

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Florida [Mr. MACK] is necessarily absent.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 51, nays 48, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 274 Leg.]

YEAS—51

Abraham	Enzi	Lugar
Allard	Faircloth	McCain
Ashcroft	Frist	McConnell
Bennett	Gorton	Murkowski
Bond	Gramm	Nickles
Brownback	Grams	Roberts
Burns	Grassley	Roth
Campbell	Gregg	Santorum
Chafee	Hagel	Sessions
Coats	Hatch	Shelby
Cochran	Helms	Smith (NH)
Collins	Hutchinson	Smith (OR)
Coverdell	Hutchison	Stevens
Craig	Inhofe	Thomas
D'Amato	Kempthorne	Thompson
DeWine	Kyl	Thurmond
Domenici	Lott	Warner

NAYS—48

Akaka	Feinstein	Levin
Baucus	Ford	Lieberman
Biden	Glenn	Mikulski
Bingaman	Graham	Moseley-Braun
Boxer	Harkin	Moynihan
Breaux	Hollings	Murray
Bryan	Inouye	Reed
Bumpers	Jeffords	Reid
Byrd	Johnson	Robb
Cleland	Kennedy	Rockefeller
Conrad	Kerrey	Sarbanes
Daschle	Kerry	Snowe
Dodd	Kohl	Specter
Dorgan	Landrieu	Torricelli
Durbin	Lautenberg	Wellstone
Feingold	Leahy	Wyden

NOT VOTING—1

Mack

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 51, the nays are 48. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

Mr. LOTT addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

PROVIDING FOR CONDITIONAL ADJOURNMENT OF BOTH HOUSES OF CONGRESS

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now turn to the adjournment resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 169; that the resolution be agreed to; and that the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, all without intervening action or debate.

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

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 169) was agreed to, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 169

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring) That when the House adjourns on the legislative day of Thursday, October 9, 1997, it stand adjourned until 10:30 a.m. on Tuesday, October 21, 1997, or until noon on the second day after Members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first; and that when the Senate recesses or adjourns at the close of business on Thursday, October 9, 1997, Friday, October 10, 1997, or Saturday, October 11, 1997, pursuant to a motion made by the Majority Leader, or his

designee, in accordance with this concurrent resolution, it stand recessed or adjourned until noon on Monday, October 20, 1997, or such time on that day as may be specified by the Majority Leader or his designee in the motion to recess or adjourn, or until noon on the second day after Members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first.

SEC. 2. The Speaker of the House and the Majority Leader of the Senate, acting jointly after consultation with the Minority Leader of the House and the Minority Leader of the Senate, shall notify the Members of the House and Senate, respectively, to reassemble whenever, in their opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I don't have a complete schedule yet, but I believe we are ready to go to the HUD-VA appropriations conference report. We are trying to get clearance to go to Transportation appropriations conference report after that. We are still working with Senator DASCHLE so that we can outline the schedule for the remainder of the day. We are arranging for some debate time. We are also working on clearing some Executive Calendar nominations. Hopefully, within the next few minutes, we will be able to make some further specific announcement and try to get a UC on all of that. I yield the floor.

Mr. MCCAIN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, the Senate is not in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will come to order. The Senator from Arizona is recognized.

CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, a minority has prevailed for the moment in blocking campaign finance reform. They will not prevail forever. Sponsors of campaign finance reform knew from the outset that our legislation faced long odds. We knew that finding a supermajority of Senators to cut off debate would be very difficult. Not impossible, but difficult.

What we had hoped might occur is that as the amending process on the bill proceeded, Senators from both sides of the aisle would begin to find common ground on this subject, and the basis for a fair bipartisan compromise would be discovered. That was not to be the case, however, because the rules of this debate were structured to prevent anyone from offering any amendment. No vote on any single aspect of campaign finance reform was allowed, and that's unfortunate.

The chief opponent of our bill, the Senator from Kentucky, very forthrightly claimed that he would proudly cast a vote against any bill that sought to reduce the amount of money that currently soaks our Federal election system. I commend him for his candor and having the courage of his convictions.

Mr. President, I wish all opponents of campaign finance reform were so forthright. I wish all Members of the Senate could have had the opportunity to unambiguously register their support for or opposition to campaign finance reform in all its forms so that the American people would have a clear public record of where we all stood on the subject. I can only assume that the public was denied a clear record because some of us are apprehensive about how the public would react to our votes. I cannot find any other explanation for the elaborate lengths opponents of the bill went to in order to prevent a single vote on any amendment to this legislation.

I do not resent the use of the filibuster to obstruct reform. I regret it, but I do not resent it. It is a frequent roadblock to action in the Senate, and I and the other sponsors of the bill always understood that we must overcome it to prevail. Necessary to our efforts to overcome this institutional obstruction, however, is the amendment process. We believe that if Senators are obliged to vote yea or nay on various aspects of reform, the public's reaction to our votes might persuade 60 Senators to vote to limit debate. But as I have noted, we were precluded from offering and disposing of amendments.

As I made clear to everyone before debate on this bill began, if the supporters of McCain-Feingold were denied an up-or-down vote on the bill or on amendments to the bill, we would exercise our rights as Members of the Senate to offer amendments related to reform on legislation subsequently considered by the Senate. Now we are confronting a parliamentary tactic that is intended to deny us the opportunity to offer amendments to the highway funding bill. I don't think that it is fair, even if it is sanctioned by Senate rules. Nor do I think the tactic will permanently preclude us from offering reform amendments to other legislation.

Mr. President, no Member of this body can be permanently disenfranchised from the right to offer amendments. It is a practical impossibility. Unanimous consent is required for nearly all the work of the Senate, and Members who are denied their right to amend legislation are not likely to consent to moving that legislation forward. Every Senator knows that their colleagues who intend to offer campaign finance reform amendments will eventually succeed in doing so. At some point, the support or opposition of Senators will be a matter of public record. Therefore, I am at a loss to understand what purpose is served by attempting to temporarily prevent us from offering these amendments.

We cannot be disenfranchised permanently, Mr. President, because to do so would disenfranchise the American people. The people have a right to know where their elected representatives stand on the issue of campaign finance reform so that they may render an informed judgment at election time

about how fairly we represent their concerns.

The supporters of reform intend to offer amendments related to various aspects of reform, and as I have stated previously, I intend to offer an amendment banning soft money, the unregulated ocean of money which is drowning the integrity of our political system and which occasioned so much scandal in the last election. I am looking forward to the great debate on the first amendment that supporters of soft money will offer in opposition to the ban.

I know that the Senator from Kentucky will enthusiastically engage in that debate, and I again commend him for having the courage of his convictions, for his clear willingness to have his opposition to reform recorded unambiguously for the people to judge. Will the other Senators join him? I don't know. I don't think support for unlimited soft money is quite so clear as his opposition to other reform proposals. I think we would win a vote banning soft money. I am not certain, but I am fairly confident, and I intend to find out.

We will keep trying until the Senate agrees to provide the people we serve with an honest, clear record of our support or opposition to campaign finance reform. They will then make a judgment as to whether they approve of our position or not.

Finally, again, Mr. President, I am hopeful that at some point, there will be sufficient requests by the American people, including a million signatories, 1 million Americans signing a petition asking us to address this issue of campaign finance reform. I hope that sooner or later that and the better angels of our nature will persuade us that it is time to sit down and work out a campaign finance reform which is fair to everyone and gives and restores the American people control of their Government.

I yield the floor.

Mr. KERRY addressed the Chair.

Mr. BOND. Without objecting, may I say, we are trying to arrange for the expeditious consideration of the VA-HUD report.

Mr. KERRY. I just ask for 3 minutes or so. I want to respond to Senator McCain.

Mr. BOND. I have no objection.

THE SENATE WILL ULTIMATELY BE HEARD

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I would like to thank the Senator from Arizona for his comments, for his steadfast efforts and leadership on this and, speaking for Senator Daschle who is not here at this moment and for the leadership on this side, we would like to make it very clear that what Senator McCain has said we are determined to try to help effect. We are determined that we will bring back campaign finance reform again and again and again until we have the ability to vote

up or down on either McCain-Feingold or on some measure of full reform. I think Senator McCain has appropriately suggested that ultimately the will of the Senate can't be held down on a matter like this. Senators will have to vote one way or the other in order to make their positions clear, and the will of the Senate ultimately will be heard.

We, on our side, are particularly grateful to Senator Feingold for his leadership, but, Mr. President, we regret enormously that the American people were not permitted to have one amendment properly voted on and debated. Not one. Not once in this important issue, where 88 percent of the American people believe we ought to have reform, was the U.S. Senate, known as the world's greatest deliberative body, able to truly deliberate. Some would argue deliberation comes in many forms and a filibuster is a form of that deliberation. But everyone knows that a majority of this Senate was prepared to vote for this bill as it is today. This bill will come back again and again until the Senate has a chance to work its will.

Mr. BOND addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT—CONFERENCE REPORT ACCOMPANYING H.R. 2158

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now turn to the VA-HUD conference report; that the report be considered read; and that there be 20 minutes equally divided between the majority and the minority, plus 5 minutes for the Senator from Washington, Senator Gorton; that following the conclusion or yielding back of time, the conference report be agreed to and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, all without intervening action or debate.

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

DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1998—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the bill (H.R. 2158) making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2158) having met, after full and free con-

ference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses this report, signed by a majority of the conferees.

The Senate proceeded to consider the conference report.

(The conference report is printed in the House proceedings of the RECORD of October 6, 1997.)

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I may require.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I am pleased to present the Senate with the conference report accompanying H.R. 2158. The bill provides a total of \$90.7 billion in new budget authority, including \$21.5 billion in mandatory spending, which is \$855 million less than the President's request.

As with most legislative activity in this body, the bill is not perfect, but I do think it reflects a very balanced approach to a number of particularly difficult funding and policy decisions. In achieving that balance, I owe a special debt of gratitude and express my sincerest thanks to my hard-working ranking member, Senator Mikulski, whose cooperation, guidance, and wise counsel has helped to craft a consensus in reaching many of these difficult decisions.

We have done our best to ensure that both the spirit of the budget agreement and the highest priorities of the President have been met without jeopardizing key programs, such as veterans' medical care and the space program which were not protected in the budget agreement.

For the VA, the highest priority in the VA-HUD conference report is afforded to veterans' programs which total \$40.45 billion and veterans' medical care in particular. The conference report provides \$17,060,000,000 for VA medical care, which is \$100 million more than the President's request and more than \$300 million above the amount assumed for veterans' medical spending in the budget agreement. This level should ensure continued care to all eligible veterans and continued improvements to the VA medical system. Increases also are provided for the State Nursing Home Program construction and research.

For the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the conference report provides close to \$25 billion for fiscal year 1998, including full funding of \$8.2 million for section 8 contract renewals as provided through the budget resolution.

Other key programs include \$310 million for drug elimination grants; \$1.5 billion for HOME; \$4.7 billion for community development block grants; \$600 million for the Native American Block Grant Program; \$823 million for homeless assistance programs; \$35 million for Youth Build; \$25 million for Brownfields; and \$138 million for the economic development initiative.

Unfortunately, we were unable to fund the preservation program due to the high cost of the program, reported