construction. We will then own the building as we now own the site. We will end by having saved the Treasury a third of a billion dollars.

Mr. President, the Committee on Environment and Public Works is understandably seen as a place where moneys are spent as indeed they ought to be. Public works are an honorable and necessary activity.

But our particular committee has for some 10 years now—I would like to mention Senator BURDICK and Senator STAFFORD in particular—watched the gradual escalation of our rent bills as a Government.

We stopped building buildings such as we had been in the 1960's and have simply been renting them ever since. It always looks better in this year's budget to rent the building rather than to own the building. We reached the point from where rent bills have gone from $400 million annually in 1970 to $1.6 billion today, and we are heading for $2 billion.

Mr. President, for the first time we have been successful in turning this around and setting an example of how we may proceed in the future. Here on Pennsylvania Avenue is as visible and viable an example of what we have in mind as you could hope for. We will save the Treasury a third of a billion dollars.

If there is anyone who can note when this has last happened in this body, I should be very much interested to hear.

Mr. President, for the record, I would like to state this is a committee substitute for S. 1550 and that I submit the committee substitute for myself, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. BREAUX, Mr. REID, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. STAFFORD, Mr. DURENBERGER, and Mr. WARNER; and that, finally, to note that the bill was reported without a dissenting vote from the committee on which the distinguished Presiding Officer is such a welcome addition. It was reported by a rollcall vote of 15 to zero.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement on the major provisions of the reported bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GENERAL STATEMENT

This bill brings to completion—we would dare to say triumphant completion—twenty-five years of the redevelopment of Pennsylvania Avenue which was ordered by President John F. Kennedy on June 1, 1962. It brings to completion, also, the construction of the Federal Triangle as provided in the Public Buildings Act of 1926, signed by

President Coolidge and undertaken by then Secretary of the Treasury, Andrew Mellon.

The circumstances of President Kennedy's great directive ought to be recorded. At a meeting of the Cabinet on August 4, 1961, there was a pause in the discussion of foreign policy and talk turned to the second most important of all issues in government, which is to say office space. In truth the matter was pressing. Work on Mellon's Federal Triangle simply stopped with the Depression. Somehow the great New Deal public works projects barely touched Washington. The war ended any such activity, save for the construction of the Pentagon. The postwar period was taken up with reconstructing the cities of Europe and suchlike, but Washington remained neglected, and commenced to be run down. From the point of view of simple efficiency, departments grew ever more difficult to manage as bureaus spilled over into ever more haphazard temporary quarters. Worse yet, as with most postwar cities, Washington was striving to move away from its old "downtown", heading for the suburbs. The area between the capitol and the White House was becoming a slum.

Riding down Pennsylvania Avenue in his Inaugural Parade President Kennedy noted this, and later the same day mentioned it to his energetic and innovative Secretary of Labor Arthur J. Goldberg. At the August cabinet meeting it was decided to set up an Ad Hoc Committee on Federal Office space, with Secretary Goldberg as Chairman. (Labor was high on any list for a new building; besides, Goldberg saw the assignment as an opportunity both to press for the redevelopment of Pennsylvania Avenue, and to bring modernity to Federal architecture. At this time it had been roughly half a century since the Federal government had last built what could be called a contemporary building, and even these were derivative in the beaux arts tradition.

With the now Chairman of the Subcommittee on Water Resources, Transportation, and Infrastructure serving as secretary, and with the special encouragement of the President's great friend, William Walton, and the watchful assistance of Fred Holborn on the White House staff, the Ad Hoc Committee set to work. Its report to the President submitted on May 23, 1962, contained a ten year building program and two special sections, The Redevelopment of Pennsylvania Avenue, and Guiding Principles for Federal Architecture. (It should be noted that the Guiding Principles are still in effect, and are of course nationwide in their application.)

THE REDEVELOPMENT OF PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE

One of the distinctive features of the American Republic is that from the earliest days the Nation's capital has been located in an area set apart for that special purpose. No one visiting Washington can fail to recognize that the Government established here in the 18th Century was something new in the world, and that the men who created it were fully conscious of the great enterprise on which they had embarked.

The plans for the City of Washington, as drawn for the first President by Major Charles Pierre L'Enfant, began with the location of the principal buildings of the new Government and the great avenues that would connect them. The grand axis of the city, as of the Nation, was Pennsylvania Avenue leading from the Capitol to the White House, symbolizing at once the separation of powers and the fundamental unity in the American Government.

Just as the new Government was not founded on small aspirations, neither did Washington or L'Enfant make any little plans. The city they conceived was not intended to be completed in the life of one administration, or one generation. They designed the Capital of a great nation: building it would become the work of that nation.

Scarcely a generation in our history has not contributed to this work. The appearance of the Nation's Capital has been a matter of continued concern to Congress and to successive administrations. Down through the years, despite some lapses, those responsible have been essentially faithful to the original vision of Washington and his inspired city planner.

The modern era began with the report of the McMillan Commission at the beginning of the Century, which reiterated the essential principles of the L'Enfant scheme. The Commission plans called for the construction of the Mall, the Lincoln Memorial, the Arlington Bridge, and for a general development of public buildings in the area between the Capitol and the White House.

The most recent major development in the Capital took place under President Hoover and Secretary of the Treasury Andrew Mellon who conceived the great Federal Triangle. This spacious and dignified complex of office structures occupies the area formed by Constitution Avenue, Fourteenth Street and Pennsylvania Avenue. As a result, all of the space on the south side of Pennsylvania Avenue between the Capitol and the White House is occupied by public buildings.

It was clear to the planners of the 1920's that the south side of Pennsylvania Avenue could not be developed while neglecting the north side. To develop one without the other would produce an imbalance wholly at odds with the spirit of L'Enfant. Accordingly, the plans for the Federal Triangle were accompanied by plans for a Municipal Center on the north side of the Avenue extending from Third Street to Sixth Street, with John Marshall place at the center. The architecture of the Municipal buildings was to follow closely that of the Federal structures opposite.

Andrew Mellon expressed with great feeling the harmony of the scene he hoped to create—

"It is easy to see what the effect will be. As one proceeds down Pennsylvania Avenue toward the Capitol, on the south side will be a succession of beautiful and harmonious buildings, all of a design in keeping with the semiclassical tradition so well established in Washington. On the north side, such as the beautiful District of Columbia Courthouse, on John Marshall Place, shall be brought into the general plan of Pennsylvania Avenue. At the same time the Mall will present the spectacle of a great park bordered on one side by the new boulevard with beautiful buildings, a wide parkway of greensward with its four rows of trees, its drives and walks, statues, and reflecting pools, all arranged in such a way that long vistas will be opened up for views of the Capitol in one direction and of the Washington Monument and Lincoln Memorial in the other."

The plans for Pennsylvania Avenue were never fulfilled. The great depression prevented the completion of the facade of the Federal buildings (while the Main Court of the Triangle was left to become a parking lot of surpassing ugliness.) For various reasons, only about half the Municipal Center was constructed.

The result of the failure to fulfill this grand concept has been lamentable disharmony. On the south side of the Avenue the stately progression of Federal offices designed under Andrew Mellon is twice interrupted by earlier structures of a quite different character. The north side presents a scene of desolation; block after block of decayed nineteenth century buildings, many of which are vacant above the first story, only rarely interspersed by partially successful efforts at modernization. The roadway, sidewalks, lamp posts and other features of the avenue have been sorely neglected. Increasingly the Capitol itself is cut off from the most developed part of the city by a blighted area that is unsightly by day and empty by night.

Pennsylvania Avenue should be the great thoroughfare of the City of Washington. Instead it remains a vast, unformed, cluttered expanse at the heart of the Nation's Capital.

The present appearance of Pennsylvania Avenue demands attention for the precise reason that profound changes are about to take place. Large segments on the north side are decayed beyond restoration. It is clear that a great many of the buildings are about to be torn down and replaced by new structures which will include both private and public buildings.

This presents a great opportunity. From Washington's time there has been a general understanding that the Federal Government has a responsibility to maintain standards of buildings and architecture in the Nation's Capital. For the past half century this function has been ably performed by the Commission of Fine Arts. The prospect that a considerable number of buildings will be erected along Pennsylvania Avenue in a short span of time makes it possible to consider the overall appearance, as well as the appearance of the individual structures. Instead of designing and constructing one new building at a time, it becomes possible to design and construct what would, in effect, be a new avenue.

This is an opportunity not to be missed. It will not come again for a half century or more, except at the prohibitive cost of demolishing large blocks of new and expensive office buildings.

At the same time it is clear that a dramatic transformation in the appearance of Pennsylvania Avenue is possible with only a marginal increase in projected expenditure. The General Services Administration hopes to build a number of new buildings in the downtown area. The need for additional office space is such that it cannot be doubted that Congress will approve. There are equally good grounds to suppose that substantial private capital will be expended for hotels and office buildings in the downtown area. (It may be noted that Washington attracts over 15,000,000 visitors a year.) Merely by combining these separate endeavors in one construction program a totality far more handsome, more truly functional, and more soundly economical may be achieved.

The committee feels there should be no delay in setting up this effort. Specifically, the Federal Government, in cooperation with the District government, should formally undertake the redevelopment of Pennsylvania Avenue, so that it may assume its rightful place as the principal thoroughfare of the Nation's Capital.

The Pennsylvania Avenue project should be regarded as a continuation of the work on the Federal Triangle which began a gen-

eration ago. In this instance, however, the effort should involve a partnership between the Government and private enterprise. A primary object of the redevelopment of the Avenue should be to emphasize the role of the Capitol itself as the center of the city. For this reason care should be taken not to line the north side with a solid block of public and private office buildings which close down completely at night and on weekends leaving the Capitol more isolated than ever. Pennsylvania Avenue should be lively, friendly and inviting, as well as dignified and impressive.

As much attention should be paid to the 160-foot wide Avenue itself as to the buildings that line it. Much repairing and rearranging is in order. The object should be to produce an Avenue on which it is pleasent to walk as well as possible to drive. Benches, arcades, sculpture, plantings and fountains should be encouraged.

In 1952, by Act of Congress, the National Capital Planning Commission was created and designated as "the central planning agency for the Federal and District Governments to plan the appropriate and orderly development and redevelopment of the National Capital and the conservation of the important natural and historical features thereof." It is clear that the central responsibility for planning the redevelopment of Pennsylvania Avenue resides with this Commission. To fulfill this responsibility it will be necessary for the Commission to engage the services of a number of the foremost architects of the Nation: nothing less than the very finest, established talents available will be sufficient for this unusually significant undertaking.

Responsibility for the design and construction of new Federal buildings will, of course, remain with the General Services Administration, which should play a major role in the entire program. The Planning Commission will also wish to work in the closest cooperation with the Architect of the Capitol and the Commission of Fine Arts. They will also wish to work with the National Capital Transportation Agency, the Federal City Council, Downtown Progress, the American Institute of Architects and the numerous other public and private organizations that will be concerned with this splendid challenge to the creative talents of all those concerned with the beauty and majesty of the Capital City of the United States of America.

GUIDING PRINCIPLES FOR FEDERAL ARCHITECTURE

In the course of its consideration of the general subject of Federal office space, the committee has given some thought to the need for a set of principles which will guide the Government in the choice of design for Federal buildings. The committee takes it to be a matter of general understanding that the economy and suitability of Federal office space derives directly from the architectural design and the belief that good design is optional, or on some way separate from the question of the provision of office space itself; does not bear scrutiny, and in fact invites the least efficient use of public money.

The design of Federal office buildings, particularly those to be located in the nation's capital, must meet a two-fold requirement. First, it must provide efficient and economical facilities for the use of Government agencies. Second, it must provide visual testimony to the dignity, enterprise, vigor and stability of the American Government.

It should be our object to meet the test of Pericles' evocation to the Athenians, which the President commended to the Massachusetts legislature in his address of January 9, 1961: "We do not imitate—for we are a model to others."

The committee is also of the opinion that the Federal Government, no less than other public and private organizations concerned with the construction of new buildings, should take advantage of the increasingly fruitful collaboration between architecture and the fine arts.

With these objectives in view, the committee recommends a three point architectural policy for the Federal Government.

1. The policy shall be to provide requisite and adequate facilities in an architectural style and form which is distinguished and which will reflect the dignity, enterprise, vigor, and stability of the American National Government. Major emphasis should be placed on the choice of designs that embody the finest contemporary American architectural thought. Specific attention should be paid to the possibilities of incorporating into such designs qualities which reflect the regional architectural traditions of that part of the Nation in which buildings are located. Where appropriate, fine art should be incorporated in the designs, with emphasis on the work of living American artists. Designs shall adhere to sound construction practice and utilize materials, methods and equipment of proven dependability. Buildings shall be economical to build, operate and maintain, and should be accessible to the handicapped.

2. The development of an official style must be avoided. Design must flow from the architectural profession to the Government, and not vice versa. The Government should be willing to pay some additional cost to avoid excessive uniformity in design of Federal buildings. Competitions for the design of Federal buildings may be held where appropriate. The advice of distinguished architects ought to, as a rule, be sought prior to the award of important design contracts.

3. The choice and development of the building site should be considered the first step of the design process. This choice should be made in cooperation with local agencies. Special attention should be paid to the general ensemble of streets and public places of which federal buildings will form a part. Where possible, buildings should be located so as to permit a generous development of landscape.

President Kennedy approved the Report and on June 1, 1962, issued this directive, as taken from his Presidential Papers.

MEMORANDUM CONCERNING IMPROVEMENTS IN FEDERAL OFFICE SPACE AND THE REDEVELOPMENT OF PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, JUNE 1, 1962

Memorandum for: The Secretary of Commerce; the Secretary of Labor; the Director, Bureau of the Budget; the Administrator of General Services Administration; the Special Assistant to the President for Cabinet and Departmental Relations; the Chairman, National Capital Planning Commission.

I have reviewed the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Federal Office Space. This report provides a long-needed perspective on Federal office space problems and prospects in the Washington, D.C. metropolitan area.

I am requesting each department and agency head to give immediate study to the report and take appropriate action. Future planning for the acquisition and use of office space is to be guided by the findings and recommendations of this report.

I will appreciate a progress report one year from now by the Administrator of General Services with regard to Federal office space and the adoption of improved architectural standards. I should like a similar report on progress from the Chairman of the National Capital Planning Commission with regard to the improvement of Pennsylvania Avenue.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

Note: At a cabinet meeting on August 4, 1961, the President directed that a survey be made of the Governments immediate and long-term space needs, with particular reference to the Greater Washington area. An ad hoc committee was established consisting of the Secretaries of Commerce and Labor, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, the Administrator of General Services, and the Special Assistant to the President for Cabinet and Departmental Relations.

In reporting to the President, on May 23, the Committee pointed out that the problem of office space in the District of Columbia area was acute and that with each succeeding year the needs increased. The report noted that the steady growth of personnel in the area, combined with a low level of public building construction had produced a haphazard pattern of space procurement and continued reliance on temporary and obsolete buildings, some of which dated from World War I. The Committee recommended a 10-year plan providing for a minimum of 12 new Federal buildings, together with the elimination of existing temporary and obsolete Government-owned buildings. The design of the new buildings, the Committee emphasized, should provide efficient and economical facilities for the use of Government agencies, and should provide visual testimony to the dignity, enterprise, vigor, and stability of the American Government.

The Committee further recommended that immediate attention be given to improving the appearance of Pennsylvania Avenue. It noted that "the north side presents a scene of desolation; block after block of decayed nineteenth century buildings, many of which are vacant above the first story, only rarely interspersed by partially successful efforts at modernization." The Capitol, it pointed out, is increasingly cut off from the most developed part of the city by a blighted area that is unsightly by day and empty by night. The report stated that a great many of the buildings were soon to be torn down and replaced by new structures, both private and public, and that this presented an opportunity for a dramatic transformation in the appearance of the Avenue, with only a marginal increase in projected expenditures. "As conceived by L'Enfant," the Committee stated, "the 'grand axis' of the City of Washington was to be Pennsylvania Avenue from the Capitol to the White House, expressing symbolically both the separation of powers and the essential unity in the American form of Government."

The report concluded with the recommendation that central responsibility for planning the redevelopment of the Avenue should reside with the National Capital Planning Commission; for the design and construction of the new Federal buildings, with the General Services Administration

Next the great American architect and impresario Nathanial Alexander Owings was asked to chair a committee of architects, de-

signers, and planners to develop a plan. This took another year, but was ready in the fall of 1963. Again the young President was moved by a vision of the City that had stirred Washington and Jefferson, if few of his predecessors in between. The last instruction President Kennedy gave before leaving for Dallas on November 21, was that on his return a coffee hour should be arranged at which he might show the model of the Pennsylvania Avenue plan to the Congressional leaders.

This meeting was being planned at a luncheon in Mr. Walton's house attended by him, the Chairman of our Subcommittee, and Honorable Charles A. Horsky, the President's Advisor for National Capital Affairs, when the White House operator phoned to report that the President had been shot.

There thus devolved on others the task and the dream the young President had embraced. It has taken a quarter century, but it is now done, or soon will be. One by one the projects have been put in place. They have not been uniformly successful, and they are anything but uniform, but they have saved the great avenue. The fine new Canadian Embassy is rising at the foot of Capitol Hill, its pillars echoing those of the Federal Trade Commission and the National Gallery. Across the Avenue I.M. Pei's masterful East Building seems now to have been there from the beginning. The Frances Perkins Department of Labor Building sits astride the sunken Interstate route 395, leading to the Reflecting Pool which was built with the savings that came from not bending the tunnel to accommodate three old cottonwood trees beloved of a then Senior Senator. The Meade Memorial is splendidly out of place just up the Avenue. Market Square, leading the L'Enfant's great transverse, is now being transformed into the Navy Memorial, while 8th Street is half on its way to becoming a pedestrian mall. The semi-derelict Pension Office of a quarter century back is now the vibrant National Portrait Gallery and National Museum of American Art. The Committee has provided for the restoration of the original Post Office Building on the west side of 8th Street. At 9th Street we come upon the massive FBI building which J. Edgar Hoover moved back fifty feet to allow for the Avenue's plan. Then we come upon the magnificently restored Old Post Office. One of the first decisions of President Kennedy's committee was not to tear down the Post Office as the Federal Triangle plan would have done. The purpose was to keep access to the magnificent platform in the tower which gives the finest view of Washington to be had anywhere. In the intervening quarter century we have learned to recycle buildings, and now the Post Office interior is alive with restaurants and shops. A similar happy fate awaited the old Pension Building, now the National Building Museum. All along the way buildings have been recycled, notably the old Apex Liquor building as it was known, now a corporate headquarters. Just outside is the restored Temperance Fountain dedicated in the minds of many to Nathanial Alexander Owings. The Washington Star Building is being redone, and next to it is the first building in which private owners voluntarily followed the "set back" scheme for a plante sidewalk. Western Plaza, with fair success, faces the equally modest achievement of the Marriott Hotel. But at 14th Street we come upon glory indeed with the reopened Willard Hotel, in ways the queen of the Avenue. The redone National Press Building is a great success, and a good case for not tearing things down too quickly. Pershing Square is a triumph. And now we shall have the International Cultural and Trade Center on 14th Street. It will be the City's largest—and let us hope one of its best designed—buildings on the site of what the Ad Hoc Committee described in 1962 as "a parking lot of surpassing ugliness." It is what he hoped would be done. It has been worth doing.

After a quarter century I believe our work is done and respectfully ask to be relieved. Before concluding, however, I wish to express special appreciation to Honorable Harry C. McPherson, Jr., who, as Counsel to President Johnson ensured that this enterprise was not lost in the difficult days that followed the death of President Kennedy, and also to President Richard M. Nixon who determined that it would indeed go forward. It is especially satisfying that we have ended up not merely saving the center of Washington, but saving almost a third of a trillion dollars in rent money as well.

It paid for itself!

SUMMARY OF MAJOR PROVISIONS

This bill authorizes development of a federal office complex and international cultural and trade center on the federal triangle site at 14th St. and Pennsylvania Avenue N.W. The building will be built on a "lease-to-own" plan, whereby the federal government's lease payments over a thirty year lease term will pay for the cost of constructing the building. At the end of thirty years, the federal government will own the building in fee simple—no payments in addition to the rent over the thirty years will be necessary. This method of financing will save the Federal Government $281 million—almost a third of a billion—over the thirty year lease.

The primary agencies involved in planning and building this center will be the General Services Administration (GSA), Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation (Corporation) and a Presidential Commission, the International Cultural and Trade Center Commission (Commission). The Departments of State, National Capital Planning Commission and Commission of Fine Arts will have advisory roles. The bill mandates specific roles for these entities to ensure that the complex is of monumental quality, appropriate to the distinguished setting of the federal triangle.

Members of the Committee have long been concerned over escalating rents which the federal government pays for leased space. At the end of the lease term, often the landlord dramatically increases the rent to the federal government, which is somewhat of a "captive" tenant. The government must choose between this higher rent and a costly move to perhaps equally expensive or less desirably located space elsewhere.

Rents for the federal government in the National Capital region have increased by 30 percent over the last two years alone. The annual federal government's rental bill is about $1.4 billion currently, up from about $400 million in 1970. Without decisive action by Congress, the federal rental bill will reach $2 billion annually by the end of the century. Within the next 10 years, 95 percent of the federal office leases will come up for renewal.

In the 1960's, the federal government stopped constructing buildings, partly over concern about annual spending. In the short run, it appeared less expensive to appropriate funds for an annual lease payment, than to appropriate the entire cost of constructing a building up front. Now, however, the federal government is paying for this "creative accounting," as the statistics cited demonstrate. The Committee believes that the federal government once again must start to build office buildings, to ensure that the government not be at the mercy of escalating rents, and to guarantee that safe, comfortable working environments are provided to federal employees. The Committee intends that the international cultural and trade center be a model for future projects of this kind.

GSA's current housing plan calls for the Justice Department, the Securities and Exchange Commission, the Treasury, and State Departments to occupy the federal office portion of the complex. This project and other actions in the District will permit major consolidations of Treasury, Justice and State.

Treasury from 38 buildings to 4.

Justice from 26 buildings to 3.

State from 16 buildings to 3.

The benefits from these consolidations will include increased efficiency and decreased need for transportation of employees from location to location.

Next to the Pentagon, which has 3.8 million occupiable square feet, this will be the second largest federal building in the nation, and the largest building in the District of Columbia. According to GSA's estimates, this building will provide about 1.9 million occupiable square feet; 1.4 million square feet for the federal uses, and 500,000 square feet for the International Cultural and Trade Center (ICTC).

The ICTC will house foreign missions, international, state and local agencies concerned with trade, and government sponsored organizations supporting cultural exchanges. The ICTC Commission will determine appropriate tenants and uses for the center, in conjunction with the State Department and GSA Administrator.

At the hearing on this matter held May 1, 1987, the Committee received enthusiastic support for the center from representatives of the State Department, Commerce Department, U.S. Information Agency, diplomatic community, the Mayor of Washington, D.C., and the Federal City Council. The Committee believes that the center, if properly leased and operated, will enhance opportunities for American trade, commerce, communications, and cultural exchanges, and thus complement the work of Federal, State and Local agencies in the areas of international trade and cultural activities.

The House Public Works and Transportation Committee, led by Chairman James J. Howard and Subcommittee Chairman Fofo I.F. Sunia, and ranking minority Members, Representatives John Paul Hammerschmidt and Guy v. Molinari, held a hearing on this proposal July 22, 1987. Chairman Howard hopes to pass the Senate bill expeditiously once it is received from the Senate. The Committee on Environment and Public Works appreciates this cooperation on this important undertaking.

SAVINGS TO THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

This method of financing will save the Federal Government $281 million—almost a third of a billion—over the thirty year lease. According to GSA, the total construction cost for the building will be $362 million. The cost of the lease for the federal office portion of the complex to GSA will be $38 million/year. Comparable space in the private market would cost $50 million/year, according to GSA. When the building is ready

for occupancy in 1993, this lease cost for the federal office portion computes to $27.00 per square foot. The comparable cost in the private market would be $35.00 per square foot. These figures reflect GSA's assumption of 1.4 million occupiable square feet of federal office space.

For the ICTC portion of the lease, the cost will be $15.2 million per year. This is equivalent to $30.00 per square foot, slightly more than the federal office portion, due to special features of the space suitable for exhibits, displays, meetings, and security measures.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I am pleased to cosponsor S. 1559, completing the complex of Federal buildings at the Federal Triangle over which Chairman MOYNIHAN has labored so carefully.

I have had a longstanding interest in seeing this historical location used for a valuable public purpose.

The Public Buildings Act gave the Treasury Department under the guidance of the supervising architect the responsibility for developing the Federal Triangle.

In 1921, Secretary of the Treasury, Andrew Mellon, envisioned a complex of Federal buildings at this location. I am pleased that this legislation will recognize Ambassador Mellon's leadership in this effort by dedicating the historic auditorium as the "Andrew Mellon Auditorium."

Within that decade the area became the home of what is now the Federal Trade Commission, the Justice Department, Commerce Department, and others. For over 50 years the Congress has languished over various proposals to complete the Federal Triangle. Yet, today, this space is still used as a parking lot.

I commend the chairman for the creative financing plan proposed in the bill. Each year the Federal Government's lease payment will be contributed toward the cost of constructing the building and at the end of the 30-year-lease period the Federal Government will hold the sole title to the building. This approach is the beginning of freeing the Federal Government from the enormous rents we are obliged to pay to house our Federal workers.

For the American public, the International Cultural and Trade Center will provide a centralized passport and visa location. This will be a vast improvement over the current confusion the traveling public is put through to get a passport or visa.

I commend the Senator for diligent pursuit of this proposal and I am pleased to join as a copsonsor of S. 1550.

By Mr. INOUYE, from the Select Committee on Indian Affairs, with amendments:

S. 887: A bill to extend the authorization of appropriations for and to strengthen the provisions of the Older Americans Act of 1965, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 100-140).

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second time by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. WEICKER:

S. 1581. A bill to prohibit the importation of objects from the R.M.S. Titanic; considered and passed.

By Mr. WILSON (for himself and Mr. MCCAIN):

S. 1582. A bill to amend section 1876 of the Social Security Act to protect medicare beneficiaries enrolled in an eligible organization with a risk-sharing contract under such section against certain practices; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. GORE:

S. 1583. A bill for the relief of Maria Antonieta Heird; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REID:

S. 1584. A bill to assure compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. CHAFEE (for himself and Mr. STAFFORD):

S. 1585. A bill to provide financial assistance to local educational agencies to improve the educational opportunities of the Nation's children and adults by integrating early childhood education and adult education for parents into a unified program to be referred to as "Even Start"; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

By Mr. KERRY (for himself, Mr. WEICKER, Mr. STAFFORD, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. SIMON, and Mr. METZENBAUM):

S. 1586. A bill to provide financial assistance under the Education of the Handicapped Act to assist severely handicapped infants, children, and youth to improve their educational opportunities through the use of assistive device resource centers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

By Mr. D'AMATO:

S. 1587. A bill to authorize the minting of commemorative coins to support the training of American athletes participating in the 1988 Olympic Games; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. MITCHELL (for himself and Mr. COHEN):

S. Res. 267. A resolution to express the sense of the Senate that Rachel Carson is recognized on the twenty-fifth anniversary of her book "Silent Spring," for her outstanding contributions to public awareness and understanding of environmental issues; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. WILSON (for himself and Mr. MCCAIN):

S. 1582. A bill to amend section 1876 of the Social Security Act to protect Medicare beneficiaries enrolled in an eligible organization with a risk-sharing contract under such section against certain practices; to the Committee on Finance.

PROTECTING BENEFITS OF CERTAIN MEDICARE RECIPIENTS

Mr. WILSON. Mr. President, health maintenance organizations, or HMO's, are a new health care option for most older Americans. Although authority was given in the 1982 Tax Equity and Fiscal Responsibility Act for the Federal Government to contract with federally qualified health maintenance organization's and competitive medical plans [CMP's] it wasn't until 1985 that the office of prepaid health plans began to contract directly with HMO's for the care of Medicare beneficiaries. As a result, many HMO's have only recently become involved in the Medicare Risk-Sharing Program.

I have encouraged their growth because they are a cost-effective means of providing more health services than are usually covered under the traditional Medicare system plus supplemental insurance. Currently, the Health Care Financing Administration [HCFA] contracts with 156 HMO's and CMP's in 34 States. To date, these plans have enrolled nearly 937,000 Medicare consumers or approximately 3 percent of the 31 million Medicare beneficiaries.

I want to commend the administration for its efforts in developing and promoting competition through consumer choice, thus making available to beneficiaries the same options in health care delivery systems as are available to their fellow Americans under age 65. As I have indicated, this has been a very popular program with the seniors. Unfortunately, the popularity of this program has also caught the attention of a few unscrupulous individuals who seek to further their own selfish interests at the expense of the elderly and of those many legitimate providers who operate within the law. I wish to make it clear to my colleagues that while the problem does not appear to be systemic, still the incentives and potential for abuse exist, and, unfortunately, vulnerable seniors have been the victims of these abuses and continue to deserve and need protection against them.

The bill I am introducing contains the following provisions:

First, the bill would require those organizations with HCFA risk-sharing contracts to notify potential Medicare consumers that the organization can by law choose to refuse to renew it's contract with HCFA when it comes up for renewal. Currently, there is no requirement for eligible organizations—that is, HMO's—to notify the elderly consumer prior to enrolling him in a health plan that he may be disenrolled from the plan should the organization decide not to renew it's contract. This required notification will

91-059 O-89-15 (Pt. 16)

make the consumer aware of the possibility of disenrollment and assist Medicare beneficiaries in deciding whether to choose the HMO or Medicare as the health plan that is most likely to meet their needs.

Second, the bill imposes civil monetary penalties and intermediate sanctions on an eligible organization with risk-sharing contracts which:

First. Fails to provide medically necessary items and services if the failure has adversely affected the individual; or

Second. Charges an individual a greater premium than is permitted; or

Third. Acts to expel or to refuse to re-enroll an individual for medical reasons; or

Fourth. Engages in any practice that denies or discourages an individual whose medical condition or history indicates a need for future medical services; or

Fifth. And misrepresents or falsifies information to the Secretary of HHS or the individual, or enrolls an individual without the individual's knowledge or consent or makes a material inducement to the individual.

Currently, the only authority HCFA possesses to punish abusive marketing practices is to terminate the organization's contract. Although this authority is necessary, I believe the intermediate sanctions I am proposing are more appropriate for the less severe sharp marketing practices and better serve the needs of the elderly who would otherwise be the ones punished by a contract termination which leaves the HMO enrollee effectively disenrolled and once again in need of a health care program.

Third, the bill prevents the Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services [DHHS] from entering into or renewing a contract with any eligible organization in a State that does not require the licensure of those individuals who solicit the enrollment of an individual. The results of a survey of the 50 States and the District of Columbia in June 1986, by the Illinois and Indiana Departments of Insurance reveal the following results regarding the solicitation or sale of HMO products.

Nineteen States presently require some degree of licensure for agents soliciting on behalf of HMO's. The remaining 31 States and the District of Columbia are without licensing requirements. Of these, 16 States have the statutory authority to promulgate the rules and regulations necessary for the licensing of HMO agents but, as of the date of this survey, have chosen not to exercise this authority. Three other States have limited authority and the remaining 12 States and the District of Columbia are without any provisions for regulating the solicitation or sale of HMO products.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that material in connection with the licensure be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Re: Summary State Licensure requirements for agents soliciting HMO products.

To: NAIC/NAHMOR Joint Committee members

From: Shirley S. Hayes—Indiana Department of Insurance, David E. Grant—Illinois Department of Insurance.

The results of the survey of the 50 States and the District of Columbia reveal diverse positions on agent licensure, though the potential for consistency may exist in the event a standard is adopted by NAHMOR and the NAIC. The map attached divides the States into those which presently have some sort of licensure requirements and those which do not. Also attached is a brief statement of each State's licensure status.

Further analysis of the survey indicates 19 States presently require some degree of licensure for agents soliciting on behalf of HMO's. Of these, 11 require a special license for the HMO solicitor, 5 require a health license and 2 require a disability license. South Carolina requires all HMO solicitors be licensed; however, if they are salaried employees of the HMO, they are exempt from examination.

The remaining 31 States and the District of Columbia are without licensing requirements. Of these, 16 States have the statutory authority to promulgate the Rules and Regulations necessary for the licensing of HMO agents but as of the date of this survey, have chosen not to exercise this authority. Two States permit HMO's to enter contractual arrangements for the marketing of health plans, and one State requires solicitors be salaried employees of the HMO. The remaining 12 States and the District of Columbia are without any provisions for regulating the solicitation or sale of HMO products.

S.S.H.
D.E.G.

STATUS OF STATE LICENSURE REQUIREMENTS FOR AGENTS SOLICITATING HMO PRODUCTS

State	Licensure	Comments
1. Alabama	Yes	HMO must secure a Certificate of Authority for each agent writing or soliciting health care certificates.
2. Alaska	No	
3. Arkansas	Yes	Prior to performing solicitation activities, each agent must submit an application for licensure, pay a fee, and pass a written examination.
4. Arizona	Yes	The Commissioner has issued Rule and Regulation 35. An agent is a person directly or indirectly associated with a health care plan who engages in solicitation or enrollment.
5. California	No	
6. Colorado	No	The HMO may contract with any person for marketing, enrollment and administrative services. The Commissioner may promulgate reasonable Rules and Regulations as are necessary to provide for the licensing of agents.
7. Connecticut	No	
8. Delaware	No	The HMO may solicit enrolless and sell its services through its own employees, persons licensed or otherwise permitted to sell health insurance or persons licensed or otherwise permitted to sell the benefit program of a health service corporation.
9. Florida	No	
10. Georgia	Yes	Requires that each agent take and pass the examination required for an insurance agent in the accident and sickness lines or such other examination as may be prescribed by the Commissioner. No person shall act as an HMO agent without having passed the examination.
11. Hawaii	No	
12. Idaho	Yes	Agents or persons representing the organization in solicitation and negotiation of subscribers contracts shall qualify and be licensed as agents in accordance with procedures under Insurance Law for licensing of agents of disability insurers, with noted exceptions.
13. Illinois	No	The Director may promulgatge reasonable Rules and Regulations for the licensing of agents.
14. Indiana	Yes	Agents, solicitors, and brokers performing services for HMOs are subject to the laws governing the licensing of health insurance agents.
15. Iowa	No	The Commissioner of Insurance may promulgate Regulations to provide for the licensing of agents of an HMO.
16. Kansas	No	
17. Kentucky	No	The Commissioner of Insurance may promulgate the necessary Rules and Regulations for the licensing of agents.
18. Louisiana	No	
19. Maine	No	The Insurance Superintendent may promulgate Rules and Regulations for the licensing of agents.
20. Maryland	No	
21. Massachusetts	Yes	The Commissioner is authorized to regulate the licensing of agents.
22. Michigan	No	
23. Minnesota	Yes	Agents, solicitors, and brokers performing services for HMOs are subject to the laws governing the licensing of health insurance agents.
24. Mississippi	Yes	Agents of the corporation soliciting contracts must be certified by the Commissioner of Insurance.
25. Missouri	No	The HMO is permitted to enter into contracts for the provision of marketing and enrollment services.
26. Montana	No	
27. Nebraska	No	The Director of Insurance may issue Rules and Regulations governing the licensure of agents.
28. Nevada	Yes	No person may solicit or sell to any group or individual a plan that provides for comprehensive health care services unless such person has a valid license, issued by the Commissioner.

STATUS OF STATE LICENSURE REQUIREMENTS FOR AGENTS SOLICITATING HMO PRODUCTS—Continued

State	Licensure	Comments
29. New Hampshire	Yes	All persons engaged in the solicitation or enrollment of subscribers must be duly licensed agents for the sale of health insurance in the State.
30. New Jersey	No	The Commissioner of Health may promulgate such reasonable Rules and Regulations which have been approved by the Commissioner of Insurance, as are necessary to provide for the certification of agents.
31. New Mexico	Yes	Solicitation of enrollees in an HMO is handled by an agent who is appointed or employed by the HMO and licensed by the Superintendent.
32. New York	No	An HMO is prohibited from employing solicitors or accepting business from brokers on a commission basis. Solicitors must render their services as employees on a salaried basis.
33. North Carolina	No	The Commissioner may issue Rules and Regulations to provide for the licensing of agents.
34. North Dakota	No	The Commissioner may promulgate such reasonable Rules and Regulations as are necessary to provide for the licensing of agents.
35. Ohio	No	The Superintendent of Insurance may establish qualifications of agents and issue licenses to qualified applicants.
36. Oklahoma	No	The State Insurance Commissioner after notice in hearing may promulgate such reasonable Rules and Regulations as are necessary to provide for the licensing of agents.
37. Oregon	No	
38. Pennsylvania	Yes	Solicitors or agents shall meet such prerequisites as the Commissioner by Regulation shall require.
39. Rhode Island	No	An HMO is authorized to enter into contracts for marketing its health plan, enrollment and/or administration.
40. South Carolina	Yes	Regulations require all HMO solicitors be licensed however if they are salaried employees of the HMO they are exempt from examination.
41. South Dakota	No	The Director of the Division of Insurance may promulgate such reasonable Rules and Regulations as are necessary to provide for the licensing of agents.
42. Tennessee	Yes	Agents writing or soliciting contracts for the corporation must be certified by the Commissioner of Insurance.
43. Texas	Yes	Before making any solicitation for enrollment in an HMO, a person or other legal entity must have a valid HMO agents license.
44. Utah	No	The Commissioner may promulgate such reasonable Rules and Regulations as are necessary to provide for the licensing of agents.
45. Vermont	No	
46. Virginia	Yes	Enrollee contracts may be solicited outside of the principal office of an HMO only through licensed salesmen.
47. Washington	Yes	No person may act as or hold himself out to be an agent of an HMO unless licensed as a disability insurance agent by the State and appointed or authorized by the HMO on whose behalf solicitations are to be made.
48. West Virginia	No	The Commissioner is authorized to issue Regulations necessary to regulate marketing of HMOs by persons compensated directly or indirectly by the HMO.
49. Wisconsin	Yes	Chapter 628, regulating insurance marketing, provides for licensing of agents representing service insurance corporations.
50. Wyoming	No	The Insurance Commissioner may promulgate reasonable Rules and Regulations as necessary to provide for the licensing of agents.
51. District of Columbia	No	

Mr. WILSON. Mr. President, this provision should stimulate those States which have not yet adopted licensure of HMO marketing agents to do so promptly in order to protect their senior health care consumers.

This bill will protect the elderly from the many unscrupulous marketing techniques of those health maintenance organizations which have been guilty of sharp practices in seeking to attract Medicare recipients to their rolls.

As an example, some HMOs set up tables outside shopping malls, outside flea markets—even outside Social Security offices—to give free blood pressure tests to Medicare beneficiaries. To participate, the seniors are told they must give their names, Medicare numbers, and sign a form. What they aren't told is that what they are actually signing is an HMO enrollment application.

In other cases, Medicare beneficiaries are offered free gifts such as cameras as an inducement to sign enrollment forms. HMO marketing representatives pose as agents of the Government, or falsely advise beneficiaries that their current clinic is being closed and that they must enroll in the HMO which the HMO salesman is pitching.

Mr. President, there are many other abuses and I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a full list of the marketing abuses documented by HCFA and my staff.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEED FOR THE LEGISLATION

1. Tables are set up in shopping malls, flea markets, banks, outside Social Security offices, outside clinics, or at retirement hotels or community centers. Free blood pressure tests are offered to Medicare beneficiaries, who are required to provide their names and Medicare numbers and sign for the tests. They do not realize that they are signing an enrollment application when they sign for tests.

2. Door to door solicitation is conducted, seeking signatures for a "petition" having to do with something of interest to seniors such as medical cost containment, better housing, or expanding Medicare. The "petition" turns out to be an enrollment application.

3. Gifts such as cameras are offered as an inducement to sign such "petitions" or HMO enrollment applications in other forms.

4. Potential enrollees are solicited to sign a request for information or literature about an HMO, which request turns out to be a membership application.

5. Beneficiaries are misled by HMO agents to believe that the HMO plan is a supplement to regular Medicare or to their current plan, rather than a substitute for it.

6. Misrepresentations are made by the marketing representative that he represents the U.S. Government or a State Government, or another insurance company.

7. The beneficiary is told by the marketing representative that "if you'll just sign the form now, I won't turn it in until after you call me and tell me you want it."

8. HMO representatives misrepresent the lock in provision so that a beneficiary believes he can still use his own physician.

9. An enrollee is told by a marketing representative that his current clinic is being closed and he must choose another one, and then enrolls him in another HMO.

10. The beneficiary is induced to sign multiple applications, one of which is later submitted to re-enroll the beneficiary without his knowledge or consent.

11. A Social Security Office is called by an HMO agent, falsely identifying himself as a relative of a beneficiary to obtain information regarding the Medicare number and status of that beneficiary.

12. A beneficiary is photographed under the guise that he is being interviewed for a magazine article and is induced to sign what is said to be a "consent" form and to give his Social Security number. The "consent" form turns out to be an enrollment application.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. President, when Congress enacted the legislation that authorized the Health Care Financing Administration to contract with qualified health maintenance organizations and competitive medical plans to care for Medicare patients, it intended the system to efficiently and effectively deliver high quality medical care.

Quality health care must be the foundation of any health delivery system. I believe we have accomplished that objective with a large degree of success. However, with any new program, mistakes will be made. Although some safeguards were built into the program to assure that Medicare beneficiaries were protected from potential abuse, more can and must be done. That is what I hope to accomplish with this piece of legislation today. This bill will help to protect the

elderly from abusive and sharp marketing practices and give them the emotional as well as the physical security, which they deserve.

We in Congress, can no longer stand by and permit such abuses to be perpetrated on the elderly by unscrupulous marketing representatives. I urge my colleagues to join me in passing this legislation as quickly as possible.

Mr. President, I ask unamimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1582

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. NOTICE TO MEDICARE BENEFICIARIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1876(c)(3) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395mm(c)(3)) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subparagraph:

"(F)(i) Each eligible organization having a risk-sharing contract under this section shall notify individuals eligible to enroll with the organization under this section and individuals enrolled with the organization under this section that—

"(I) the organization is authorized by law to terminate or refuse to renew the contract, and

"(II) termination or nonrenewal of the contract may result in termination of the enrollments of individuals enrolled with the organization under this section.

"(ii) The notice required by clause (i) shall be included in—

"(I) any materials described in subparagraph (C) that are distributed by an eligible organization to individuals eligible to enroll under this section with the organization, and

"(II) any explanation provided to enrollees by the organization pursuant to subparagraph (E).".

(b) APPLICATION.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to contracts entered into (or renewed) on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 2. CIVIL MONEY PENALTIES AND INTERMEDIATE SANCTIONS FOR ELIGIBLE ORGANIZATIONS WITH RISK-SHARING CONTRACTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1876(i)(6) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395mm(i)(6)) is amended to read as follows:

"(6)(A) Any eligible organization with a risk-sharing contract under this section that—

"(i) fails substantially to provide medically necessary items and services that are required (under law or under the contract) to be provided to an individual covered under the contract, if the failure has adversely affected (or has a substantial likelihood of adversely affecting) the individual, is subject to a civil money penalty of not more than $25,000,

"(ii) charges an individual covered under the contract a greater premium than is permitted under this section, is subject to a civil money penalty of not more than $2,000 plus double the excess amount charged (and the excess amount charged shall be deducted from that penalty and returned to the individual),

"(iii) acts to expel or to refuse to re-enroll an individual in violation of the provisions of this section, is subject to a civil money penalty of not more than $15,000, for each incident,

"(iv) engages in any practice that would reasonably be expected to have the effect of denying or discouraging enrollment with the organization (except as permitted by this section) by eligible individuals whose medical condition or history indicates a need for substantial future medical services, is subject to a civil money penalty of not more than $100,000, plus $15,000 for each individual consequently not enrolled, or

"(v) misrepresents or falsifies enrollment information that is furnished to the Secretary, to an individual, or to any other entity, or enrolls an individual without the individual's knowledge or consent or after making a material inducement to the individual, is subject to a civil money penalty of not more than $15,000 for each incident (or, in the case of enrollment information furnished to the Secretary, not more than $100,000 for each incident).

"(B) The provisions of section 1128A (other than subsections (a) and (b)) shall apply to a civil money penalty under subparagraph (A) in the same manner as they apply to a civil money penalty under that section.

"(C) If the Secretary determines that an eligible organization has committed any of the violations specified in subparagraph (A), the Secretary, in addition to, or instead of, imposing a civil money penalty, may provide for the suspension of enrollment of individuals under this section or of payment to the organization under this section for individuals newly enrolled with the organization, after the date the Secretary notifies the organization of the violation.".

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall become effective at the end of the fourteen-day period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act and shall not apply to administrative proceedings commenced before the end of such period.

SEC. 3. LIMITATION ON CONTRACTS WITH ELIGIBLE ORGANIZATIONS.

(a) LIMITATION.—Section 1876 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395mm) is amended—

(1) in subsection (g)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking "The Secretary" and inserting in lieu thereof "Subject to paragraph (7), the Secretary", and

(B) by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(7) The Secretary may not enter into or renew a contract under this subsection with any eligible organization unless that organization is located in a State that requires any individual who—

"(A) is an employee or agent of an eligible organization with a risk-sharing contract under this subsection, and

"(B) solicits the enrollment of any individual under this section with the organization, to be licensed in accordance with procedures established by or pursuant to State law.", and

(2) in subsection (h)(1)—

(A) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) and (B) as clauses (i) and (ii), respectively,

(B) by inserting "(A)" after "(1)", and

(C) by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(B) The Secretary may not enter into or renew a contract under this subsection with any eligible organization that is located in a State that fails to meet the requirements of subsection (g)(7).".

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply to contracts entered into or renewed on or after January 1, 1990.

● Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, I rise today with my distinguished colleague from California, Senator WILSON, to introduce S. 1582. The purpose of this legislation is to provide the Health Care Financing Administration [HCFA] the authority to protect older Americans from possible abuses arising from the sales and operations of health maintenance programs targeted toward Medicare eligible Americans.

In 1982, through the Tax Equity and Fiscal Responsibility Act, Congress gave HCFA the authority to contract with health maintenance organizations [HMO's] and competitive medical plans [CMP's] in order to make this kind of prepaid plan option available to Medicare beneficiaries. It was not until 1985, however, that HCFA actually began contracting with HMO's and CMP's for the care of Medicare beneficiaries. Since that time, close to 1 million seniors have enrolled in these prepaid plans.

This was a positive move due to the fact that this capitated approach—paying one preset amount for each enrollee rather than paying on a fee-for-service basis—is such a cost-effective way of providing health care services. This approach in fact, appears to be a more cost effective way to provide health care services than through the traditional Medicare system, with an added supplemental plan. Perhaps this is the direction that the entire Medicare system will eventually move.

Mr. President, in Arizona we've been experimenting with a capitated approach to providing care for our State's poor. Rather than utilizing the traditional fee-for-service Medicaid Program, Arizona and the Federal Government entered into a contractual agreement and established the Arizona health care cost containment system—or AHCCS for short. This Medicaid demonstration project has been a success. Not only has it facilitated the providing of care to Arizona's poor, it has been a financial success—saving the State of Arizona and the Federal Government millions of dollars each year. Capitated health care programs may be the way of the future in terms of Government provided health care coverage.

The administration deserves to be commended for its efforts in developing and promoting the HMO concept for the Medicare-eligible population. As we have witnessed in just 2 years of operation, this competitive, consumer choice program has become very popular among seniors. The popularity of the program, however, has led to some abuse by a few quick profit solicitors.

These unscrupulous individuals have illustrated that a potential for abuse does exist due in large part to a lack of effective means to deal with individuals who desire to operate in such a self-serving manner.

While some safeguards were built into the program at the time of its inception, I believe we can and should do more to protect older Americans from the potential of abuse. Specifically, I think we need to do three things—all of which are addressed in this legislation we are introducing today.

First, we need to require eligible organizations to inform potential enrollees, prior to enrolling in the health plan, that they may be disenrolled from the plan should the organization decide not to renew its contract.

This will serve to promote greater consumer awareness, providing the consumer—up front—with all of the information they need to know in order to make a wise and informed decision regarding the selection of health care coverage.

Second, we need to give HCFA the authority to impose civil monetary penalties and/or intermediate sanctions on those organizations with risk sharing contracts who: Fail to provide medically necessary items and services, resulting in an adverse affect on the enrollee; charge an individual a greater premium than is permitted; expel or refuse to reenroll an individual for medical reasons; deny or discourage an individual from enrolling whose medical condition or history indicates a need for future medical services; or misrepresent or falsify information to the Department of Health and Human Services or the individual; enroll an individual without the individual's knowledge or consent; or tries to induce an individual into enrolling by offering material goods.

The only enforcement authority HCFA currently possesses in responding to marketing abuses is the termination of the organization's contract. There are many scenarios where such action many not be warranted, but where action must still be taken. The reality of terminating a contract is that seniors lose their health care plan. By providing HCFA with the flexibility and authority to impose lesser sanctions and/or penalties, we provide more effective ability to address such abuses.

Third, we ought to prevent the Secretary of HHS from entering into a renewing a contract with any eligible organization in a State that does not require the licensure of those individuals participating in enrollment solicitations. This would facilitate compliance on the part of salesmen with accepted marketing practices in the solicitation or potential enrollees.

The State of Arizona as well as 18 other States already require licensure. Of the other 31 States, 16 have the authority to promulgate such rules and regulations. Requiring licensure nationwide certainly would be a positive move.

Mr. President, the capitated approach to providing health care coverage ought to remain an option for seniors. The existence of this option is threatened whenever unscrupulous individuals attempt to take advantage of the system. We must give HCFA the tools to deal effectively with such individuals. Hopefully, the mere existence of such tools serve as a deterence to those who would even flaunt with the thought of making a fast buck at the expense and well-being of others.

I urge my colleagues to seriously consider this legislation and lend their support toward its adoption.●

By Mr. REID:

S. 1584. A bill to assure compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

AIRSPACE PROTECTION ACT

● Mr. REID. Mr. President, as an eagle soars over Nevada he beholds scenes of wonder as far as his his eyes can scan.

Wheeling over her snowcapped mountain ranges he can marvel at the Ruby Mountains, and the Sierra Nevada's towering fortress. He can swing upward through the drafts rising from the Black Rock and Mojave Deserts, with their vast expanse of dunes, and the joshua trees marching in prehistoric order. After a sudden summer rainstorm, he can smell the scent of sage warting from the valley floors sweeter than any perfume that could be devised by the poor hand of man.

And suddenly, out of the still desert air, he can detect the scream of mighty jet engines. Our Nation's aerial power bursts through the desert silence as fighters roar across the desert flats at low level, and twist suddenly upward to the Sun in an awesome display of the combination of technical ability and human skill which protects our Nation.

Those aircraft, flying from bases at Nellis, Indian Springs, and Fallon, contribute extraordinarily to the defense of America and the free world. It is over those desert ranges that our pilots hone their skills; it is in Nevada's desert air that they experience the anxiety and stress of aerial combat in a war without weapons. It is because those aerial battles take place that we can rest assured that the quality of our pilots is second to none on the face of this globe.

The still desert air with all its beauty, and the sudden scream of jet engines. Can the two coexist? Can we protect our Nation's vital interests, and yet still prevent the destruction of the very land those aircraft exist to preserve? I believe we can.

To protect both those interests, however, we must first resolve a serious problem occurring in the the United States, particularly in the West: the wholesale giveaway of airspace to the Department of Defense.

Airspace withdrawal is currently an administrative process which consists of the Secretary of Defense submitting a proposal to the Secretary of Transportation who, up until now, has acted as little more than a rubber stamp for DOD's requests. Airspace withdrawal not only restricts direct routes for civilian and commerical flights, but also has a significant effect on the health and safety of the people who live below or near the withdrawn area.

In the case of designated low-altitude supersonic areas [SOA's], hundreds of sonic booms per day are being reported. The long-term effect on residents of high volume exposure to sonic booms is still under study. For some, however, the situation has created intolerable living conditions.

I do not question the necessity of restricted airspace so that the military can conduct mock aerial combat, bombing practice and flight testing, nor do I doubt the good will of the military, especially the staff at NAS Fallon, in dealing with the problem. However, the process must become one in which the Department of Defense seriously takes into account the impact upon the environment, including human safety.

In my discussions with citizens, I have heard more and more complaints about the overwhelming and unchecked militarization of the public lands and the airspace above that land.

Conveying that sentiment, I testified 2 years ago before the House Public Lands Subcommittee on the illegal acquisition of the Navy's Bravo-20 bombing range in Nevada. I reminded the Navy that withdrawing land over 5,000 acres must be done by an act of Congress as stated in the Engle Act of 1958, and that until an act is passed the public has a right to enter that land.

In researching the airspace issue, I found there was no definitive law concerning its restrictions. That is why 2 years ago I introduced H.R. 1584. That bill would have required congressional approval whenever the Department of Defense created any restriction on airspace over nonmilitary public land.

I continued that effort last year, by introducing H.R. 4413, which again emphasized the problem of airspace restrictions over public lands.

During my time in this honorable body, I have been made increasingly aware that the problem is not just with airspace restrictions over public lands. The problem exists over both public and private lands. Simply put,

the problem involves airspace above the entire Nation. The problem, therefore, affects all Americans.

Aerial thunder and the use restrictions on our land are becoming extremely important to Americans, particularly those in the Western United States. In Nevada, the military currently restricts almost 20 million acres of airspace.

I am convinced of the necessity of airspace withdrawals for the sort of flight training and testing which is done on the Nevada ranges. At the same time, however, citizens have been subjected increasingly to low-altitude supersonic flights by the military. These types of flights have had a significant adverse impact.

Based on the realization that there was indeed a national problem, I broadened the scope of my legislative thrust to offer protection to all Americans. Today I am offering that legislation. I feel it will provide that protection. Yet, I also feel it is also limited enough to allow the military to be able to successfully perform its vital duties in the defense of our Nation.

My bill is called the Airspace Protection Act. By introducing this bill, I hope to balance the needs of America's defense against the need to preserve the land which that defense is designed to protect.●

By Mr. CHAFEE (for himself and Mr. STAFFORD):

S. 1585. A bill to provide financial assistance to local educational agencies to improve the educational opportunities of the Nation's children and adults by integrating early childhood education and adult education for parents into a unified program to be referred to as "Even Start"; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

EVEN START ACT

● Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, the persistence of illiteracy in this country is one of the largest challenges we face. One of the most tragic aspects of illiteracy is that it tends to be passed from one generation to the next. Today, together with Senators PELL and STAFFORD, I am introducing legislation to break this cycle.

Over 60 million adults in this country—or one-third of the adult Population—reads below the ninth grade level. Consider the kinds of basic survival information that would be out of reach: Public housing leases, phone bills, food stamp applications, job manuals, even the antidote instructions on a can of Drano—all of which require reading abilities above the ninth grade level.

Even more tragic is that many of these adults will—despite their best intentions—pass their literacy problems on to their children. Lacking the intellectual stimulation that is crucial during the early years of life, the children of nonreaders tend to grow up to be nonreaders as well. They enter school at a distinct disadvantage in comparison to children from reading household, and fall still further behind as their school years progress. Their parents are at a loss to offer even the most basic help—much less to get actively involved in their child's schooling. What we need to do is to give these parents help, and give their children an even start at school—an even start on literacy.

The bill I'm introducing today, the Even Start Act, seeks to break the cycle by funding literacy programs targeted specifically at nonreading parents and their preschool-age children. The kinds of projects funded under this bill would combine adult and early childhood education in innovative ways. In an Even Start Program, parents would not only learn to read along with their children—they would also learn how to be their children's first teacher. They would, for the first time, get the tools to be true participants in their children's education.

This bill would authorize $30 million for Even Start projects in the first year, and such sums as may be necessary in the 4 subsequent years. These projects would be collaborative efforts between schools, libraries, community organizations, Head Start providers, JTPA agencies, and adult education organizations. Eligible for services would be families residing in chapter 1 eligible school attendance areas: specifically, nonreading parents and their children between the ages of 1 and 7.

The purpose of the Even Start Act is to spur a wide variety of parent-child literacy programs, particularly those that:

Involve parents and children together, providing instruction to both in the same setting or in the home where possible; use a variety of nonschool settings, since school, to the nonreading adult, can be a symbol of failure; and make maximum use of the literacy resources the community already has: Rather than supercede or compete with existing services, Even Start projects should build on these services.

Some may question the need for a new literacy program. First of all, Federal funding for literacy efforts is a far cry from the all-out effort that is needed. It amounts to about $350 million every year—or about $5.83 for each nonreader. When you consider the enormous social and personal costs of illiteracy, it is clear that we need to do more.

Second, Even Start tackles a very specific facet of illiteracy: The dilemma of parents who are unable to help their children succeed in school because fo their own literacy problems.

Imagine the anguish of parents who know they should be reading to their preschooler, but can't; who can't interpret or reply to notes from teachers or school bulletins; and who must stand helplessly by while their children try to handle school's challenges all alone. Imagine the child who gets no reinforcement at home for what he or she learns in school.

Even Start programs would address both sides of this problem by using a joint parent/child approach. This is something quite new, but where it has been done, it has been phenomenally successful. This is because nonreaders who are the parents of young children have not only a tremendous need to learn to read—they also have a tremendous incentive. In my view, the joint parent/child approach is so promising that it warrants a concerted effort, in the form of a nationwide program. It offers us our best hope for breaking the inexorable cycle in which illiteracy is handed down from one generation to the next.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the Even Start Act and a summary of the bill be printed in the RECORD at this point. I urge my colleagues to lend their support to this effort, and hope that the Senate will see fit to act swiftly upon it.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1585

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited a the "Even Start Act".

PROGRAM AUTHORIZED

SEC. 2. The Education Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981 is amended—

(1) by redesignating chapter 3 as chapter 4; and

(2) by adding after chapter 2 the following new chapter:

"CHAPTER 3—EVEN START PROGRAMS

"STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

"SEC. 590A. It is the purpose of this chapter to improve the educational opportunities of the Nation's children and adults by integrating early childhood education and adult education for parents into a unified program to be referred to as "Even Start", to be implemented through cooperative projects that build on existing community resources.

"GRANT ALLOCATION

"SEC. 590B. (a) STATE ALLOCATION.—Except as provided in subsections (b) and (c), each State shall be eligible to receive a grant under this chapter in each fiscal year that bears the same ratio to the amount appropriated for this chapter in that fiscal year as the amount allocated under section 111 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as incorporated by reference in chapter 1 of this Act, to local educational agencies in the State bears to the total amount allocated to such agencies in all States.

"(b) STATE MINIMUM.—

"(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), no State shall receive more than 5 percent or less than three-fourths of one percent of

the amount appropriated for this chapter for any fiscal year.

"(2) Subject to the availability of appropriations, no State shall receive less than $100,000 for any fiscal year.

"USES OF FUNDS

"SEC. 590C. (a) IN GENERAL.—Funds made available to local educational agencies under this chapter shall be used to pay the Federal share of the cost of providing family-centered education programs which involve parents and children in a cooperative effort to help parents become full partners in the education of their children and to assist children in reaching their full potential as learners.

"(b) PROGRAM ELEMENTS.—Each program assisted under this chapter shall include—

"(1) the identification and recruitment of eligible children;

"(2) screening and preparation of parents and children for participation, including testing, referral to necessary counseling, and related services;

"(3) design of programs and provision of support services (when unavailable from other sources) appropriate to the participants' work and other responsibilities, including—

"(A) scheduling and location of services to allow joint participation by parents and children;

"(B) child care; and

"(C) transportation;

"(4) the establishment of instructional programs that promote adult literacy, training parents to support the education and growth of their children, and preparation of children for success in regular school programs;

"(5) provision of special training to enable staff to develop the skills necessary to work with parents and young children in the full range of instructional services offered through this chapter (including child care staff in programs enrolling children of participants under this chapter on a space available basis);

"(6) provision of and monitoring of integrated instructional services to participating parents and children through home-based programs; and

"(7) coordination of programs assisted under this chapter with programs assisted under chapter 1, the Adult Education Act, the Job Training Partnership Act, and with the Head Start program, volunteer literacy programs, and other relevant programs.

"(c) FEDERAL SHARE LIMITATION.—The Federal share under this chapter may be—

"(1) not more than 80 percent of the total cost of the program in the first year of the local educational agency receives assistance under this chapter,

"(2) 60 percent in the second such year,

"(3) 40 percent in the third such year, and

"(4) 20 percent in the fourth and any subsequent such year.

The non-Federal share may be obtained from any available source (including Federal, State, and local programs and part A of this chapter).

"ELIGIBLE PARTICIPANTS

"SEC. 590D. Eligible participants in a program assisted by a local educational agency under this chapter may be a parent and child from a family that includes—

"(1) a parent who is eligible for participation in an adult basic education program under the Adult Education Act; and

"(2) a child aged 1 to 7, inclusive, who resides in a school attendance area designated for participation in programs under chapter 1.

"APPLICATIONS

"SEC. 590E. (a) SUBMISSION.—To be eligible to receive a grant a local educational agency shall submit an application to the State educational agency in such form and containing or accompanied by such information as the State educational agency may require.

"(b) REQUIRED DOCUMENTATION.—Each such application shall include documentation that the local educational agency has the qualified personnel required—

"(1) to develop, administer, and implement the program required by this chapter, and

"(2) to provide special training necessary to prepare staff for the program.

"(c) PLAN.—Each such application shall also include a plan of operation for the program which includes—

"(1) a description of the program goals;

"(2) a description of the activities and services which will be provided under the program (including training and preparation of staff);

"(3) a description of the population to be served and an estimate of the number of participants;

"(4) a statement of the methods which will be used—

"(A) to ensure that the programs will serve those eligible participants most in need of the activities and services provided by this chapter;

"(B) to provide services under this chapter to special populations, such as individuals with limited English proficiency and individuals with handicaps; and

"(C) to encourage participants to remain in the programs for a time sufficient to meet program goals; and

"(5) a description of the methods by which the applicant will coordinate programs under this chapter with programs under part A of this chapter, the Adult Education Act, the Job Training Partnership Act, and with Head Start programs, volunteer literacy programs, and other relevant programs.

"AWARD OF GRANTS

"SEC. 590F. (a) SELECTION PROCESS.—Each State educational agency shall award grants on the basis of proposals which—

"(1) are most likely to be successful in meeting the goals of this chapter;

"(2) are serving areas of the State in greatest need of services provided under this chapter;

"(3) demonstrate the greatest degree of cooperation and coordination between a variety of relevant service providers in all phases of the program;

"(4) submit budgets which appear reasonable, given the scope of the proposal;

"(5) demonstrate the local educational agency's ability to provide the non-Federal share of the cost of the program as required by section 590C(c);

"(6) are representative of urban and rural regions of the State; and

"(7) show the greatest promise for providing models which may be transferred to other local educational agencies.

"(b) DURATION.—Grants may be awarded for a period not to exceed 4 years.

"EVALUATION

"SEC. 590G. (a) INDEPENDENT ANNUAL EVALUATION.—The Secretary shall provide for the annual independent evaluation of programs under this chapter to determine their effectiveness in providing—

"(1) services to special populations;

"(2) adult education services;

"(3) parent training;

"(4) home-based programs involving parents and children;

"(5) coordination with related services programs; and

"(6) training of related personnel in appropriate skill areas.

"(b) CRITERIA.—

"(1) Evaluations shall be conducted by individuals not directly involved in the administration of the program or project operation under this chapter. Such independent evaluators and the program administrators shall jointly develop evaluation criteria which provide for appropriate analysis of the factors under subsection (a). When possible, evaluations shall include comparisons with appropriate control groups.

"(2) In order to determine a program's effectiveness in achieving its stated goals, the evaluations shall contain objective measures of such goals and, whenever feasible, shall obtain the specific views of program participants about such programs.

"(c) REPORT TO CONGRESS AND DISSEMINATION.—The Secretary shall prepare and submit to the Congress an annual review and summary of the results of such evaluations. The annual evaluations shall be submitted to the national diffusion network in the form required for consideration, for possible dissemination.

"AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

"SEC. 590H. There are authorized to be appropriated $30,000,000 for fiscal year 1988 and such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 1989, 1990, 1991, 1992, and 1993 to carry out the provisions of this chapter.".

SUMMARY: THE EVEN START ACT OF 1987

Purpose: To break the generational cycle of illiteracy by funding innovative literacy programs for non-reading parents of very young children. These children often start school at a disadvantage in relation to children from reading households, and fall still further behind as their school years progress. Their parents are at a loss to help, because of their own literacy problems.

By providing literacy training in these crucial early years, we will enable parents to participate in their children's education for the first time, and thus to give them an "even start" at school.

Funding: $30 million in the first year; such sums as may be necessary in each of the five succeeding years.

Allocation to States: States would receive Even Start allocations in proportion to their Chapter One allocations. The states would then review proposals for Even Start projects: collaborative efforts by schools, libraries, community organizations, Head Start providers, JTPA agencies, and adult education organizations to provide parent/child literacy instruction.

Grantees; required coordination with other literacy services: In these collaborative efforts, the school would serve as the umbrella organization: that is, the school would actually apply for and receive an Even Start grant on behalf of all the other entities. This does not mean that the schools would necessarily be the focus of Even Start activities; the intent of the program is to provide for maximum coordination with other literacy resources and maximum flexibility in the type of services offered. Rather than supersede or compete

with existing services. Even Start projects should *build* on these services.

Federal/State match: Applications showing the most promise would be funded for 4 years, with a declining federal share each year: 80 percent, 60 percent, 40 percent, 20 percent. The purpose here is to encourage Even Start grantees to become self-sufficient, so that the programs would continue to exist after federal funds are withdrawn and given to other worthy applicants.

Eligible participants in even start programs: Non-reading parents and their children (between the ages of 1 and 7) who reside in Chapter one-eligible attendance areas. (About 64% of RI's school districts are Chapter One-eligible.)●

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. President, I am pleased to join the Senator from Rhode Island as a cosponsor of the Even Start Act. This program addresses the critical problem of illiteracy in our country in a very unique and promising way. Even Start combines adult education for parents with limited skills, and school readiness training for their young children into a single educational program.

During the 99th Congress, the Senate Subcommittee on Education, Arts and Humanities and the House Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary and Vocational Education, held a series of hearings on the issues surrounding illiteracy in the United States. We found that 23 million adult Americans, or 1 in every 5, are functionally illiterate as defined by the simplest test of everyday reading, writing, and comprehension. Illiteracy is found in every segment of society, and despite the many exemplary Federal, public, and private activities which provide literacy skills, we still have many more people to reach. We have yet to meet the needs of the unemployed, dislocated workers, housewives entering the job market, retired persons, or the close to 1 million teenagers who drop out of high school each year.

It is this Senator's belief that the Even Start Act is a way in which we can break the cycle of illiteracy by bringing parents and children together to learn. Parents with children between the ages of 1 and 7 from school attendance areas where the literacy problem is the greatest, may acquire the skills necessary to prepare their children for school and enhance their children's educational achievement at home.

I am pleased to rise in support of this bill today, and urge my colleagues to join me in cosponsoring this worthy and promising piece of legislation.

By Mr. KERRY (for himself, Mr. WEICKER, Mr. STAFFORD, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. SIMON, and Mr. METZENBAUM):

S. 1586. A bill to provide financial assistance under the Education of the Handicapped Act to assist severely handicapped infants, children, and youth to improve their educational opportunities through the use of assistive device resource centers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

TECHNOLOGY TO EDUCATE CHILDREN WITH HANDICAPS ACT

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I rise to introduce a very important piece of legislation on behalf of myself and Senators WEICKER, STAFFORD, KENNEDY, SIMON, and METZENBAUM, all of whom have a long and distinguished record in helping to improve the lives of citizens with disabilities.

This legislation will really make a positive difference in the lives of children with special needs. The Technology to Educate Children With Handicaps Act or the "Tech" bill, which I might add has been endorsed by over 20 national organizations who represent citizens with disabilities, establishes assistive device resource centers in each State. The purpose of these centers is to act as a resource so that handicapped children, through the use of technology, can gain more independence in the classroom and more independence in their social activities.

In our society from the very first day that a physically challenged infant is born, a host of barriers confront him. And parents of handicapped children are forced to face restrictions in their everyday lives. I cannot tell you the number of times that I have heard from parents about how they must devote each waking hour to making sure that their child is getting a fair and appropriate education; and often being too exhausted to offer any time to other children or even a spouse. But, why does that situation frequently occur? Basically, it is the fear of the unknown. Educators often are afraid of what they do not understand. Children who are nonverbal, children who use wheelchairs and children who have no control over the use of their arms and legs can be quite intimidating to someone who has not had the opportunity to learn about the unlimited potential that a handicapped child possesses.

The legislation that we are introducing today is designed to eliminate the uncomfortable, unfortunate and frankly, unnecessary educational barriers that face our special needs children through the use of technology. In Massachusetts alone, there are approximately 130,000 children who can benefit from the "Tech" bill and nationally the number is close to 4.5 million. The legislation amends the Education of the Handicapped Act by including a new discretionary program. It authorizes $20 million in fiscal year 1988, and the authorization is extended for 3 years. It also includes a State match of 30 percent the first year and then 35 percent and 40 percent for fiscal year 1990. The purpose of the "Tech" bill is to ensure that handicapped children have the opportunity to reach their educational potential through the use of assistive device technology which will enable them to maximize their learning capability. Whether it is the most advanced microcomputer to help a child communicate or a special seating system so that a child can sit up straight and participate in activities around him, assistive devices can mean the difference between sitting alone in a corner of a classroom or joking and playing with a fellow classmate.

Assistive device resource centers provide a number of services to handicapped children and their families. The centers will set up statewide service delivery systems. The centers assess the needs of, and train specialists to assess the needs of handicapped children, in order to determine what type of assistive device is most appropriate for a child in order to help him get the most out of school. Once it is decided what kind of assistive device is right for a child the center will help find funding for the assistive device. Whether it is working with a computer company to have one donated, contacting a private insurer or work out a payment scheme, grants under the Education of the Handicapped Act or even Medicaid funds, the resource center will help parents and their children get an assistive device. The resource center is there to train parents and educators in how to use assistive devices so that they feel comfortable with the device. The resource center will provide followup services with the schools and families to make sure that everything is going well. And then when a child outgrows his device and is ready to move on to more advanced equipment, the resource center is there to help find new equipment, and to act as a sort of clearinghouse for the old equipment so that another child can use the assistive device. And finally assistive device resource centers will disseminate information throughout the States on assistive devices and their availability.

Our Nation has entered the high-technology age. We have reached an era that is dominated by sophisticated computer technology. At a time when every classroom and many households have personal computers it seems particularly appropriate for handicapped children who can benefit most from such technology be able to access it. We have universities and advanced hospitals who have already demonstrated the success of assistive device technology. Let's offer them a boost. Let's take the models that we have in various parts of the country and apply their expertise nationwide, and therefore offer these excellent services to all handicapped children throughout America.

Before I close I would like to briefly tell you about a Massachusetts resi-

dent who I met this morning. His name is Ricky Hoyt. He has cerebral palsy, is nonverbal, has limited mobility, and uses a wheel chair. When I met Ricky, through the use of his synthesized talking computer activated by a head switch, Ricky told me what assistive devices have meant to him. After years of frustration of not being able to communicate he now can. He has an active social and recreational life. Rick and his father have been in the Boston marathon several times and currently Rick is attending Boston University and getting a degree in rehabilitation engineering and counseling. Rick told me that assistive devices have made this all possible and that he plans to devote his efforts to ensure that the "Tech" bill is enacted into law.

Mr. President, I thank my distinguished colleagues for their support of the "Tech" bill. I look forward to technology hearings this fall in the Subcommittee on the Handicapped, and I urge my colleagues to join this effort which will really make a tremendous difference to handicapped children. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD. I also ask for unanimous consent that a list of the national organizations who have endorsed the "Tech" bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1586

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Technology To Educate Children With Handicaps Act".

FINDING; DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

SEC. 2. (a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that assistive devices are beneficial in helping severely handicapped infants, children, and youth improve their educational performance and increase their interaction with other handicapped and nonhandicapped children in the least restrictive environment.

(b) PURPOSE.—Therefore, it is the purpose of this Act to provide financial assistance for the establishment of assistive device resource centers in each State to allow severely handicapped infants, toddlers, children, and youths to reach their maximum potential in least restrictive environments.

ASSISTIVE DEVICE RESOURCE CENTERS PROGRAM AUTHORIZED

SEC. 3. (a) PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.—Part G of the Education of the Handicapped Act is amended—

(1) by inserting before section 661 the following:

"Subpart 1—General Authority"; and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following new subpart:

"Subpart 2—Assistive Device Resource Centers

"ASSISTIVE DEVICE RESOURCE CENTERS AUTHORIZED

"SEC. 663. (a) PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary shall, from amounts appropriated pursuant to section 669, make grants to States to pay the Federal share of the cost of establishing assistive device resource centers, in accordance with the provisions of this subpart.

"ALLOTMENT

"SEC. 664. The Secretary shall, from the amount appropriated for this subpart for each fiscal year, allot to each State an amount which bears the same ratio to such amount as the number of children with handicaps counted under section 611 of this Act for the fiscal year prior to the fiscal year for which the determination is made bears to the total number of such children in all States, except that no State shall receive less than $150,000.

"SERVICES

"SEC. 665. (a) ELIGIBILITY FOR SERVICES.—Each assistive device resource center established with assistance under this subpart shall serve—

"(1) severely handicapped infants and toddlers as defined by the State in the application required under this subpart;

"(2) severely handicapped children and youth as defined in the State application approved under this subpart; and

"(3) severely handicapped individuals who have attained 21 years of age if the State plan prescribes a targeted population of handicapped individuals who have attained 21 years of age.

"(b) SCOPE OF CENTER SERVICES.—Each center receiving assistance under this subpart shall—

"(1) train and assist specialists in local educational agencies and nonprofit community organizations to evaluate a handicapped student's potential to benefit from the use of assistive devices;

"(2) instruct teachers, therapists, paraprofessionals, parents, family members, other significant individuals, and handicapped students in the appropriate use of assistive devices;

"(3) provide follow-up services for individuals who have received services by the center when appropriate and collect data to determine the effectiveness of the services provided;

"(4) develop a statewide service delivery system for severely handicapped infants, toddlers, children, and youth that ensures all handicapped children and local educational agencies have access to the services of the center;

"(5) have the ability to assist in the development, design, fabrication, and modification of assistive devices to meet the needs of handicapped individuals;

"(6) disseminate information to local educational agencies and nonprofit community organizations on assistive devices and their availability; and

"(7) provide in-service training to specialists, teachers, administrators, parents, families, and other significant individuals working with handicapped students on the benefits of assistive devices to promote improved educational performance and increased interaction between handicapped and nonhandicapped individuals.

"(c) PRIORITY OF SERVICE; CONSTRUCTION.—(1) Each State shall assure priority of services for handicapped infants, toddlers, children, and youth from birth through age 21.

"(2) Nothing in this subpart precludes the provision of services available from the assistive device resource center to handicapped individuals who are no longer eligible for services under the Education of the Handicapped Act.

"(d) ADVISORY COMMITTEE.—(1) Each center receiving assistance under this subpart shall establish an Advisory Committee.

"(2) No Federal funds may be used for the operations of the Advisory Committee.

"APPLICATIONS

"SEC. 666. (a) APPLICATIONS REQUIRED.—Each State desiring to receive its allotment under this subpart shall submit an application to the Secretary at such time, in such manner, and containing or accompanied by such information as the Secretary may reasonably require.

"(b) CONTENTS OF APPLICATIONS.—(1) Each such application shall—

"(A) describe the manner in which the State will carry out a plan to meet the requirements of this subpart;

"(B) describe the severely handicapped infants, toddlers, children, and youth who will be eligible for services provided through assistance under this subpart;

"(C) describe the types of services that will be offered by the assistive device resource center and the manner in which services will be provided;

"(D) provide assurances that the State will ensure that activities of the assistive device resource center are coordinated with Rehabilitation Engineering Centers in the State;

"(E) describe the procedures that will be used to evaluate the effectiveness of the services provided by the assistive device resource center;

"(F) provide assurances that the State will use Federal funds only to supplement and increase the level of State and local funds expended for assistive device resource centers for handicapped infants, toddlers, children, and youth and in no case to supplant such State and local funds;

"(G) provide assurances that the State will pay from non-Federal sources the non-Federal share of the cost of the application; and

"(H) provide such additional assurances as the Secretary requires to carry out the provisions of this subpart.

"(2) Each application submitted under paragraph (1) shall be submitted by the Governor of the State for a period not to exceed 3 fiscal years.

"(3) Any public agency or private nonprofit organization or institution may submit an application to the State for a grant to establish an assistive device resource center in the State to carry out the services describe in subsection (c).

"PAYMENTS; FEDERAL SHARE

"SEC. 667. (a) PAYMENT RULE.—The Secretary shall pay to each State having an application approved under section 664 the Federal share of the cost of the activities described in the application.

"(b) FEDERAL SHARE.—The Federal share shall be—

"(1) 70 percent for fiscal year 1988;

"(2) 65 percent for fiscal year 1989; and

"(3) 60 percent for fiscal year 1990.

"DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 668. For the purpose of this subpart—

"(1) the term 'assistive devices' includes adaptive learning devices, mobility and seating systems, augmentative communications systems, writing and reading devices, and environmental control devices;

"(2) the term 'assistive device resource center' means a center established by a public agency or a private nonprofit organization or institution designed to facilitate the appropriate use of commercial and noncommercial available devices that will assist severely handicapped infants, toddlers, children, and youth, and other handicapped individuals to reach their maximum potential; and

"(3) the term 'severely handicapped infants, toddlers, children, and youth' means handicapped infants, toddlers, children, and youth who, because of the intensity of their physical, mental, or emotional problems, need specialized educational and technological services in order to reach their maximum potential in the least restrictive environment.

"AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

"SEC. 669. There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out the provisions of this subpart $20,000,000 for the fiscal year 1988 and such sums as may be necessary for each succeeding fiscal year ending prior to October 1, 1990.".

(b) TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.—Section 662 of such Act is amended by striking out "part" and inserting in lieu thereof "subpart".

GROUPS WHO HAVE ENDORSED THE KERRY TECH LEGISLATION

American Association of University Affiliated Programs.

American Association of Mental Deficiency.

American Occupational Therapy Association

American Physical Therapy Association.

American Speech Language Hearing Association.

Association for Education of Rehabilitation Personnel.

Association for Children and Adults with Learning Disabilities.

Association for Retarded Citizens.

Association for Advance Rehabilitation Technology.

Child Welfare League of America.

Conference of Education Administrators Serving the Deaf.

Council of Organizational Representatives.

Disability Rights and Defense Fund.

Epilepsy Foundation.

Federation of Children with Special Needs.

National Association of Protection and Advocacy Systems.

National Association of Rehabilitation Professionals in the Private Sector.

National Association of State Directors of Special Education.

National Council on Rehabilitation Education.

National Easter Seal Society.

National Head Injury Foundation.

Spina Bifida Association of America.

United Cerebral Palsy Association.

TECHNOLOGY TO EDUCATE CHILDREN WITH HANDICAPS ACT

Mr. WEICKER. Mr. President, I am proud to be an original cosponsor of the Technology to Educate Children With Handicaps Act, a bill introduced today by Senator JOHN KERRY. This important legislation will amend the Education of the Handicapped Act to add a new section authorizing grants to States for establishing assistive devices resource centers to help integrate severely handicapped infants and children into the classroom through the use of technology. These centers will be required to develop a statewide system of service delivery to ensure that disabled children have access to the services of the resource center. They will further be able to train parents, educators, and disabled children themselves on the use of these technological devices.

Technology for individuals with disabilities is clearly an important and evolving area which has proven its value in assisting individuals with severe disabilities to be more independent, and thus more integrated into the mainstream. Last year the amendments to the Rehabilitation Act recognized the value of technology through its emphasis on rehabilitation engineering as a means of getting people with disabilities into the competitive work force. This bill recognizes the equally important role that techonology can play in reducing barriers in communication, mobility, self-direction, and learning in the lives of children who have severe disabilities.

This measure will be referred to the Subcommittee on the Handicapped, now chaired by Senator HARKIN. Under his leadership, the subcommittee intends to hold hearings on the use of technology to benefit the Nation's disabled citizens, and the measure being introduced today merits careful consideration by the subcommittee as it develops comprehensive technology legislation.

I look forward to working with Senator KERRY, Senator HARKIN, and the cosponsors of this legislation to ensure that individuals with disabilities are able to access the technology which can make the difference between dependence and independence, and a life of dignity and fulfillment for millions of Americans.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. President, I am pleased to join my colleagues, Senator KERRY and Senator WEICKER, as an original cosponsor of the Technology to Educate Children Act of 1987. This legislation will provide funds to States to establish assistive devices resource centers. These centers will in turn help local school districts with their important task of integrating severely handicapped youngsters in our public schools.

Technology to assist the disabled has made dramatic strides in recent years. Previously isolated individuals are now able to communicate with specially equipped computer terminals. People with severe physical handicaps have new found mobility because of advances in rehabilitation engineering. I am sure many of us know someone personally who has benefited from this remarkable new technology.

This legislation will bring state-of-the-art technology services within reach of urban as well as rural communities around the Nation. Very severely disabled children for whom a least restrictive school placement was once a hospital room will be able to attend their neighborhood schools with the benefit of services made available through assistive devices centers.

In summary, technological advances which once served only the most fortunate among us will be available to everyone.

When Congress enacted Public Law 94-142, the Education of All Handicapped Children Act, the discretionary programs were included to enable States, universities, and other grant recipients to keep pace with evolutions in the field of special education. Their inclusion demonstrated an awareness that the kinds of services which would be needed to truly integrate handicapped people in the mainstream of public education would change over time. We have entered a technological era that holds great promise for physically and mentally challenged children and adults. The legislation being introduced today is modest in scope but limitless in the future opportunities it holds for handicapped people of all ages. I commend Senator KERRY and Senator WEICKER for their leadership on this issue, and encourage my Senate colleagues to join me in cosponsoring this legislation.

By Mr. D'AMATO:

S. 1587. A bill to authorize the minting of commemorative coins to support the training of American athletes participating in the 1988 Olympic Games; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

1988 OLYMPIC COMMEMORATIVE COIN ACT

● Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce legislation authorizing the minting of gold and silver commemorative coins next year memorializing the competition of U.S. athletes in the 1988 winter and summer Olympic Games. These coins will help raise the funds needed for the support and training of America's athletes. In so doing, I am pleased and proud to be following my distinguished friend from Illinois, Congressman FRANK ANNUNZIO, who has introduced the companion bill in the other body, H.R. 2741.

Across America, thousands of our finest athletes are in training today for the 1988 U.S. Olympic teams. Many of them are making great personal sacrifices in the sole hope of representing the land they love at the highest level of international competition. Thousands of hours of lonely practice must be put into the goal of standing on the victory platform while the American flag is raised, and our

National Anthem is played. As the hearts of Americans swell with pride.

This idea is not novel. It has helped before to make a significant contribution to the support of America's athletes. In 1982, Congress authorized a similar minting of commemorative coins for the 1984 Los Angeles Olympic Games. Sale of those coins raised $73.5 million for the U.S. Olympic Committee, making it possible for the USOC to distribute $6.4 million to the amateur sports organizations responsible for the promotion of particular amateur sports. This money played a significant role in enabling our competitors to win more medals in the 1984 summer games than ever won by any nation at a single olympiad.

An additional $31.7 million in money raised from these sales helped fund the United States Olympic Foundation.

While that money has been a tremendous help to the Olympic Committee, the costs of participating in the Olympic Games continue to rise. This new minting should help raise millions of badly needed dollars so that American athletes can have the facilities necessary to fully realize their potential and do their best at the games.

This bill authorizes the minting of 1 million gold coins and 10 million silver coins to be sold directly by the U.S. Mint to the public. A surcharge attached to the coins will go directly to the U.S. Olympic Committee to support local amateur programs and erect facilities for athletic training.

The legislation directs, incidentally, that the coins be sold at no net cost to the Government.

Mr. President, I am pleased to join Congressman ANNUNZIO in sponsoring this effort and I sincerely hope all of my colleagues will join me in supporting our Olympic athletes.●

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 680

At the request of Mr. CHAFEE, the name of the Senator from Maryland [Ms. MIKULSKI] was added as a cosponsor of S. 680, a bill to prohibit the use of subtherapeutic doses of penicillin, chlortetracycline, and oxytetracycline in animal feed.

S. 889

At the request of Mr. GORE, the names of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DANFORTH], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS] were added as cosponsors of S. 889, a bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to provide for fair marketing practices for certain encrypted satellite communications.

S. 909

At the request of Mr. REID, the name of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] was added as a cosponsor of S. 909, a bill to require that all amounts saved as a result of Federal Government contracting pursuant to Office of Management and Budget Circular A-76 be returned to the Treasury, that manpower savings resulting from such contracting be made permanent, and that employees of an executive agency be consulted before contracting determinations by the head of that executive agency are made pursuant to that circular.

S. 1085

At the request of Mr. GLENN, the names of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. PRYOR], the Senator from Maine [Mr. COHEN], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. HEINZ] were added as cosponsors of S. 1085, a bill to create an independent oversight board to ensure the safety of U.S. Government nuclear facilities, to apply the provisions of OSHA to certain Department of Energy nuclear facilities, to clarify the jurisdiction and powers of Government agencies dealing with nuclear wastes, to ensure independent research on the effects of radiation on human beings, and for other purposes.

S. 1142

At the request of Mr. SHELBY, the name of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1142, a bill to provide Federal recognition of the Mowa Band of Choctaw Indians of Alabama.

S. 1436

At the request of Mr. DANFORTH, the name of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. BOND] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1436, a bill to amend the Hazardous Materials Transportation Act regarding the transportation by rail of certain materials, and for other purposes.

S. 1438

At the request of Mr. DURENBERGER, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. NICKLES] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1438, a bill to assist rural hospitals facing unfair Medicare payment policies.

S. 1440

At the request of Mr. EVANS, the name of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. JOHNSTON] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1440, a bill to provide consistency in the treatment of quality control review procedures and standards in the Aid to Families with Dependent Children, Medicaid and Food Stamp programs; to impose a temporary moratorium for the collection of penalties under such programs, and for other purposes.

S. 1503

At the request of Mr. HEFLIN, the name of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SHELBY] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1503, a bill to cancel repayment of the community disaster loan made to the city of Prichard, Alabama.

S. 1511

At the request of Mr. MOYNIHAN, the name of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. STAFFORD] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1511, a bill to amend title IV of the Social Security Act to replace the AFDC program with a comprehensive program of mandatory child support and work training which provides for transitional child care and medical assistance, benefits improvement, and mandatory extension of coverage to two-parent families, and which reflects a general emphasis on shared and reciprocal obligation, program innovation, and organizational renewal.

S. 1550

At the request of Mr. MOYNIHAN, the names of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MITCHELL], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. LAUTENBERG], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BREAUX], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID], the Senator from Florida [Mr. GRAHAM], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. STAFFORD], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. DURENBERGER], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. WARNER] were added as cosponsors of S. 1550, a bill to complete the Federal Triangle in the District of Columbia, to construct a public building to provide Federal office space and space for an international cultural and trade center, and for other purposes.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 41

At the request of Mr. GLENN, the names of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. DECONCINI], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. BUMPERS], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SHELBY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. DURENBERGER], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. WEICKER], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GRASSLEY], the Senator from Washington [Mr. ADAMS], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. MCCLURE], and the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. MATSUNAGA] were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 41, a joint resolution to designate the period commencing on November 22, 1987, and ending on November 29, 1987, as "National Family Caregivers Week".

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 53

At the request of Mr. CRANSTON, the names of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. DOMENICI] and the Senator from Utah [Mr. HATCH] were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 53, a joint resolution to designate the period commencing November 22, 1987, and ending November 28, 1987, as "American Indian Week".

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 106

At the request of Mr. BINGAMAN, the names of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. WEICKER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. RUDMAN], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. CHAFEE], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. STAFFORD], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ROCKEFELLER], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. EXON], the Senator from California [Mr.

WILSON], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. HATCH] were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 106, a joint resolution to recognize the Disabled American Veterans Vietnam Veterans National Memorial as a memorial of national significance.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 173

At the request of Mr. REID, the names of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. BINGAMAN], the Senator from New York [Mr. D'AMATO], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIXON] were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 173, a joint resolution to commemorate the 200th anniversary of the signing of the United States Constitution.

AMENDMENT NO. 591

At the request of Mr. DANFORTH, the name of the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. MATSUNAGA] was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 591 intended to be proposed to S. 328, a bill to amend chapter 39, United States Code, to require the Federal Government to pay interest on overdue payments, and for other purposes.

SENATE RESOLUTION 267—TO RECOGNIZE RACHEL CARSON ON THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF HER BOOK "SILENT SPRING"

Mr. MITCHELL (for himself and Mr. COHEN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 267

Whereas Rachel Carson, through her writings and work, made unprecedented contributions to public awareness and understanding of the natural environment and environmental issues;

Whereas her book, "Silent Spring", awakened the American public to the dangers posed by the misuse of chemical pesticides;

Whereas "Silent Spring" helped foster general public concern for the integrity of the natural environment and for the environmental threats posed by pollution of the water, air, and land;

Whereas the growth of environmental consciousness that occurred in the years following "Silent Spring" provided the foundation necessary for the enactment of our existing environmental laws;

Whereas continued public understanding of the natural environment is essential to the continued success of efforts to identify and respond to pollution problems; and

Whereas 1987 is the twenty-fifth anniversary of Rachel Carson's book, "Silent Spring": Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate to recognize the outstanding contributions of Rachel Carson to public awareness and understanding of environmental issues on the twenty-fifth anniversary of her book, "Silent Spring".

● Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I rise today to submit a resolution commemorating the 25th anniversary of Rachel Carson's classic work "Silent Spring."

I am pleased that Senator COHEN, the senior Senator from our home State of Maine, is joining me in submitting this resolution. Ms. Carson lived and worked in Maine for many years. And, a major wildlife refuge on the Maine coast bears her name.

The publication of "Silent Spring" forever changed America's environmental landscape. It contributed to an awakening of public awareness to a range of environmental problems and helped generate the environmental consciousness which is the foundation of our existing environmental laws.

"Silent Spring" brought to light the grave effect commonly used pesticides were having upon our environment. Ms. Carson documented the toxic nature of many pesticides and identified the threats they posed to the quality of surface and ground waters, to wildlife, and to humans.

Ms. Carson's work generated immediate controversy. The book was praised for its assessment of the environmental impact of chemical pesticides and its translation of technical data into a readable and understandable discussion. At the same time, the book was attacked by some who called it alarmist and challenged the quality of its research.

Through all the controversy, one thing has never been in doubt: the public appeal of the book has always been overwhelming. To this date, over 1½ million copies have been printed.

"Silent Spring" was not Rachel Carson's only contribution to our understanding and appreciation of the natural world. She published several books relating to Maine and the environment, including "The Sea Around Us," "The Edge of the Sea," and "Under the Sea Wind."

The greatest tribute to the work of Rachel Carson has already been paid to her by the American people. Over the last 25 years we have made tremendous strides in the field of environmental protection. The Congress has enacted statutes to protect the quality of air and water. We have made great strides to control hazardous wastes, to clean up neglected and dangerous waste disposal sites, and to ensure the safe use of pesticides and other chemicals. And, we are working to improve and expand these laws as new problems arise.

We have seen the inception of a Federal agency to manage environmental problems. And, at the State level, environmental agencies have been established and State legislatures have enacted a wide range of statutes designed to further protect our environment and public health. The greatest tribute to Rachel Carson's work is our commitment to protecting the environment.

The closing chapter of "Silent Spring" is titled "The Other Road" and begins with the following words:

We stand now where two roads diverge. But unlike the roads in Robert Frost's familiar poem, they are not equally fair. The road we have long been traveling is deceptively easy, a smooth superhighway on which we progress with great speed, but at its end lies disaster. The other fork of the road—the one "less traveled by"—offers our last, our only chance to reach a destination that assures the preservation of our earth. The choice, after all, is ours to make. If, having endured much, we have at last asserted our "right to know" and if, knowing, we have concluded that we are being asked to take senseless and frightening risks, then we should no longer accept the counsel of those who tell us that we must fill our world with poisonous chemicals; we should look about and see what other course is open to us.

Millions of Americans have considered this choice over the past 25 years. Overwhelmingly, they have chosen to pass laws and build programs which will ensure the continued protection of our environment and public health.

In closing, let me say that if Rachel Carson could be with us today, I hope she would be pleased. Pleased to see that the American people have risen to the challenge she laid before them in "Silent Spring." Pleased to see that we are continuing to work together to ensure that we will never have to face a silent spring.●

● Mr. COHEN. Mr. President, it is now 25 years since Rachel Carson, an adopted daughter of Maine, warned of the dangers that man-made pollutants, particularly pesticides, pose to our environment and ourselves.

"We stand now where two roads diverge," she wrote in 1962 in "Silent Spring," her compelling work that told of communities where birds had been silenced by the toxic effects of pesticides. I am pleased to join my distinguished colleague from Maine, Senator MITCHELL, in submitting a resolution commemorating the 25th anniversary of the publication of "Silent Spring."

Rachel Carson dedicated her life to educating us about the need to protect our world now in order to preserve it for future generations. "We could," she wrote, "continue to poison our environment with chemicals designed to destroy the Earth's insect population, or we could undertake an alternate means of natural control and environmental cleanup."

In the quarter century since she first sounded the alarm, we have made tremendous progress in cleaning up our world. Legislation has been enacted to protect our air and water, and we in Congress continue to make strides in tightening those environmental controls.

We have also passed laws, such as the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, to govern the disposition of toxic and solid waste, and the Superfund law to assist in safe cleanup when the procedures for proper dispo-

sition were not followed. Other statutes protect our drinking water, our oceans, our marine mammals, and our coastal areas. We've taken the lead out of most of our gasoline and the asbestos out of most of our buildings. DDT is no longer used on our crops.

But considerable dangers remain. We still have not figured out how to get rid of PCB's. Dioxin contamination continues to be a problem, and the chemical chlordane is still forcing people from their homes, 25 years after Rachel Carson questioned its household use.

Our last attempt to rewrite and strengthen the Federal pesticide law foundered last year, the victim of a clogged congressional calendar, political disagreements among environmentalists and the chemical industry, and a battle over States rights.

And there is clearly other work in the environmental area that remains to be done. We in Congress have not really tackled the question of ground water pollution, for example, and there still are many more chemical hazards in the food chain, the workplace and elsewhere that we must address.

But it is fitting that we pause at this 25-year milestone and remember Rachel Carson, who provided much of the impetus for the cleanup and chemical control efforts of recent years. To honor her memory—she died in 1964, just 2 short years after publication of "Silent Spring"—Senator MITCHELL and I are sponsoring this resolution to recognize the outstanding contributions that she made to the public understanding of environmental issues.

Rachel Carson loved Maine, and we are quite proud of the national wildlife refuge on our south coast that is named in her honor. She wrote:

> The shore is an ancient world, for as long as there has been an Earth and sea there has been this place of the meeting of land and water. Yet it is a world that keeps alive the sense of continuing creation and of the relentless drive of life. Each time that I enter it, I gain some new awareness of its beauty and its deeper meanings, sensing that intricate fabric of life by which one creature is linked with another, and each with its surroundings * * *.

Without Rachel Carson's efforts at environmental education, I daresay we would not have come as far in the protection of our world and the recognition of potential threats to human health and the environment. I urge my Senate colleagues to join the 53 cosponsors of this resolution in honoring the landmark work of Rachel Carson and dedicating ourselves to carrying on with that effort.●

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED

IMPLEMENTATION OF PROVISIONS OF ANNEX V TO THE INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION FOR THE PREVENTION OF POLLUTION FROM SHIPS

CHAFEE AMENDMENT NO. 656

(Ordered referred to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.)

Mr. CHAFEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 560) to implement the provisions of Annex V to the International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships, as modified by the Protocol of 1978; as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: That the purpose of this Act is to amend the Act to Prevent Pollution from Ships to implement Annex V, Regulations for the Prevention of Pollution by Garbage from Ships.

SEC. 2. Section 2 of the Act to Prevent Pollution from Ships is amended as follows:

(a) Paragraph (1) is amended to read as follows:

"(1) 'MARPOL Protocol' means the Protocol of 1978 relating to the International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships, 1973, and includes the 'Convention';".

(b) Paragraph (2) is amended by striking all after "Annexes I" and substituting ", II, and V thereto, including any modifications or amendments to the Convention, Protocols, or Annexes which have entered into force for the United States;".

(c) Paragraph (3) is amended after " 'discharge' " by inserting "and 'garbage' ".

SEC. 3. Section 3 of the Act to Prevent Pollution from Ships is amended as follows:

(a) Subsection (a) is amended to read as follows:

"(a) This Act applies to—

"(1) except as provided in paragraph (2) of this subsection,

"(A) a ship of United States registry or nationality, or one operated under the authority of the United States, wherever located; and

"(B) a ship, other than a ship referred to in clause (A) of this paragraph, while in the navigable waters of the United States.

"(2) with respect to subsection (c)(2) of this section, section 4(a)(3), section 8(d), section 9(f)(2), and section 11(c) of this Act, a ship which is not of the registry, of the nationality, or operated under the authority of a party to Annex V of the Convention, while in the navigable waters of the United States or the exclusive economic zone of the United States.

"(3) with respect to regulations under section 6 of this Act, any port or terminal in the United States."

(b) Subsection (c) is amended to read as follows:

"(c)(1) The Secretary shall prescribe regulations applicable to the ships of a country not a party to the MARPOL Protocol to ensure that their treatment is not more favorable than that accorded ships of parties to the MARPOL Protocol.

"(2) The Secretary shall adopt regulations conforming to and giving effect to Annex V of the Convention.

SEC. 4. Section 4(a) of the Act to Prevent Pollution from Ships is amended to read as follows:

"(a) Unless otherwise specified in this Act, the Secretary shall administer and enforce the MARPOL Protocol and this Act. In the administration and enforcement of the MARPOL Protocol and this Act—

"(1) except as provided in paragraphs (2) and (3) of this subsection, the MARPOL Protocol and this Act apply to all ships;

"(2) Annexes I and II of the Convention and this Act apply only to seagoing ships; and,

"(3) this Act applies to all ships referred to in section 3(a)(2) of this Act.

SEC. 5. Section 6 of the Act to Prevent Pollution from Ships is amended as follows:

(a) Subsection (a) is amended by—

(1) inserting "(1)" immediately after "(a)";

(2) in the first sentence of newly designated subsection (a)(1), after "reception facilities", inserting "for mixtures containing oil or noxious liquid substances";

(3) adding a new paragraph (2) to read as follows:

"(2) The Secretary, after consulting with appropriate Federal agencies, shall establish regulations respecting the adequacy of reception facilities for garbage at a port or terminal, and shall specify the ports or terminals which shall be required to provide such reception facilities. Persons in charge of ports and terminals shall provide reception facilities for receiving garbage in accordance with those regulations."

(b) Subsection (b) is amended after "reception facilities" by inserting ", and in establishing regulations under subsection (a) of this section," and after "seagoing ships" inserting ", or, as appropriate, ships,".

(c) Subsection (c) is amended by striking "the MARPOL Protocol" and substituting "Annexes I and II of the Convention".

(d) Subsection (e) is amended by—

(1) inserting "(1)" immediately after "(e)";

(2) striking "(1)" and substituting "(A)";

(3) striking "(2)" and substituting "(B)";

(4) in clause (A), as redesignated by this subsection, striking "the MARPOL Protocol" and substituting "Annexes I and II of the Convention"; and

(5) adding a new paragraph (2) to read as follows:

"(2) The Secretary may deny the entry of a ship to a port or terminal required by regulations issued under this section to provide reception facilities for garbage if the port or terminal is not in compliance with those regulations."

SEC. 6. Section 8 of the Act to Prevent Pollution from Ships is amended as follows:

(a) Subsection (c) is amended by—

(1) inserting "(2)" immediately after "(c)";

(2) striking "(1)" and substituting "(A)";

(3) striking "(2)" and substituting "(B)";

(4) in clause (A) as redesignated by this subsection, after "harmful substance" inserting "or disposed of garbage";

(5) in clause (B) as redesignated by this subsection—

(A) after "harmful substance" inserting "or disposed of garbage";

(B) after "that a discharge", inserting "or a disposal";

(6) In paragraph (2) as redesignated by this subsection, in the last sentence, striking "If a report made under this subsection involves a ship other than one of United States registry or nationality or one operated under the authority of the United States," and capitalizing "the" immediately following the struck words.

(7) before the newly redesignated paragraph (2) inserting new paragraph (1) to read as follows:

"(1) This subsection applies to inspections respecting—

"(A) possible violations of Annex I or Annex II of the Convention by any seagoing ship referred to in section 3(a)(1)(B) of this Act, and

"(B) possible violations of Annex V of the Convention by any ship of the registry, of the nationality, or operated under the authority of a party to Annex V of the Convention other than the United States."

(b) After subsection (c) add new subsections (d) and (e) as follows:

"(d)(1) This subsection applies to inspections respecting possible violations of the regulations adopted under section 3(c)(2) of this Act by any ship referred to in section 3(a)(2) of this Act.

"(2) To the extent authorized by international law, a ship may be inspected by the Secretary to verify whether or not the ship has disposed of garbage in violation of the regulations adopted under section 3(c)(2) of this Act.

"(3) If an inspection under this subsection indicates that a violation has occurred, the Secretary may undertake, in accordance with international law, enforcement action under section 9 of this Act.

"(e)(1) This subsection applies to inspections respecting possible violations of the MARPOL Protocol by any ship of United States registry or nationality, or operating under the authority of the United States.

"(2) The Secretary may inspect at any time a ship to which the MARPOL Protocol applies to verify whether or not the ship has discharged a harmful substance or disposed of garbage in violation of that Protocol.

"(3) If an inspection under this subsection indicates that a violation has occurred, the Secretary may undertake enforcement action under section 9 of this Act.

(c) Redesignate subsection "(d)" as subsection "(f)"."

SEC. 7. Section 9(f) of the Act to Prevent Pollution from Ships is amended as follows:

(a) Insert "(1)" immediately after "(f)".

(b) In paragraph (1) as redesignated by this section, strike "by a ship registered in or of the nationality of a country party to the MARPOL Protocol, or one operated under the authority of a country party to the MARPOL Protocol," and substitute "one which is referred to in section 8(c)(1) of this Act," and strike "to that country" and substitute "to the government of the country of the ship's registry or nationality, or under whose authority the ship is operating".

(c) Add a new paragraph (2) to read as follows:

"(2) Any action taken under this section with respect to violations of regulations adopted under section 3(c)(2) of this Act shall be in accordance with international law."

SEC. 8. Section 10 of the Act to Prevent Pollution from Ships is amended as follows:

(a) In subsection (a), strike "Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization", and substitute "International Maritime Organization".

(b) In subsection (b), strike "Annex I or II, appendices to the Annexes, or Protocol I of the MARPOL Protocol," and substitute "Annexes I, II, or V, appendices to those Annexes, or Protocol I of the Convention", and strike "Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization" and substitute "International Maritime Organization".

SEC. 9. Section 11 of the Act to Prevent Pollution from Ships is amended as follows:

(a) After subsection (b) add a new subsection (c) to read as follows:

"(c) Any person suffering damage or loss from any action of the Secretary, taken pursuant to section 8(d) or section 3(c)(2) of this Act, which is alleged to have been unlawful or to have exceeded that which is reasonably required in the light of available information may bring an action under this section to recover compensation for that damage or loss."

(b) Change existing subsections "(c)" through "(e)" to "(d)" through "(f)" respectively.

SEC. 10. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, this Act shall be effective on the date Annex V of the Convention enters into force in the United States.

(b) The authority to adopt and issue regulations under this Act shall be effective on the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 11. Section 3(f) of the Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act of 1972, as amended, (33 U.S.C. 1402(f)) is amended by inserting "or a discharge or disposal subject to regulation by the Act to Prevent Pollution from Ships, as amended," after "operation of motor-driven equipment on, vessels".

● Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, in February I introduced S. 560, a bill to implement the provisions of annex V to the International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution From Ships, commonly known as Marpol. My purpose in introducing this bill was to ensure that there would be no delay in considering legislation to implement the provisions of this important treaty.

Within the last few days the Coast Guard has completed a legislative proposal which, if enacted, will also implement the provisions of annex V. This legislative proposal is strongly supported by the administration, and forms a solid basis for a law to enact the provisions of annex V. I am therefore amending my original bill to reflect the proposed legislation received by the Senate on July 22 from the Secretary of Transportation.

I would ask that immediately following these remarks, the amendment to S. 560 appear in the RECORD.

Mr. President, last week I appeared before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to testify on the importance of ratification of annex V of Marpol. In order for this annex to enter into force, the treaty must be ratified by nations representing at least 50 percent of the world's shipping tonnage. In July the Soviet Union announced that it had ratified annex V. This creates an opportunity for the United States. If, as is my hope, the Senate approves a resolution of advice and consent for annex V, nations representing more than 50 percent of the world's shipping tonnage will have ratified the treaty, and it will have the force of international law.

It is time that we stop using the ocean as a collective garbage dump for nondegradable materials. I strongly urge the Committee on Foreign Relations to issue a favorable report on this treaty, and recommend to the full Senate that we ratify this important annex without delay.●

NOTICE OF HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, I would like to announce that the Small Business Committee will hold a field hearing in Worland, WY, on Friday, August 14, 1987, to examine the problems confronting small businesses in Wyoming related to the difficult circumstances facing the energy industry. The hearing will be held at the Worland Elks' Club and will commence at 9 a.m. For further information, please call Chuck Culver of the committee staff at 224-3188, or Bonnie Cannon of Senator WALLOP's office at 224-0871.

Mr. President, I would like to announce that the Small Business Committee will hold a full committee hearing on Thursday, September 17, 1987, on S. 818, a bill to provide permanent authorization for White House conferences on small business. The hearing will commence at 10 a.m. and will be held in room 428A of the Russell Senate Office Building. For further information, please call Todd Patterson of the committee staff at 224-3840.

Mr. President, I would like to announce that the Small Business Committee will hold a full committee oversight hearing on the Small Business Administration's Small Business Development Center Program on Tuesday, September 22, 1987. The hearing will be held in room 428A of the Russell Senate Office Building and will commence at 10 a.m. For further information, please call Patty Barker of the committee staff at 224-8495.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

NOTICE OF DETERMINATION BY THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON ETHICS

● Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, it is required by paragraph 4 of rule 35 that I place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD notices of Senate employees who participate in programs, the principal objective of which is educational, sponsored by a foreign government or a foreign educational or charitable organization involving travel to a foreign country paid for by that foreign government or organization.

The select committee has received a request for a determination under rule 35, for Mr. Ken Apfel, a member of the staff of Senator BILL BRADLEY, to participate in a program in the People's Republic of China, organized by the United States-China Friendship

Program, in conjunction with the United States-Asia Institute, and sponsored by the Chinese People's Institute of Foreign Affairs, in August 1987.

The committee has determined that participation by Mr. Apfel in the program in the People's Republic of China, at the expense of the Chinese People's Institute of Foreign Affairs, is in the interest of the Senate and the United States.

The select committee has received a request for a determination under rule 35, for Mr. Paul Vick, a member of the staff of Senator TERRY SANFORD, to participate in a program in the People's Republic of China, organized by the United States-China Friendship Program, and sponsored by the Chinese People's Institute of Foreign Affairs, in conjunction with the United States-Asia Institute, from August 8-24, 1987.

The committee has determined that participation by Mr. Vick in the program in the People's Republic of China, at the expense of the Chinese People's Institute of Foreign Affairs, in conjunction with the United States-Asia Institute, is in the interest of the Senate and the United States.

The select committee has received a request for a determination under rule 35, for Mr. Donald Hardy, a member of the staff of Senator ALAN K. SIMPSON, to participate in a program in the People's Republic of China, organized by the United States-China Friendship Program, and sponsored by the Chinese People's Institute of Foreign Affairs, in conjunction with the United States-Asia Institute, from August 8-24, 1987.

The committee has determiend that participation by Mr. Hardy in the program in the People's Republic of China, at the expense of the Chinese People's Institute of Foreign Affairs, in conjunction with the United States-Asia Institute, is in the interest of the Senate and the United States.

The select committee has received a request for a determination under rule 35, for Ms. Catherine Porter, a member of the staff of Senator JOHN H. CHAFEE, to participate in a program in Japan, sponsored by the Congressional Economic Leadership Institute and paid for by the Japan-United States Friendship Commission, from August 8-15, 1987.

The committee has determined that participation by Ms. Porter, in the program in Japan, at the expense of the Japan-United States Friendship Commission, is in the interest of the Senate and the United States.

The select committee has received a request for a determination under rule 35, for Senator MITCH MCCONNELL, and two members of his staff, Niels Holch and Robin Cleveland, to participate in a program in the Republic of Turkey, sponsored by the Turkish Foreign Policy Institute, from August 8-14, 1987.

The committee has determined that participation by Senator MCCONNELL, Mr. Holch, and Ms. Cleveland in the program in Turkey, at the expense of the Turkish Foreign Policy Institute, is in the interest of the Senate and the United States.

The select committee has received a request for determination under rule 35, for Mr. J. Thomas Sliter, a member of the staff of Senator ROBERT C. BYRD, to participate in a program in the People's Republic of China, organized by the United States-China Friendship Program, and sponsored by the Chinese People's Institute of Foreign Affairs, in conjuction with the United States-Asia Institute, from August 8-25, 1987.

The committee has determined that participation by Mr. Sliter, in the program in the People's Republic of China, at the expense of the Chinese People's Institute of Foreign Affairs, in conjuction with the United States-Asia Institute, is in the interest of the Senate and the United States.

The select committee has received a request for a determination under rule 35, for Mr. Harry Broadman, a member of the staff of the Committee on Governmental Affairs, to participate in a program in the People's Republic of China, organized by the United States-China Friendship Program, and sponsored by the Chinese People's Institute of Foreign Affairs, in conjunction with the United States-Asia Institute, from August 8-25, 1987.

The committee has determined that participation by Mr. Broadman, in the program in the People's Republic of China, at the expense of the Chinese People's Institute of Foreign Affairs, in conjunction with the United States-Asia Institute, is in the interest of the Senate and the United States.

The select committee has received a request for a determination under rule 35, for Ms. Catherine Porter, a member of the staff of Senator JOHN H. CHAFEE, to participate in a program in South Korea, sponsored by the Ilhae Institute of Seoul, South Korea, from August 9-17, 1987.

The committee has determined that participation by Ms. Porter, in the program in South Korea, at the expense of the Ilhae Institute of Seoul, South Korea, is in the interest of the Senate and the United States.

The select committee has received a request for a determination under rule 35, for Ms. Gina Despres, a member of the staff of Senator BILL BRADLEY, to participate in a program in Japan, sponsored by the Policy Study Group of Japan.

The committee has determined that participation by Ms. Despres, in the program in Japan, at the expense of the Policy Study Group of Japan, is in the interest of the Senate and the United States.

The select committee has received a request for a determination under rule 35, for Ms. Kathleen Harrington, a member of the staff of Senator CHRISTOPHER J. DODD, to participate in a trip to Seoul, South Korea, sponsored by the Ilhae Institute of Seoul, South Korea, from August 8-17, 1987.

The committee has determined that participation by Ms. Harrington in the program in South Korea, at the expense of the Ilhae Institute of Seoul, South Korea, is in the interest of the Senate and the United States.

The select committee has received a request for a determination under rule 35, for Ms. Barbara Larkin, a member of the staff of Senator TERRY SANFORD, to participate in a program in South Korea, sponsored by the Ilhae Institute of Seoul, South Korea, from August 22-29, 1987.

The committee has determined that participation by Ms. Larkin, in the program in South Korea, at the expense of the Ilhae Institute of Seoul, South Korea, is in the interest of the Senate and the United States.

The select committee has received a request for a determination under rule 35, for Mr. Andrew Hyde, a member of the staff of Senator JOHN WARNER, to participate in a trip to Seoul, South Korea, sponsored by the Ilhae Institute of Seoul, South Korea, from August 9-17, 1987.

The committee has determined that participation by Mr. Hyde in the program in South Korea, at the expense of the Ilhae Institute of Seoul, South Korea, is in the interest of the Senate and the United States.

The select committee has received a request for a determination under rule 35, for Mr. William Wight, a member of the staff of Senator JOHN WARNER, to participate in a program in the Republic of China on Taiwan, sponsored by Tunghai University, from August 8-16, 1987.

The Committee has determined that participation by Mr. Wight in the program in the Republic of China on Taiwan, at the expense of Tunghai University, is in the interest of the Senate and the United States.

The select committee has received a request for a determination under rule 35, for Ms. Jennifer Hillman, a member of the staff of Senator TERRY SANFORD, to participate in a trip to Seoul, South Korea, sponsored by the Ilhae Institute of Seoul, South Korea, from August 9-17, 1987.

The committee has determined that participation by Ms. Hillman in the program in South Korea, at the expense of the Ilhae Institute of Seoul, South Korea, is in the interest of the Senate and the United States.

The select committee has received a request for a determination under rule

35, for Ms. Mary D. Pembroke, a member of the staff of the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, to participate in a program in the Republic of China, Taiwan, sponsored by the Chinese Culture University, from August 17-24, 1987.

The committee has determined that participation by Ms. Pembroke, in the program in the Republic of China, Taiwan, at the expense of the Chinese Culture University, is in the interest of the Senate and the United States.●

RECOGNIZING THE EMANUEL PIETERSON HISTORICAL SOCIETY

● Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, I rise today to call the attention of my colleagues to the Emanuel Pieterson Historical Society. This organization's service to the Afro-American community in New York State deserves recognition.

The society was established in August 1975 to preserve the history of Afro-American culture, encourage understanding and appreciation of Afro-American life, and promote the stability and preservation of historical Harlem-like communities.

Since its founding, the society has been instrumental in gaining national landmark designation of various Harlem sites, including the Harlem River Houses, our Nation's first federally funded housing projects.

The society also hosts functions that honor a broad range of distinguished Afro-Americans, tennis great Arthur Ashe, entertainer Eartha Kitt, and physician Dr. John Holloman, just to name a few.

I am certain that my colleagues will join with me in commending this historical society for its outstanding accomplishments and commitment to preserving American culture.

Thank you, Mr. President.●

HOW THE FARMERS UNION PROMOTES GOOD COMMUNITY LIVING

● Mr. BOREN. Mr. President, each year the Oklahoma Farmers Union sponsors a speech contest. Winners are given an expense-paid tour of the Eastern section of the United States, including visits to Gettysburg, New York, Washington, and Niagara Falls. One of the Oklahoma winners, Mr. Steven Johnson, Route 3, Box 48, Gage, OK, gave his winning speech at a breakfast for members of the Oklahoma congressional delegation in the Rayburn House Office Building. His winning speech follows:

HOW MY ORGANIZATION PROMOTES GOOD COMMUNITY LIVING

Cooperation, Legislation, and Education. These three bases for the Farmers Union Triangle are as important to our society today as they were back in 1902 when the Farmers Union organization began. Each base of the Farmers Union triangle cannot function without the other, but together—connected and regarded as one—these three words can have a huge impact upon our community. Today, I would like to explain how my organization, The Farmers Union, promotes good community living.

The Oklahoma Farmers Union is a 100,000-member family farm organization promoting good community living through cooperation, education, and legislation. Our insignia is the rake, plow, and hoe. Our Farmers Union emblem is the liveoak tree and our symbol is the triangle.

The base of the triangle is education. Education is learning as well as teaching and it is a process that never ends. Farmers Union believes that strength comes through knowledge and in many ways Farmers Union promotes knowledge. One method of promoting education is through speech contests where young people have the opportunity to broaden their education plus win numerous awards including a 17-day summer tour of the Eastern states. Oklahoma Farmers Union offers its young members a well-balanced, year-'round youth program that includes study units and summer leadership training camps. These camps can led to college scholarships and other awards. My Ellis County Square Top Local has day camps where leaders teach young children through high school about various farm programs, the importance of cooperatives, and current legislation.

I have completed 10 years of youth work and it has been a valuable experience for me.

Legislation, the second side of the triangle, is important in all levels of Farmers Union. The legislative goals of the organization are directed by the policy statement. Policy making begins in the local and county meetings where members discuss and adopt resolutions and send them on to the state convention. Policies and ideas are then sent by the state to the national policy drafting committee, where they are debated, amended and finally adopted.

As a farm organization, Farmers Union is not only interested in farm programs, but we are a total front organization. This means that we are committed to policy on all fronts including environmental, social, economic, and foreign issues—issues which affect the quality of life of everyone in our community.

It is clear that Oklahoma is suffering in its worst economic situation since the Great Depression. Farmers and ranchers in our state are literally fighting for survival. Congress must pass new legislation early in 1987 to correct the direction of agricultural trade and improve the farm economy. Now is the time for Oklahoma Farmers Union to help write and pass new legislation.

Cooperation, the third side of our triangle, is democracy at work. Ever since Farmers Union was started in 1902, its members have helped set up and have used cooperatives for selling their farm products and for buying supplies to use on the farm. Some of these co-op businesses were cotton gins, grain elevators, oil companies, feed stores, grocery stores, and lumber yards.

Cooperatives are owned by the people who do business there. They are called "patrons". Co-ops give their patrons a fair price for their products and charge a fair price for the things they buy. People working together to help one another results in good community living.

Farmers Union is founded on the dignity of the individual, the value of his way of life, and the importance of the community. Through cooperation, education, legislation and brotherly love, we can attain a better rural America and promote good community living.●

SINGAPORE MAKES MAJOR STRIDES AGAINST RECORD AND MOVIE PIRATES

● Mr. WILSON. Mr. President, among the diamonds in the rough of the recently passed trade bill, there are provisions enhancing the ability of U.S. companies to protect their intellectual property rights against piracy and other unwarranted market barriers. Such practices rob American businesses of billions of dollars of sales each year.

During the debate on an amendment to a provision that I authored, the "Anti-Piracy and Market Access Act," I stated the following:

Many beneficiaries of our GSP program allow rampant piracy and have erected insurmountable barriers to our intellectual property-based products. Specifically, Indonesia, Singapore, Taiwan, South Korea, and other Far East nations have been guilty of these practices, though some progress has been made in recent months.

Mr. President, while Indonesia continues as a "leader" in the field of piracy, as I noted in my statement, recent progress has been made by some countries. South Korea has made some changes improving market access for motion pictures and settled a 301 case on intellectual property protection. Taiwan has a new law designed to improve the ability of copyright, patent, and trademark holders to enforce their rights.

Mr. President, as to Singapore, the record of progress is even more startling. In the most recent "National Trade Estimate" report, issued by the U.S. Trade Representative in October of last year, the impact of piracy in Singapore was estimated at more than $350 million per year—most in the form of music piracy. It was on the basis of this report that I included Singapore in my statement. While I was aware that a new law had been enacted in Singapore, new laws generally do not have an immediate impact by themselves. The key ingredients are the will to enforce the law and the provision of resources to do the job.

Well, Mr. President, after hearing from the Ambassador of the Republic of Singapore, the Honorable Tommy T B Koh, I contacted the Recording Industry Association of America and the Motion Picture Association of America to ascertain if progress had been made, as represented. I am more than pleased to tell the Senate that swift and sure progress against piracy has been made in Singapore.

The new Singapore copyright law took effect on April 10 of this year—just 4 months ago—and already it has

produced significant effects. There have been millions of dollars in increased sales of American music, thereby increasing our exports—and increasing profits for legitimate Singaporean businesses. Further domestic benefits include a willingness of record companies to invest in the development of Singaporean singers and musicians.

In the movie market, video sales have increased 20 to 25 percent this year. Legitimate video rental operations have been revitalized, while a local magazine catering to the movie market has seen a great increase, to the point that a new competitor has come to the market.

Mr. President, this fast and effective turnaround belies any suggestion that the new Singapore copyright law was an empty gesture. Obviously, the Government of Singapore is determined to wipe out piracy, and for that they deserve a great deal of credit.

Mr. President, I ask that two newspaper articles from the Straits Times of Singapore on the progress against piracy be printed in the RECORD at the end of my remarks.

Mr. President, with the new law and official attitude in Singapore, the worldwide problem must still be addressed. It is important to note that while piracy in Singapore hurt United States sales in that country, most of the harm done by illegal copying in Singapore occurred outside of Singapore, in third-country markets. Therefore, while the illegal market is being shut down in Singapore, there are still markets for pirated music and movies, and other countries are moving "to fill the void".

So, Mr. President, as we continue to work for an end to the insidious practice of intellectual property privacy, we should recognize that progress has been made in some countries.

The articles follow:

[From the Straits Times, July 23, 1987]

COPYRIGHT PERKS UP THE FUN INDUSTRY

FEWER PIRATES AND BIGGER PROFITS SPUR DISTRIBUTORS

(By Serena Toh)

Films such as critically acclaimed Eleni, Woody Allen's Hannah and Her Sisters and the remake of the Western classic Stagecoach, previously held back by video distributors because of "pirates", will now be released, thanks to the new Copyright Act.

In fact, video company, Kwangsia Home Video, encouraged by the clearing out of pirates, re-started its video rental business last week.

Frustrated by the raids of pirates, it shut down operations last year.

Because of the Act, too, entertainment magazine Swing was launched last month and longtime film magazine. Movie News, revamped.

Both magazines anticipate a boom in the film, video and recording industries, thus generating more revenue from advertising.

Swing, a bi-monthly magazine is distributed free at record shops, discotheques, nightclubs and Burger King restaurants, while the revamp of Movie News last month was timed to coincide with an expected rise in the number of cinema patrons.

Just three months after the Copyright Act came into force, sales are booming for video distributors and recording companies, while film distributors expect good times ahead, now that the pirates can no longer rob them of business.

The Act carries a maximum fine of $100,000 and maximum jail terms of five years for piracy of audio and video cassettes, books, computer software.

Major video distributors say their sales have increased by 20 to 25 per cent in an industry which is reportedly worth more than $7 million.

Cinema chain Shaw Brothers expects 20 per cent more patrons in the next few months. Polygram Records thinks sales would increase by 50 per cent this year while WEA Pte Ltd already reports that business has improved "manifold".

The Act could also help bring new talent into the music market now that pirates are less likely to eat into the profits.

WEA managing director Jimmy Wee said: "We want to spend more on promoting local singers, and look for long-term artistes."

The company also wants to import "quality studio people" such as sound engineers, song writers and producers from abroad to produce an album of international standard, something which it has not done since 1976.

[From the Straits Times, June 4, 1987]

TAPE PIRATES LOSING THE WAR

(By Yeo Kim Seng)

The music industry's relentless war on pirates last year has paid off.

Sales of records, cassettes and compact discs by wholesalers soared to a record $25.5 million last year, an $11 million increase over 1985.

They would have been higher if translated into retail prices, which are between 15 and 20 per cent more, said a senior music industry official yesterday.

Mr. Giouw Jui Chian, spokesman of the International Federation of Phonogram and Videogram Producers (IFPI), attributed the sharp rise in sales partly to the 200 or so raids against sellers of pirated music last year.

Since February 1984, 943,021 pirated cassette tapes with a street value of nearly $2.3 million have been destroyed.

Mr. Giouw also said the sales figures represented about 85 per cent of the industry.

Another reason for the better sales was the co-operation among retailers, the IFPI and the Singapore Sound Tape Retailers Association, Mr. Giouw said.

At the core of this effort was the strategy used to cushion retailers from the high costs of replacing their stocks with copyright versions, he added.

"We got retailers last year to beef up their stocks of copyright cassette tapes gradually to prepare for the introduction of the Copyright Act," he said. The Act came into effect in April this year.

Some shops would have been forced to close down if they had to replace all their stocks with copyright tapes immediately when the law took effect and this would have hurt everyone, he added.

"And others would have run into high financial commitments."

So the phonogram federation and the sound tape retailers association proposed a timetable for the retailers to get rid of their pirated tapes.

They were urged to ensure that, between January and March last year, up to 75 per cent of their stocks were copyright tapes. By last September the figure had risen to 90 per cent.

And between October and this April when the law took effect, their stocks should have had fewer than 70 pirated tapes.

"This ensured that shops could come clean on the day the law took effect," Mr. Giouw said.

This was important, he explained, because if they had closed down, the industry would have been hurt, too.●

ADVANCE NOTIFICATION

PROPOSED ARMS SALE

● Mr. PELL. Mr. President, as the result of a 1976 agreement, the executive branch provides Congress with advance notification of proposed arms sales under the Arms Export Control Act in excess of $50 million or, in the case of major defense equipment as defined in the act, those in excess of $14 million. Upon such notification, the Congress has not less than 20 calendar days for informal review and consultation with the administration on the proposed sale. If the executive branch wishes to proceed with the sales proposal following the informal review period, section 36(b)(1) requires that the executive branch submit a formal notification to Congress of the proposed arms sale. Upon such notification, the Congress has 30 calendar days to review the sale. The provision stipulates that, in the Senate, the notification of proposed sales shall be sent to the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee.

In keeping with the committee's intention to see that such information is available to the full Senate, I ask to have printed in the RECORD at this point a notification which has been received. Portions of the notification which are classified have been deleted for publication, but are available to Senators at the Foreign Relations Committee.

The notification follows:

DEFENSE SECURITY ASSISTANCE AGENCY,
Washington, DC, August 3, 1987.

In reply refer to: I-03451/87ct.

Mr. GERYLD B. CHRISTIANSON,
Staff Director, Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHRISTIANSON: By letter dated 18 February 1976, the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, indicated that you would be advised of possible transmittals to Congress of information as required by Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act. At the instruction of the Department of State, I wish to provide the following advance notification.

The Department of State is considering an offer to a Northeast Asian country tentatively estimated to cost $50 million or more.

Sincerely,

GLENN A. RUDD,
Deputy Director.●

INFORMED CONSENT: FLORIDA II

● Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, today I would like to insert into the RECORD two letters from women who support my informed consent legislation, S. 272 and S. 273. Today's letters come from the State of Florida.

I ask that these letters from women in Florida be printed in the RECORD.

The letters follow:

APRIL 1, 1987.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: I am writing to you on behalf of myself and the many other women who have been deceived through abortion. I have suffered two abortions. When I went to Orlando for the abortions no one at the clinic advised me about fetal development, physical consequences or emotional stress. I am now a counselor at a Crisis Pregnancy Center and I see over and over women who have suffered physically and emotionally from previous abortions. Very few of the women I see have ever been educated about abortion.

My plea to you is to support any legislation to educate women before they can consent to having an abortion. Also, for parent consent of minor girls seeking an abortion. If that law had been in affect my parents could have my protection from all of this pain and suffering. I would hope had I been educated about the truth of abortion I would have chosen to keep my babies. I grieve their loss but I am on the battlefront to save other unborn children.

Thank you for your support in the important issue.

Sincerely,

VONNIE CARDWELL.

TITUSVILLE, FL.

FEBRUARY 23, 1987.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: When I went for "counseling" regarding obtaining an abortion, the first thing that was discussed was money and then the procedure that would be used. They never raised the question that the fetus I was carrying might actually be a human being or that there were other alternatives to abortions.

I really feel that my baby that was aborted was a victim of a conspiracy of silence. I knew and realized after the abortion (without being told) that what I had done was wrong and tantamount to murder.

Yes, I should have control over my own body, but after conception the fetus that is created inside my body is a separate entity and deserves a chance to live.

Please continue your efforts on behalf of the babies that cannot lobby for their own lives. Please let me know if there is any way that I can help support your efforts.

Thank you,

MRS. KATE JONES.

ORLANDO, FL.●

REAUTHORIZATION OF THE PRICE-ANDERSON ACT

● Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, there is an urgent need to pass legislation to reauthorize and extend the Price-Anderson Act. The Price-Anderson Act provides a system for public compensation in the event of a nuclear accident. On July 30, the House of Representatives passed legislation to modify and extend Price-Anderson. The Senate must take immediate action to do similarly.

Existing authority under the Price-Anderson Act expired on August 1, and we must take action quickly to renew the act.

The Price-Anderson system is a comprehensive, compensation-oriented system of liability insurance for Department of Energy contractors and Nuclear Regulatory Commission licensees operating nuclear facilities. Under Price-Anderson, there is a ready source of funds that would be available to compensate the public for damages resulting from a nuclear accident. Without Price-Anderson, there would not be such a pool of funds available.

The Price-Anderson Act was first enacted in 1957, and it has been modified and extended twice. We should not allow it to expire now.

In the absence of Price-Anderson, compensation to victims of a nuclear accident would likely be seriously limited. Failure to extend the Price-Anderson system for DOE contractor activities would raise serious concerns about adequate compensation for victims of a nuclear accident at a DOE facility.

DOE contractors are covered under the Price-Anderson indemnity provisions of current contracts, but with expiration of the act, DOE has lost its authority to indemnify contractors under Price-Anderson in new contracts. Therefore, any existing indemnity agreements will expire at the end of the term of the existing contracts and cannot be renewed. If the act is not renewed, DOE contractors—those involved in atomic energy defense, uranium fuel preparation, and nuclear waste disposal—will be without the comprehensive, no-fault liability insurance system provided by Price-Anderson. Congress must act quickly to preserve the ability of the Federal Government to undertake these essential activities.

Several of DOE's major contracts will come up for renewal soon. Contracts at three major facilities—Los Alamos National Laboratory, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, and Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory—will expire on September 30. The contract for operation of another major facility, Brookhaven National Laboratory, will expire on December 31.

There is an urgent need to extend and reauthorize the Price-Anderson Act before any of these contracts expire. If these contracts are renewed without Price-Anderson coverage, the loser will be the public. In the absence of Price-Anderson, compensation for victims of a nuclear accident would be less predictable, less timely, and potentially inadequate compared to the compensation that would be available under the current system.

On June 12, the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources reported S. 748, the Price-Anderson Amendments Act of 1987. S. 748 would modify and extend the portions of the Price-Anderson Act that provide public liability coverage for DOE contractors.

S. 748 would extend authority for the Price-Anderson indemnification system for DOE contractors for 30 years. It would increase the amount of public compensation immediately available after an accident from $500 million in current dollars per incident to $6 billion in constant dollars per incident. In the event that damages exceed the $6 billion cap, S. 748 establishes an expedited mechanism for congressional action on additional compensation measures.

In addition, S. 748 adds new authority to provide for greater accountability of contractors, subcontractors, and suppliers in the performance of their duties under contract with the Department of Energy for nuclear activities. The Energy and Natural Resources Committee felt that exercise of this authority by DOE could reduce the likelihood of serious nuclear incidents.

S. 748 grants the Secretary of Energy new authority to impose civil and criminal penalties on contractors for violations of DOE rules, regulations, and orders related to nuclear safety. This authority parallels that provided to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission in the Atomic Energy Act with respect to NRC licensees. S. 748 provides for civil penalties of up to $100,000 per day for violations of DOE nuclear safety rules, regulations, or orders. The bill also provides authority for criminal penalties in the case of knowing or willful violations of these rules, regulations, or orders on the part of individual directors, officers, or employees of DOE contractors.

Additional mechanisms for ensuring safe operations by DOE contractors included in S. 748 are the establishment of an inspector general for nuclear programs and the establishment of an independent panel to make recommendations for permanent regulation and oversight of DOE nuclear activities. These provisions are positive steps toward ensuring continued safe operation of DOE facilities.

On July 30, the House of Representatives approved legislation to extend the Price-Anderson Act. The House-passed bill, H.R. 1414, will extend coverage under the Price-Anderson system for both DOE contractors and NRC licensees. The House-passed bill will increase the amount of public compensation available after an accident to just over $7 billion.

It is important that the Senate extend the Price-Anderson Act. The compensation system established by this Act has been a good one, and we

must extend the Act to allow that system to continue.

I hope that the Senate will be able to take action on Price-Anderson this week. If not, I hope we will take it up as soon as we come back after Labor Day.●

HIGHWAY AND TRAFFIC SAFETY

● Mr. DANFORTH. Mr. President, highway and traffic safety is, in my judgment, an area where government can make a constructive contribution to the public interest. As we debate questions of highway and traffic safety, we often focus on statistics about death and injury, the cost of competing options, and the state of technology. I rise to call attention not to statistics, but to a person named Matthew Young, aged 24, of St. Louis. Two years ago, he was severely injured in a crash on an exotic new kind of motorcyle—one of the so-called "killer motorcycles" that are gaining increasing popularity with young riders. Such machines can reach 60 miles per hour in less than 2.7 seconds. They can achieve top speeds in excess of 160 miles per hour. I have introduced legislation to direct the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration to set a safety standard for this new and unique class of motorcycles. Killer motorcycles have no appropriate on-street use and should be used only in competition or other off-street environments. They should not be mass-marketed for general use on the public streets by young men like Matt Young. Matt Young agrees. He recently shared his experiences in an interview with the St. Louis Post-Dispatch. I ask that the article be reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and commend it to the attention of Senators.

The article follows:

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, July 27, 1987]

"I'M LUCKY I'M ALIVE"

"SUPERBIKE" CRASH VICTIM BACKS CURB ON MACHINES

(By Kathleen Best)

WASHINGTON.—Saturday, June 15, 1985, is a blank space in Matt Young's memory.

He doesn't remember going out motorcycle riding with friends or slamming his hot, new Kawasaki Ninja against the side of a van. He doesn't remember the ambulance ride to St. Joseph Hospital of Kirkwood or the prognosis that he would die.

He remembers the five months in traction while his two broken legs and his broken hip mended, the later surgery to try to heal the three broken vertebrae in his neck and the 10 months of grueling physical therapy as movement slowly—and, he says, miraculously—returned to his limbs.

Young, 24, a nephew of former U.S. Rep. Robert A. Young, wants to share those memories to spare others the same pain.

"I'm lucky I'm alive," he says. "I don't think, especially for unqualified riders, that (the Ninja and other racing bikes) should be on the streets. I'm living proof they are very dangerous.

Sen. John C. Danforth agrees. He wants to take such motorcycles, which he calls "superbikes," off the roadways.

"From a dead stop, one of these superbikes accelerates to 60 miles per hour by the time it reaches the other side of a city intersection," Danforth said. "It takes one of these killer cycles 2.7 seconds to reach this speed.

"The combination of these racing machines and young, inexperienced riders is deadly."

Danforth introduced legislation last week that would direct the Department of Transportation to develop, within 12 months, safety standards aimed at taking high-horsepower, lightweight motorcycles off public streets.

The measure was narrowly drawn so that it would not apply to traditional motorcycles or dirt bikes, said Steve Hilton, a spokesman for Danforth.

Instead it is aimed at motorcycles that weigh between 400 and 600 pounds with engines that in some cases have more than 100 horsepower.

Hilton said the so-called superbikes were manufactured primarily by Japan's "big four" motorcycle companies—Kawasaki, Honda, Suzuki and Yamaha—and were marketed under model names such as the Ninja, Hurricane, GSXR and FZ.

Mel Stahl, vice president for government relations for the Motorcycle Industry Council, declined to comment on the legislation. "At this point, we don't have a position to express," he said.

The council has requested a meeting with Danforth to discuss voluntary regulations for such motorcycles. The request was made "before we saw the bill and the press release," Stahl said.

When Danforth introduced the legislation, he said, "The marketing of killer cycles is a lesson in corporate irresponsibility.

"The advertising is directed at teen-age males. A typical one is Honda's slogan: 'Zero to 55 faster than you can read this'."

Hilton said superbikes made up a minuscule proportion of motorcycle sales nationwide and seemed most popular on the West Coast.

He said no one had studied the number of such motorcycles or the injuries or deaths attributed to their use.

But Matt Young doesn't need any studies to be convinced of their danger.

"I'm not sure what the top speed on mine was, but it was at least 120, maybe more," he said. "I wouldn't consider myself a real good rider. At the time of the accident, I wasn't even motorcycle-qualified on my license.

"But it kind of caught my eye. I'd seen ads for them, seen them around town. It was a catchy bike, good-looking. It was what I had to have to be in with everybody else."

Being "in" has lost its importance, these days. Being alive is the main thing.

"I think this law is probably needed," Young said as he prepared for another round of therapy.●

FIVE-YEAR ARCTIC RESEARCH PLAN

● Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, on Friday an important message from the President of the United States was delivered to the Senate.

In keeping with the Arctic Research and Policy Act of 1984, the President submitted to Congress the Nation's first 5-year Arctic research plan—a comprehensive 5-year program plan for the overall Federal effort in Arctic research.

The United States is an Arctic nation that has only very recently begun to play the part. Thousands of Americans live and work in the Arctic, and we have substantial natural resources and important strategic interests in the Arctic. However, we have only recently begun to think of ourselves as an Arctic nation.

When I was first elected to the U.S. Senate in 1980, Alaskans asked me to foster the creation of a comprehensive national Arctic research policy, an effort begun almost 20 years earlier by Alaska's first Senators. Indeed, as early as 1960, Alaskans in Washington were arguing that national goals in the Arctic required the United States to direct a greater share of national scientific resources toward research in the far north.

While an increase in Arctic research did occur during the 1970's, largely due to the construction of the trans-Alaskan pipeline, Government Arctic research was almost exclusively performed on an ad hoc, program-oriented basis. The Nation's Arctic Research Program, if you could call it that, was a fragmented collection of projects and programs that lacked clear direction, coordination, or an overall guiding policy.

By 1980, our stake in the Arctic had clearly risen. By that time, America was addicted to Arctic oil, deriving some 20 percent of our domestic production from a single Arctic field at Prudhoe Bay, AK. At the same time, new developments in military technology, most notably nuclear-powered submarines and long-range bombers equipped with cruise missiles, transformed the Arctic from a seemingly benign and remote polar region to one of the most strategic places on Earth. Indeed, the Arctic was beginning to be recognized as the true common border between the superpowers.

As a result of these developments, a new push for a policy-guided Arctic research effort began. As a result of my efforts, in addition to those of Senators TED STEVENS and Henry "Scoop" Jackson, and Representatives DON YOUNG, DOUG WALGREN, DON FUQUA, and others, Congress passed the Arctic Research and Policy Act [ARPA] of 1984.

In passing ARPA, Congress intended that the Nation as a whole become more informed about the Arctic and the fact that the United States is an Arctic nation. Our lack of knowledge about the Arctic had been a clear source of frustration to Congress during the 1970's when the discovery of oil at Prudhoe Bay and a global energy crisis moved Congress to enact a number of new statutes affecting the

future of the Arctic. With hindsight, it's easy to see that the congressional debates which preceeded passage of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act of 1971, the Trans-Alaska Pipeline Act of 1973, the Alaska Natural Gas Transportation Act of 1976, and the Alaska Lands Act of 1980, were sometimes characterized by ill-informed, sensational, and misleading information.

For instance, the Senate was only able to narrowly pass the Trans-Alaska Pipeline Act with the tie-breaking vote of the Vice President. Many Senators who opposed the pipeline believed the assertions of extreme environmentalists who argued that any development would seriously jeopardize the future of the central Arctic caribou herd and other wildlife. While we now know that responsible development can occur in the Arctic, ignorance of the truth in 1973 almost exacted a significant price—the pipeline might never have been built.

Mr. President, as the old saying goes, if you think knowledge is expensive, try ignorance. The basic purposes of the Arctic Research and Policy Act is to increase our knowledge of the Arctic in order that we can make wise decisions about its future and the future of our Arctic nation. As a consequence of the act:

The United States now has an Arctic Research Commission which meets regularly to advise the President and Congress on matters of Arctic Research;

The United States has a Federal Interagency Committee to coordinate Federal Arctic research efforts.

We have a coordinated Arctic research budget.

We are looking closely at the need for new research platforms, icebreakers, and other mechanisms to study the Arctic.

Finally, we have this document that was just transmitted to the Congress by the President—the first 5-year Arctic research plan.

The fact is, we've come a long way in the short time since the passage of the Arctic Research and Policy Act. And that's fortunate, because there is much we must know about the Arctic if we expect to move into what some have called "the Age of the Arctic" with confidence. For instance:

We must find the new technologies we need to develop Arctic resources wisely while protecting the Arctic ecosystem;

We must fully understand how Arctic systems operate if we expect to address problems such as Arctic haze and the greenhouse effect.

We must improve our knowledge of glaciers, sea ice, permafrost, and snow in order to perfect new Arctic air, land and maritime transportation technologies.

We must fully understand disruptive auroral displays and high latitude atmospheric disturbances if we expect to enjoy dependable telecommunications capabilities in the Arctic;

Finally, the Arctic, in stark contrast to the Antarctic, is the home to an indigenous people who have lived and hunted in the region since time immemorial. We must fully understand the Arctic and the short and long-term impacts of what we do there if we expect to protect the unique lifestyle of the Inuit—Eskimo—people.

Mr. President, it is clear that the Arctic, once considered a remote and forgotten area of our planet, is emerging as one of the most important regions of the world. Congress has recognized this fact. Building on the foundation of ARPA, the United States is poised to take its rightful place as a leader among the Arctic nations of the world.

In closing, I want to say just a few words about the plan and how it evolved. A tremendous amount of time, effort, and consultation went into this plan—more than we will ever know. It may interest my colleagues to know that meetings and workshops leading to the plan were held in Hanover, NH; Anchorage, AK; Boulder, CO; Barrow, AK; and Washington, DC.

Moreover, the members and staff of the Interagency Arctic Research Policy Committee, the Commissioners and staff of the Arctic Research Commission, the National Science Foundation, Arctic residents, other interested members of the public, and scientists in and outside of government, have all made significant contributions in time, energy, and expertise far above and beyond their normal duties. We owe them all a special debt of gratitude. The result of their efforts is before us today: A comprehensive plan that will help us to chart our course as a true Arctic nation.●

COMMITTEES TO HAVE UNTIL 7:30 P.M. TO FILE REPORTS

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the committees have until 7:30 today to file reports.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDERS FOR TUESDAY

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business the Senate stand in adjournment until the hour of 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow the call of the calendar be waived and no motions or resolutions over, under the rule, come over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow after the two leaders are recognized there be a period for morning business not to extend beyond 11:30, the Senators may speak therein up to 5 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire is recognized.

NOMINATION OF ROBERT BORK TO BE SUPREME COURT JUSTICE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to comment on some noteworthy positive developments regarding our forthcoming consideration of the Bork nomination.

Though the chairman of the Judiciary Committee continues to unreasonably delay the start of the hearings on Robert Bork, indeed the delay will by far surpass any previous delay in modern times for the consideration of a Supreme Court nomination, I am pleased to note nonetheless that several distinguished Members from the other side of the aisle—that is the side opposite from which I am now standing—have made commendable efforts to bring some fairness and reasonableness to bear on the consideration of the nomination.

The majority leader and the senior Senator from Arizona have cautioned their colleagues to avoid premature judgments and to objectively examine Judge Bork's professional qualifications, judicial temperament, and other relevant criteria.

Mr. President, Senators will recall the inflammatory and intemperate rhetoric heard on this floor on the very day the nomination was announced. We were told then that the addition of this distinguished American to the Supreme Court would somehow result in "blacks being forced to sit at segregated lunch counters, rogue police breaking down citizens' doors in midnight raids," for example.

Such demagoguery has no place in our deliberations on this critically important nomination. That is why I welcomed and commend the refreshing and responsible statements of the majority leader and the Senator from Arizona.

Let us have a fair and rational debate. It is not asking too much. Indeed, the American people expect it of us in deliberating the confirmation

of a candidate for so important an office.

I can think of no more relevant criterion for us to consider than the nominee's key performances as a judge on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the D.C. District Court over the past 5 years. That position, Mr. President, is literally as close as one can get to the Supreme Court in our Federal judicial system without being on the High Court itself.

Judge Bork has been a member of that court now for 5 years, unanimously confirmed by the Senate in 1982. And how he performed as a U.S. court of appeals judge unquestionably provides the best possible evidence of how he would perform on the Supreme Court.

His record on the court of appeals also provides the best evidence for evaluating the charges of those who, in my opinion, unfairly and unreasonably claim that Mr. Bork is an extremist whose views are outside the mainstream of responsible jurisprudence.

Judge Bork's actual record as a Federal judge not only refutes such charges beyond any dispute, but also demonstrates that he is one of the most qualified and responsible judges ever nominated to the Supreme Court.

On the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals, Robert Bork has authored over 100 opinions for the majority. Not one of those opinions has been reversed by the Supreme Court. Not one.

Hardly the work of an extremist, Mr. President. In fact, although the losing party has petitioned the Supreme Court to review 13 of Bork's majority opinions, his opinions have been so well-grounded that the Court has not considered it necessary to review a single one of them. The fact that the losing parties decided not to seek review of Bork's 87 other majority opinions further reenforces the soundness of those rulings. The sounder the reasoning in an opinion, the less likely it is that lawyers will pursue an appeal.

Equally remarkable is the fact that the Supreme Court has not reversed any of the 400 majority opinions in which Judge Bork has joined; in concurrence, not as author.

He has authored 100, none of which has been overturned. He has taken part and participated and concurred in some 400, not one of which has been reversed.

These hard facts are the most eloquent and objective possible testimony to the soundness of Bork's judicial approach. A judge who endorses and applies legal views which are "extremist" or outside the judicial mainstream could not possibly compile such an extraordinary record of consistently sound rulings, which have been upheld by the Supreme Court.

These are not the only facts from Judge Bork's judicial record that refute the unfair and unreasonable charges which some have made against the nominee. Other objective data demonstrate the fallacy of claims that his judicial philosophy places him on the "outer fringes" of responsible judicial decisionmaking.

Bork has voted with the majority of the D.C. circuit in 94 percent of the cases he has heard during his tenure there. Yet the D.C. Circuit Court had 7 Democratic appointees out of 10 members when he joined it, and presently has 5 Democratic appointees out of 10 members. This court includes some of the most prominent liberal jurists in the Nation, including Chief Judge Patricia Wald and Judge Abner Mikva.

Interestingly, when Supreme Court Justice Antonin Scalia sat on the D.C. Circuit Court with Judge Bork, Scalia and Bork voted the same in 84 out of the 86 cases—more than 98 percent—in which they both participated. More similar voting records would be difficult to find among any pair of judges. Are Bork's critics prepared to call Scalia an extremist as well? Are Senators prepared to admit they voted to confirm to the Supreme Court an extremist in the person of Antonin Scalia with whom Judge Bork voted 98 percent of the time? Justice Scalia was confirmed by a vote of 98 to 0 one year ago.

Where, then, is the basis for harshly condemning a nominee whose judicial record is virtually identical to that of another nominee who was unanimously confirmed less than a year ago? I suggest that the question provides its own answer—none!

The chairman of the Judiciary Committee was candid enough to concede last fall that if Judge Bork were nominated and "looked a lot like Scalia," then the chairman would "have to vote for him," despite the expected attacks from the special interest groups.

Well, Judge Bork does "look a lot like Scalia," at least from the standpoint of their voting records as appeals court judges. That is the point of the remarks I am delivering tonight. A 98-percent rate of agreement in voting record could hardly be more alike. And that is the standpoint that should count when we are considering a nomination for the highest appeals court in the land. Or maybe we misunderstood the distinguished Senator from Delaware when he used the phrase "looks a lot like Scalia." Maybe the Senator meant facial appearance. Maybe he favors jurists who are clean-shaven. Could that have been it? In that case, we must get Bork to shave off his beard, and then the Senator from Delaware no doubt will be prepared to support him.

The anti-Bork campaign being waged by certain special interest groups in connection with Presidential campaigning is an ill-disguised attempt to divert this confirmation process from its proper and legitimate task. We should be deciding whether Judge Bork, like Justice Scalia, has the qualifications, the judicial record, and the integrity befitting a Supreme Court Justice. Unless our hearings reveal some serious impropriety or flaw undetected by the prior hearings and microscopic examinations of Robert Bork's personal and public record, it is quite clear that he meets those tests.

Mr. President, like others, including many Senators on the Democratic side, I urge my colleagues to keep their focus on these relevant and legitimate considerations. We should not and cannot allow this important process to be dominated, distorted, by inflammatory assaults designed to turn our confirmation process into some element of the Presidential campaign by certain Members.

If each of us on both sides of the aisle listens to the wise admonitions of the majority leader and the Senator from Arizona, we will at least get off to a good start.

Mr. President, likewise, in connection with the Bork nomination, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD an editorial on that subject printed in the Fosters's Daily Democrat, Dover, NH, on July 30, 1987.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Dover (NH) Foster's Daily Democrat, July 30, 1987]

THE BORK BROUHAHA

OPPOSITION TAINTED BY OPPORTUNISM

Critics of U.S. Court of Appeals Justice Robert H. Bork base their opposition to his nomination to the U.S. Supreme Court on two fundamental arguments—one weak and the other illogical.

First, opponents contend Supreme Court nominees have historically been judged on their political ideology, not only their scholarly qualifications. Bork is brilliant, they admit, but he's too right-wing.

Historically, they are only partially right. Yes, about 20 percent of all presidential appointments to the high court have been rejected by the Senate—many of those for reasons rooted in politics. But that means an overwhelming majority, 80 percent, have been approved.

A credible case can be made that the Senate's constitutional charge to advise on and approve presidential appointments to federal courts provides for a role more aggresive than simply validating a nominee's sound morals and high intelligence. Supreme Court justices serve for life—all the more reason an appointee should be subjected to the same spirit of checks and balances that characterizes other conflicts between the executive and legislative branches of government.

However, history also shows the Senate generally gives presidents the benefit of the doubt—as the 80 percent approval rating attests. Even when the Senate does not agree with a court nominee's opinions, it tends to discount political differences and accedes to presidential prerogative.

The Bork nomination has crossed the bounds of legitimate ideological debate. it has become a tawdry partisan show trial tainted by the special interest politics of presidential campaigning. On issues relating to the Supreme Court, differences of opinion should be debated with an eye on civility and reason—a fact lost on Sen. Edward Kennedy and presidential hopeful Sen. Joseph Biden, who is chairman of the Senate's Judiciary Committee.

Kennedy recently made Bork out to be less humane than Adolf Hitler and Biden pledged to fight the nomination after first saying eight months ago that Bork was such an excellent judge he would vote to confirm Bork if he were nominated.

The Senate was never intended to be a rubber stamp for Supreme Court nominations, but neither was it meant to conduct confirmation proceedings as a kangaroo court. The rhetoric from the left leans to the latter.

The argument absent of logic is the one that says at another time Bork would be acceptable, but because he might become a swing vote on the conservative side, he must be rejected to maintain political "balance" on the court. Those making that claim never complained about the lack of "balance" during the heyday of the Warren Court. They showed no constitutional consternation when liberal rulings overturned established conservative decisions. Now that liberal sacred ground is threatened, suddenly the notion of "balance" is in vogue. Balance is relative. If anything, a more conservative court is needed in the 1990s to "balance" the liberal court of the 1960s and 1970s.

The big point the liberals are missing is that Bork is simply not the ogre they make him out to be. His writings are controversial, but actions speak louder than words. During Bork's tenure on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, not one of his decisions has been overruled by the Supreme Court on appeal.

Furthermore, Bork is a devout follower of judicial restraint; he favors judicial intervention only when absolutely necessary. He is more likely to vote to maintain the status quo than incite a conservative counterrevolution.

When the political hysteria and opportunism is stripped away, what remains is a Supreme Court nominee with outstanding qualifications whose ideology has been unfairly distorted. Bork deserves to be confirmed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I would just note that the editorial is titled "The Bork Brouhaha" and the subtitle is "Opposition Tainted by Opportunism." The editorial takes the opponents of Judge Bork to task for unfairness, unreasonable conduct and irresponsible charges against the nominee.

Inasmuch as some Members of the Senate are campaigning for the Presidency, I thought they might like to read this editorial from one of the important papers in New Hampshire, a State which everyone knows has the first Presidential primary.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TOMORROW AT 11 A.M.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, if there be no further business, I move, in accordance with the order previously entered that the Senate stand in adjournment until the hour of 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to and the Senate, at 6:37 p.m., adjourned until Tuesday, August 4, 1987, at 11 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nomination received by the Senate August 3, 1987:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Samuel A. Alito, Jr., of New Jersey, to be U.S. attorney for the district of New Jersey for the term of 4 years, vice W. Hunt Dumont, resigned.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate August 3, 1987:

FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

Alan Greenspan, of New York, to be a Member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for the unexpired term of 14 years from February 1, 1978.

Alan Greenspan, of New York, to be Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for a term of 4 years.

The above nomination was approved subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.