

That is a very disturbing fact. We all know that perception becomes reality. If that is the belief of the American people, that means they would say we do not have any opportunity. If we want to change a law, if there is something that we would like to influence in Washington, DC, we would like to bring in an idea and have it become incorporated into a piece of legislation, we just do not think we have a fighting chance.

We have to change that perception.

I believe, among other things, campaign finance reform can be a means to that end. There may be other things that people have on the list, but I would put that very high—indeed, I would put that at the top of my list in the ways to change the law so we can begin to change that perception, so the American citizens out there can say, as, for example, Sarah Brady did, we can change the law. It may not be a popular change, maybe it will produce a lot of heartache where people will have to take a position on legislation we want to change, but we want to fight to change the law.

We have to change the perception that people have that there is no opportunity for them to come to Washington, DC, and change the law of the land. If we are able to do that, not only will we get increased participation at the day of the election, we will get increased participation all year long from citizens who feel this really is a government of, by, and for the people.

Mr. SPECTER, I yield the floor.

Mr. SPECTER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SPECTER. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I believe that campaign finance reform is long overdue. I have just had a conversation with the distinguished Senator from Connecticut—if I could have the attention of the Senator from Connecticut—and one of the real problems in the electoral process involves the soft money, where, on both sides of the political spectrum, Republicans and Democrats have sought enormous sums of money with the \$100,000 contribution being made which is totally outside the system.

I have just talked to Senator DODD about that. And I am glad to know his acquiescence on the issue of eliminating the soft money, because you can have all the limitations you like in many other respects, but if that soft money is available, it is all for naught. So I thank my colleague from Connecticut.

Mr. DODD. If my colleague would yield.

The bill does do that. And I think there is value in that. I neglected to say to my colleague in our private conversation that I think you might be able to make a case, for instance, in the area of local—not national—but local, statewide elections, and so forth, where you want to promote a certain activity, that you might find a way to have some exceptions and caveats.

In the underlying point, I think the Senator from Pennsylvania is correct, but I can also see where some modifications in that might meet the concerns of the Senator from Pennsylvania and my concerns, what he properly describes as the proliferation of this kind of resource that comes into our national coffers, in a way to promote, I think, sound, intelligent, and worthwhile political activity at the grassroots level.

Mr. SPECTER. If I may pursue that discussion for one more moment with the Senator from Connecticut.

I get concerned when you say caveat. What kind does the Senator have in mind?

Mr. DODD. I do not have one in mind. I think, like the Senator from Nebraska said, this 60-percent requirement, that the funds be 60 percent from your State, that might be fine in California, Pennsylvania, even Connecticut, but in some other States you may want to have some flexibility in that, small States that do not have that kind of population. You may want to modify that.

That is what I mean by some of the provisions here. I support this bill. I am a cosponsor of it. I think that speaks volumes about where we stand. I am willing to consider ways in which we can accommodate some legitimate questions being raised.

But my view is it is better to get behind a bill you fundamentally support so we have some possibility of reform, than to not support the bill at all. If I had as my standard here that I disagreed with a couple of points here and believed that there needed to be some modifications before I could support it, we would never get anything done in this area. In all the years I have supported campaign finance reform, that is what has happened here. The Democrats offer a bill, the Republicans offer a bill, and nothing ever gets done. We both go out and issue our press releases saying how much we are for campaign finance reform.

What the Senator from Nebraska and I have decided to do here backs our colleague—here is a colleague from the other side of the aisle who cares deeply about the issue, with two Members of the House, both of the Republican Party, Congressman SMITH and Congressman SHAYS, along with some Democrats, who offer a proposal. Because there are a number of Republicans and Democrats who endorse the McCain bill, we thought maybe, just maybe, we might be able to get beyond what has been the traditional response, Mr. President, to the historic way we have dealt with this issue, and that is a couple of bills and the press releases go out.

I am not going to endorse every aspect of this bill. I would not expect everyone else to. In the soft money area, my general view is we ought to get out of it. You may make some exceptions on the local level or State level. That may have some value. But I still believe honestly we ought to get behind

this bill and get something on the floor that would change the way we run our campaigns in this country.

INTERNATIONAL TRIBUNAL ON WAR CRIMES

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I have sought recognition today to lend my support to a request made by the prosecutor on the International War Crimes tribunal on the Bosnian situation, where the International tribunal on War Crimes in Bosnia has formally asked the United States to make the surrender of the indicted suspects a condition for any peace accord.

As we know, right now in Dayton there are negotiations underway to try to resolve the Bosnian conflict. But indictments have already been issued for Gen. Ratko Mladic, the Bosnian Serb military commander, and Radovan Karadzic, the Bosnian Serb leader, on indictments which specify their leadership role in the ethnic cleansing and reported massacres and organized rapes that marked the first months of the Bosnian war.

The tribunal prosecutor, the distinguished lawyer Richard J. Goldstone, has been pursuing these matters with real diligence, and it poses a real test for the international community. Part of the test arises because the President of Serbia, President Slobodan Milosevic, is involved in these negotiations. He was identified some time ago by the then-Secretary of State, Lawrence Eagleburger, as having been involved possibly in international war crimes in connection with the Bosnian Serbs' ethnic cleansing in the early months of that campaign.

I am pleased to note that ranking Clinton administration officials have committed that there will be no amnesty granted, but I think it is very important as a matter of international law that these prosecutions go forward and the United States cooperate with these prosecutions.

For more than a decade, Mr. President, I have urged the formation of an international criminal court to deal with crimes such as hostage taking, terrorism, and drug dealing where we find that there are people in custody who they will not extradite to the United States; for example, in Colombia where there are drug leaders and drug criminals who ought to be brought to trial, but because of domestic politics in Colombia, they are not willing to extradite them to the United States. If there were an international criminal court, then I do believe there would be a tribunal set up where the political disadvantage of extraditing, say, to the United States would not be present.

And I note today, Mr. President, that there are ceremonies marking the tragedy of Pan Am 103, where indictments have been issued for two Libyans implicated in the tragedy of Pan Am 103, and the intransigence of the Libyan

Government and their leader, Mu'ammar Qadhafi, who is refusing to allow those suspects to be tried in the United States or in Scottish or in British courts.

Were we to have an international criminal court, there is at least a chance that those individuals would be extradited to be tried in an international criminal court. Perhaps if such a court were in existence, Qadhafi would find another reason for declining to allow that trial to take place, but at least it would provide a possible alternative for such a trial.

The rule of law is indispensable, Mr. President, in a civilized society. We have benefited enormously in those countries which do have the rule of law. It is a high priority in the United States, obviously, with our constitutional rights.

We should have established an international criminal court a long time ago. It has been on the horizon. It has received favorable comment from the U.S. Senate and from the House on sense-of-the-Congress resolutions. But we ought to be moving to really put it into effect. With the Bosnian war crimes tribunal, we have a chance to advance the rule of law internationally. So I do hope that we will see to it that the request made by the international tribunal on war crimes to have the surrender of these indicted suspects be made as a condition to any peace accord that will take place.

I yield the floor.

Mr. SIMPSON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COVERDELL). The Chair recognizes the Senator from Wyoming.

EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. SIMPSON. What is the parliamentary situation, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair advises the Senator from Wyoming that morning business was to have closed at 1 o'clock, although the Senator would have an option to extend it.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I do not like to do that, and do not do it often at all; however, I will do so.

I ask unanimous consent that I may be allowed an additional 35 minutes.

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

Mr. SIMPSON. I thank the Chair because I know full well that it is the staff that needs the recess as much as we do. I cannot tell you how much we appreciate what they do for us, especially when we have had a week where there were 39 rollcall votes one day and some 20 the next or the day before, everybody back behind these halls that we do not see, the reporters—I never like to take advantage of that. But I have an important measure, Mr. President.

(The remarks of Mr. SIMPSON and Mrs. FEINSTEIN pertaining to the introduction of S. 1394 are located in to-

day's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

POLITICAL ACTIVITIES OF SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS, JESSE BROWN

Mr. SIMPSON. Let me just now refer briefly to my work on the Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee. I chaired that committee.

Mr. President, each and every day the Secretary of Veterans Affairs apparently greets his employees with a memo on their computer. Usually that memo recognizes the accomplishments of individual employees, notes the significance of a particular date in terms of this country's military history, or exhorts VA employees to a higher level of service to America's veterans. Nothing at all wrong with that.

But, on August 21, the Secretary took a leap beyond that boundary. In that day's message, he launched into his old stump speech about the woeful VA budget. About the same time, he also communicated with all VA employees by means of a similar message printed on their own personal pay stub.

I ask unanimous consent that these messages be printed in the RECORD.

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

MESSAGE FROM SECRETARY JESSE BROWN
PRINTED ON A RECENT VA EMPLOYEE PAY
VOUCHER

The Administration and the Congress have outlined dramatically different budget approaches designed to balance the budget, reduce taxes, and create a leaner government. As I have been telling the nation's veterans organizations this summer, the Administration's plan is much better for veterans and their families. The President recommended a good FY 1996 VA budget, with a \$1.3 billion increase, including nearly \$1 billion for health care. On the other hand, the House of Representatives has approved a plan to increase veterans health care \$563 million by taking money from our construction account and preventing us from building badly needed hospitals in Florida and California, hospitals which the President proposed be fully funded. And we will lose some of the money we need to renovate older facilities. The House also voted to stop compensation to some incompetent veterans. This is nothing but a means test that will push some service-connected veterans into poverty. We hear a lot these days about making sacrifices. We need to point out that veterans and their families have already paid their dues.

SECRETARY BROWN'S MESSAGE SENT AUGUST 21, 1995

This is what our veterans' budget future boils down to: the President has proposed a 10-year plan to eliminate the deficit, while protecting critical programs. He has proposed no new cuts in veterans entitlements. Congress has adopted a budget resolution outlining a 7-year plan to eliminate the deficit, which would be devastating to veterans' programs. The President has recommended a \$1.3 billion increase in VA's FY96 budget, nearly a billion of which is targeted to veterans' health care. The congressional budget resolution effectively freezes VA funding for veterans' health care at 1995 dollar levels for the next 7 years. This means eliminating

61,000 health care positions by 2002 and denying care to more than a million veterans. The House budget would also cancel plans for two badly needed VA replacement hospitals in central Florida and northern California. When it comes to meeting veterans' needs, gratitude and penny-pinching don't mix.

SECRETARY BROWN'S DAILY MESSAGE ON
OCTOBER 6, 1995

I am being attacked publicly for telling you through various forums what is going on with our budget. Rest assured I do not intend to stop. I believe VA employees had a right to know about the public and Congressional debate on VA's future and the impact our lawmakers' decisions can have on benefits and services for veterans. Is this a partisan endeavor? Absolutely not! As Secretary of Veterans Affairs, I have a responsibility to keep you informed on issues that affect your careers, livelihood and roles as members of the VA team. And certainly I have the right to let our valued constituency—veterans and their families—know that their programs may be adversely affected. It is important that employees be made fully aware that tens of thousands of VA jobs may be eliminated over the next seven years as a result of current budget proposals. I am not calling on you to act, but I think you have the right to know the facts. Stay tuned!

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, these messages, and their distribution to all VA employees, are highly political, and seem to me to be wholly inappropriate.

They all state a biased, partisan perspective of the Department's budget and its implications. This is a perspective with which I wholeheartedly disagree.

Nothing new in that either. Reasonable men can disagree.

However, my disagreement regarding the effects of the Congressional budget for veterans' programs is fully supported by a General Accounting Office [GAO] analysis of the budget conducted for the Chairman of the House Veterans Affairs Committee.

GAO documented that, on the merits themselves, Secretary Brown's criticisms of the VA budget which was approved by the Congress are indeed "exaggerated."

GAO also points out that if Secretary Brown were to analyze the President's budget using the same assumptions he used when he analyzed the budget approved by the Congress, he would find that veterans are better off under the Congressional budget—than under the President who appointed him.

In short, Mr. President, veterans should not be misled. Veterans are better off under the budget that Secretary Brown is attacking than they are under the President's budget he is defending.

Please hear that clearly. The VA knows this. The Secretary knows this.

Secretary Brown complains that the Congress will force him to close hospitals. What he doesn't tell us, and what he doesn't tell the VA employees who are pretty much compelled to read his daily ration of propaganda, is that, using the very same pessimistic assumptions, the President's own budget would require him to close 6 additional hospitals than he would have to close