

I look forward to working with Secretary Peña on these and other important issues. The next Secretary of Energy has a great opportunity to give our country an energy policy that values energy sufficiency for our country.

I thank you for this opportunity to speak on behalf of Secretary Peña. I yield the floor.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 30 seconds.

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

Mr. DOMENICI. Regarding soon-to-be-confirmed Secretary of Energy Peña, I want to tell the Senate I know him and his family very well, in particular his wife, who went to school with my children. We are good friends. I do not support him on that basis only. I think he is ready to undertake this very difficult job. I wish him well.

I think we can work together to make the Department of Energy a better department under his administration. I look forward to working to that end. I yield the floor.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF FEDERICO PENA, OF COLORADO, TO BE SECRETARY OF ENERGY

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order the Senate will now go into executive session and proceed to vote on the Peña nomination.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Federico Peña, of Colorado, to be Secretary of Energy? On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROBERTS). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 99, nays 1, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 30 Ex.]

YEAS—99

Abraham	Coats	Glenn
Akaka	Cochran	Gorton
Allard	Collins	Graham
Ashcroft	Conrad	Gramm
Baucus	Coverdell	Grassley
Bennett	Craig	Gregg
Biden	D'Amato	Hagel
Bingaman	Daschle	Harkin
Bond	DeWine	Hatch
Boxer	Dodd	Helms
Breaux	Domenici	Hollings
Brownback	Dorgan	Hutchinson
Bryan	Durbin	Hutchinson
Bumpers	Enzi	Inhofe
Burns	Faircloth	Inouye
Byrd	Feingold	Jeffords
Campbell	Feinstein	Johnson
Chafee	Ford	Kempthorne
Cleland	Frist	Kennedy

Kerrey	Moseley-Braun	Smith, Bob
Kerry	Moynihan	Smith, Gordon
Kohl	Murkowski	H.
Kyl	Murray	Snowe
Landrieu	Nickles	Specter
Lautenberg	Reed	Stevens
Leahy	Reid	Thomas
Levin	Robb	Thompson
Lieberman	Roberts	Thurmond
Lott	Rockefeller	Torricelli
Lugar	Roth	Warner
Mack	Santorum	Wellstone
McCain	Sarbanes	Wyden
McConnell	Sessions	
Mikulski	Shelby	

NAYS—1

Grams

The nomination was confirmed.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will return to legislative session.

Mr. HOLLINGS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

CAMPAIGN FINANCE AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, in accordance with the unanimous-consent agreement, I call up Senate Joint Resolution 18 on behalf of myself, Mr. SPECTER, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. BYRD, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BRYAN, Mr. BIDEN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. REED, Mr. REID, Mr. CONRAD, Mr. DORGAN, Mr. FORD, and Mr. HARKIN, and ask the clerk to report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now proceed to the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 18, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 18) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to contributions and expenditures intended to affect elections.

The Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, in a line, what we say is that the Congress is hereby authorized to regulate or control expenditures in Federal elections.

Let me say that I come now to this particular subject of a constitutional amendment, which we have been on for over 10 years, with some hope, because I noticed on yesterday, Mr. President, we had a fit of conscience. We were about to pass a resolution that said Congress was only going to look at illegal contributions and not at improper ones, and, finally, in a fit of conscience, the Congress, particularly here in the Senate, decided that was not going to fly. It would appear to be, if we took that course, a coverup whereby we did not want to get into soft money and all of these other extravaganzas, legal as they are, says the Supreme Court, but as improper as can be.

That is what is causing the headlines and the consternation and the money chase that we read in the headlines and news stories. We had a fit of conscience

when we passed the 1974 act. This act came about due to the untoward activity in the 1967 and 1971 Presidential races. In the 1967 race, President Nixon had designated Maurice Stans, later the Secretary of Commerce, to collect the money.

And I will never forget; he came to the State of South Carolina, and he told our textile friends, "your fair share is \$350,000," almost like the United Fund or Community Chest. Well, I had been their Governor and everything else and had never gotten \$350,000 out of the textile industry, and they were all my friends. But the ten of them, at \$35,000 apiece, got up the money, and more than that. There were other large contributions, including one of \$2 million from Chicago.

The fact was, after President Nixon took office, Treasury Secretary John Connally went to the President and said, "Mr. President, you have got a lot of good support and you have not even met these individuals much less thanked them. Why not come down to the ranch and we will put on a barbecue and you can meet and thank them." President Nixon said, "fine business," and they did. But as they turned into the weekend ranch barbecue on the Connally Ranch in Texas, there was a big Brinks truck. Dick Tuck, the prankster from the Kennedy campaign, had stationed a truck with signs out there. A picture of it was taken. And we in Washington, Republican and Democrat, said, "heavens above, the Government's up for sale." Thereafter, you had the extremes of Watergate, which everyone is familiar with. So, in 1974 we had a fit of conscience. Yes, everybody thought they had advantages with respect to getting the money. They had gotten here on the ground rules as they then appeared, and said "Why change? I can operate as the rules are."

But, with that fit of conscience, we came and passed the 1974 act. I want to remind everyone that this was a very deliberate, bipartisan effort at the time. It set spending limits on campaigns, limited candidates' personal spending on their own behalf, limited expenditures by independent persons or groups for or against candidates, set voluntary spending limits as a condition for receiving public funding, set disclosure requirements for campaign spending and receipts, set limits on contributions for individuals and political committees, and created the Federal Election Commission.

When you hear the debates, some of the new Members will come on the floor talking about what we really need is disclosure. That is what we have, still, under that 1974 act. I am required to record every dollar in and out with both the Secretary of the Senate on the one hand and the secretary of state back in the capital of my State, Columbia, SC, on the other. We have complete disclosure. You cannot take cash.