1994; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–95. A communication from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the Office of the Inspector General for the period April 1, 1994 through September 30, 1994; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–96. A communication from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, notice of reports and testimony for October 1994; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–97. A communication from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the audit of the Congressional Award Foundation's financial statements for the periods ended December 31, 1992 and September 30, 1993; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–98. A communication from the Director of the Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of health promotion and disease prevention activities; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–99. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of surplus real property for fiscal year 1994; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–100. A communication from the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Office of the Inspector General for the period April 1, 1994 through September 30, 1994; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–101. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report on the implementation of locality-based comparability payments for General Schedule employees for calendar year 1995; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–102. A communication from the Secretary of the Postal Rate Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the notice and order concerning proposed express mail rulemaking; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–103. A communication from the Manager (Benefits Communications), Ninth Farm Credit District Trust Committee, the annual report for the plan year ended December 31, 1993; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–104. A communication from the Director of Federal Management Issues, General Accounting Office, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report entitled ''Managing for Results: State Experiences Provide Insights for Federal Management Reform''; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–105. A communication from the Director of the Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to locality-based comparability payments; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–106. A communication from the Administrator of the General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the privately-owned vehicle operating cost investigations; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–107. A communication from the Human Resources Manager of the National Bank for Cooperatives Trust Fund, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report for calendar year 1993; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–108. A communication from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, notice of reports and testimony for November 1994; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–109. A communication from the Special Assistant to the President and Director of the Office of Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the aggregate report on personnel employed in the White House Office; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–110. A communication from the Chairman of the Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report for calendar year 1993; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–111. A communication from the Chairman of the Postal Rate Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the opinion and recommended decision in the 1994 omnibus rate case; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–112. A communication from the Chief Judge of the U.S. Tax Court, transmitting, pursuant to law, the actuarial reports for calendar year 1991; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–113. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of State (Legislative Affairs), transmitting, pursuant to law, the report on the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability Fund for fiscal year 1993; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–114. A communication from the Chairman of the Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report on the internal controls and financial systems in effect during fiscal year 1994; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–115. A communication from the Federal Co-Chairman of the Appalachian Regional Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report on the internal controls and financial systems in effect during fiscal year 1994; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–116. A communication from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report on the internal controls and financial systems in effect during fiscal year 1994; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–117. A communication from the Director of the Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report on the internal controls and financial systems in effect during fiscal year 1994; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–118. A communication from the Chairman of the Federal Labor Relations Authority, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report on the internal controls and financial systems in effect during fiscal year 1994; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–119. A communication from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report on the internal controls and financial systems in effect during fiscal year 1994; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–120. A communication from the Chairman and General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report on the internal controls and financial systems in effect during fiscal year 1994; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–121. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report on the internal controls and financial systems in effect during fiscal year 1994; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–122. A communication from the Director of Selective Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report on the internal controls and financial systems in effect during fiscal year 1994; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–123. A communication from the Director of the Peace Corps, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report on the internal controls and financial systems in effect during fiscal year 1994; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–124. A communication from the Administrator of the Agency For International Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report on the internal controls and financial systems in effect during fiscal year 1994; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–125. A communication from the Chairman of the Merit Systems Protection Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report on the internal controls and financial systems in effect during fiscal year 1994; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–126. A communication from the Director of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report on the internal controls and financial systems in effect during fiscal year 1994; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–127. A communication from the Director of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report on the internal controls and financial systems in effect during fiscal year 1994; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–128. A communication from the Executive Director of the Martin Luther King, Jr. Federal Holiday Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report on the internal controls and financial systems in effect during fiscal year 1994; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–129. A communication from the Director of the Trade and Development Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report on the internal controls and financial systems in effect during fiscal year 1994; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–130. A communication from the Director of the National Science Foundation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report on the internal controls and financial systems in effect during fiscal year 1994; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. HATCH, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. Res. 54. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Judiciary Committee.

By Mr. PRESSLER, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, without amendment:

S. Res. 56. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

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. KYL (for himself and Mr. MCCAIN):

S. 231. A bill to modify the boundaries of Walnut Canyon National Monument in the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. D'AMATO (for himself, Mr. SARBANES, and Mr. BOND):

S. 232. A bill to provide for the extension of the Farmers Home Administration program under section 515 of the Housing Act of 1949 and other programs relating to housing and community development; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. HOLLINGS (for himself, Mr. SPECTER, Mrs. KASSEBAUM, Mr. CAMPBELL, and Mr. EXON):

S.J. Res. 18. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution relative to contributions and expenditures intended to affect elections for Federal, State, and local office; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN:

S.J. Res. 19. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to limiting congressional terms; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. HATCH:

S. Res. 54. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Judiciary Committee; from the Committee on the Judiciary; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. COHEN (for himself and Mr. PRYOR):

S. Res. 55. A resolution authorizing expenditures by the Special Committee on Aging; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. PRESSLER:

S. Res. 56. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation; from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. LOTT (for Mr. DOLE):

S. Res. 57. A resolution making majority party appointments to the Small Business and Aging Committees for the 104th Congress; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. LOTT (for Mr. STEVENS):

S. Res. 58. A resolution providing for members on the part of the Senate of the Joint Committee on Printing and the Joint Committee of Congress on the Library; considered and agreed to.

S. Res. 59. A resolution to authorize the printing of a collection of the rules of the committees of the Senate; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. SPECTER:

S. Res. 60. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the President should exercise the line-item veto without awaiting the enactment of additional authorization for the purpose of obtaining a judicial determination of its constitutionality; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. Res. 61. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the President currently has authority under the Constitution to veto individual items of appropriation and that the President should exercise that authority without awaiting the enactment of additional authorization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. KYL (for himself and Mr. MCCAIN):

S. 231. A bill to modify the boundaries of Walnut Canyon National Monument in the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

THE WALNUT CANYON NATIONAL MONUMENT BOUNDARY MODIFICATION ACT OF 1995

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I introduce today with my colleague from Arizona, Senator JOHN MCCAIN, the Walnut Canyon National Monument Boundary Modification Act of 1995. Identical legislation is being introduced in the House of Representatives by Representative J.D. HAYWORTH.

This legislation is based upon consensus reached last year among interested parties, including local officials in Arizona, as well as residents of the Walnut Canyon area, the National Park Service and U.S. Forest Service, with respect to modification of the monument boundaries for the purpose of better protecting important archeological resources.

Walnut Canyon National Monument was originally established by Presidential proclamation in 1915 to preserve and protect numerous Sinaguan cliff dwelling and associated sites. The canyon includes five areas where archeological sites are concentrated around natural promontories extending into the canyon, areas which early archeologists referred to as forts. Three of the five forts are within the current boundaries of the monument, but the two others are located on adjacent lands administered by the U.S. Forest Service. The legislation I am introducing today would redraw the monument boundaries to include those areas and provided the protection that those resources need and deserve.

About 1,239 acres of forest land would be transferred to Park Service administration. No State or private land would be affected.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 231

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Walnut Canyon National Monument Boundary Modification Act of 1995''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND PURPOSE.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that:

(1) Walnut Canyon National Monument was established for the preservation and interpretation of certain settlements and land use patterns associated with the prehistoric Sinaguan culture of northern Arizona.

(2) Major cultural resources associated with the purposes of Walnut Canyon National Monument are near the boundary and are currently managed under multiple-use objectives of the adjacent national forest. These concentrations of cultural resources, often referred to as ''forts'', would be more effectively managed as part of the National Park System.

(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this Act is to modify the boundaries of the Walnut Canyon National Monument (hereafter in this Act referred to as the ''national monument'') to improve management of the national monument and associated resources.

SEC. 3. BOUNDARY MODIFICATION.

Effective on the date of enactment of this Act, the boundaries of the national monument shall be modified as depicted on the map entitled ''Boundary Proposal—Walnut Canyon National Monument, Coconino County, Arizona'', numbered 360/80,011, and dated September 1994. Such map shall be on file and available for public inspection in the offices of the Director of the National Park Service, Department of the Interior.

SEC. 4. ACQUISITION AND TRANSFER OF PROPERTY.

The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to acquire lands and interest in lands within the national monument, by donation, purchase with donated or appropriated funds, or exchange. Federal property within the boundaries of the national monument (as modified by this Act) is hereby transferred to the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior for management as part of the national monument. Federal property excluded from the monument pursuant to the boundary modification under section 3 is hereby transferred to the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture to be managed as part of the Coconino National Forest.

SEC. 5. ADMINISTRATION.

The Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Director of the National Park Service, shall manage the national monument in accordance with this Act and the provisions of law generally applicable to units of the National Park Service, including ''An Act to establish a National Park Service, and for other purposes'' approved August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535; 16 U.S.C. 1, 2–4).

SEC. 6. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There is authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

By Mr. D'AMATO (for himself, Mr. SARBANES, and Mr. BOND):

S. 232. A bill to provide for the extension of the Farmers Home Administration program under section 515 of the Housing Act of 1949 and other programs relating to housing and community development; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

THE FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION SECTION 515 RURAL MULTIFAMILY HOUSING PROGRAM EXTENSION ACT OF 1995

● Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, I am today introducing, along with my colleagues Senators SARBANES and BOND, the Farmers Home Administration Section 515 Rural Multifamily Housing Program Extension Act of 1995. The Section 515 Program, now administered by the Rural Housing and Community Development Service [RHCDS] at the Department of Agriculture, is an important rural affordable housing program. It provides long-term, low interest rate direct government loans for nonprofit and for-profit developers to develop multifamily rental housing for low-income families in rural America. Moreover, this program is one of the few sources for low-income rental housing in rural America, with over 440,000 rental units in rural America to its credit.

This simple legislation permanently reauthorizes the Section 515 Program and allows RHCDS to administer $220 million in funding appropriated as part of the HUD/VA fiscal year 1995 appropriations bill. While providing funding

for projects in the section 515 pipeline, it also will help with pressing rehabilitation needs. In addition, this bill enjoys strong bipartisan support and deserves quick action to help ensure the availability of low-income affordable housing in rural America.

This program is of particular importance to my State, New York. Many people may not realize that New York is a very rural State, with a large number of persons below the poverty line living in rural areas. Of the hundreds of thousands of New Yorkers below the poverty line, one-third live in rural communities. This program has been of great assistance to working families and the elderly who live in rural areas. There are currently 473 section 515 developments with 12,281 units in New York. Nearly 7,000 of these units are reserved for elderly citizens and 4,500 units are used by families. There is approximately a 4-year pipeline of projects in New York that are awaiting funding. Reauthorization of this program will help address this backlog in New York, as well as nationwide.

The Section 515 Program has received widespread support. In addition to helping working families and the elderly obtain rental housing in rural areas, the program has provided construction and management employment opportunities. These jobs are desperately needed in States, such as New York, with rural areas that have been hit hard economically.

I know there have been some concerns in recent years about possible program abuses in the Section 515 Program. In response to these concerns, the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992 made a number of reforms to ensure that developers would not be receiving unreasonable or windfall profits. The Department of Agriculture, through Farmers Home and RHCDS, has also been implementing a series of regulatory reforms to combat fraud and abuse in the Section 515 Program. Moreover, I expect that all rural housing programs, including the Section 515 Program, will be included in this Congress' overall reform of Federal housing policy.

Finally, this legislation provides the Department of Housing and Urban Development with authority to renew, for up to 18 months, certain section 8 project-based contracts on terms identical to the current contract. This is a temporary provision. Section 8 contract renewals will be a major part of any housing reform considered by Congress this year.

Mr. President, I ask for unanimous consent that the text of this legislation be printed in the RECORD.

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

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Section 515 Rural Multifamily Housing Program Extension Act of 1995''.

SEC. 2. RURAL HOUSING.

(a) UNDERSERVED AREAS SET-ASIDE.—Section 509(f)(4)(A) of the Housing Act of 1949 (42 U.S.C. 1479(f)(4)(A)) is amended—

(1) in the first sentence, by striking ''fiscal years 1993 and 1994'' and inserting ''fiscal year 1995''; and

(2) in the second sentence, by striking ''each''.

(b) RURAL MULTIFAMILY RENTAL HOUSING.—Section 515(b) of the Housing Act of 1949 (42 U.S.C. 1485(b)) is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (4); and

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (5) and (6) as paragraphs (4) and (5), respectively.

(c) RURAL RENTAL HOUSING FUNDS FOR NON-PROFIT ENTITIES.—The first sentence of section 515(w)(1) of the Housing Act of 1949 (42 U.S.C. 1485(w)(1)) is amended by striking ''fiscal years 1993 and 1994'' and inserting ''fiscal year 1995''.

SEC. 3. TEMPORARY EXTENSION OF EXPIRING SECTION 8 CONTRACTS.

(a) REQUIREMENT.—Subject only to the availability of budget authority to carry out this section, not later than October 1, 1995, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall make an offer to the owner of each housing project assisted under an expiring contract to extend the term of the expiring contract for not more than 18 months beyond the date of the expiration of the contract.

(b) TERMS OF EXTENSION.—Except for terms or conditions relating to duration, the terms and conditions under an extension provided pursuant to this section of any expiring contract shall be identical to the terms and conditions under the expiring contract.

(c) DEFINITION OF EXPIRING CONTRACT.—For purposes of this section, the term ''expiring contract'' means a contract for assistance pursuant to section 8(b)(2) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (as such section existed before October 1, 1983), including a contract for assistance referred to in section 209(b) of the Housing and Urban-Rural Recovery Act of 1983, having a term that expires before October 1, 1996.

(d) DISPLACEMENT ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development may make available to tenants residing in units covered by an expiring contract that is not extended pursuant to this section, either—

(1) tenant-based assistance under section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937; or

(2) a unit with respect to which project-based assistance is provided under section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937.

(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this section.●

● Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I am pleased to join with my colleagues from the Banking Committee as an original cosponsor of this legislation.

The bill we are introducing today would extend the rural rental housing program authorized under section 515 of the Housing Act of 1949. This program, now administered by the Rural Housing and Community Development Service [RHCDS] at the Department of Agriculture, is a valuable and critical source of funding for the development of affordable housing for low-income families who live in rural areas. The legislation is needed because the authorization for the Section 515 Program expired at the beginning of this fiscal year. The Appropriations Act provided $220 million for this program. With this authorization, the RHCDS will be able to address pressing needs for the rehabilitation and preservation of existing housing, as well as provide funding for a large pipeline of worthwhile projects. I am particularly pleased that this bill also extends two important features of the Section 515 Program—a set-aside for nonprofit developers and a set-aside for underserved areas.

The bill we are introducing today will also provide the Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development [HUD] with the authority to extend the section 8 contracts on low-income housing projects whose subsidy contracts will expire before October 1, 1996. Under the current section 8 contracts, owners must provide their tenants with a 12-month notice before the expiration of the subsidy contract. The contracts on a relatively small number of projects nationwide will expire in the next 12 months or the owners of the projects will be required to provide notice in the next 12 months. It is important to note, Mr. President, that this provision is temporary and the extension of the contracts cannot exceed 18 months. The provision's inclusion in this legislation will give the Administration and the Congress time to review the Section 8 Program and examine long-term strategies for dealing with contract expirations, without causing uncertainty for residents or the inadvertent displacement of low-income households who reside in section 8 developments.●

● Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I support the Farmers Home Administration Section 515 Rural Multifamily Housing Program Extension Act of 1995. The Section 515 Program, now administered by the Rural Housing and Community Development Service [RHCDS] at the Department of Agriculture, is an important program that makes multifamily rental housing available for low-income families in rural America. I emphasize the importance of this program. Since the program's inception in 1963, section 515 has financed some 440,000 affordable, low-income rental units in rural America.

This legislation permanently reauthorizes the Section 515 Program and allows RHCDS to administer $220 million in funding appropriated as part of the HUD/VA fiscal year 1995 appropriations bill. I believe the fiscal year 1995 $220 million appropriation provides adequate authority for RHCDS to administer the Section 515 Program. Nevertheless, RHCDS refused to administer this program without a new reauthorization. Therefore, I ask my colleagues for their support of this legislation. I emphasize that this bill enjoys strong bipartisan support and industry support. I ask for quick consideration of this bill to help ensure the continued availability of low-income affordable housing in rural America.

Moreover, I want to rest the concerns of my colleagues about reported problems with the Section 515 Program. In response to past concerns, the Housing

and Community Development Act of 1992 made a number of important reforms to the program, including reforms to safeguard the program from unscrupulous developers. The Department of Agriculture, through Farmers Home and RHCDS, has also recently put in place a number of additional needed regulatory reforms. Finally, I expect all rural housing programs, including the Section 515 Program, to be part of a major housing policy overhaul during this Congress.

This bill also allows the Department of Housing and Urban Development to extend, for up to 18 months, certain expiring section 8 project-based contracts. These contracts can only be renewed on terms identical to the current contracts. This is a stop-gap measure designed to provide some certainty to the section 8 project-based programs as Congress considers major reforms to address the cost and designs of these programs. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.●

By Mr. HOLLINGS (for himself, Mr. SPECTER, Mrs. KASSEBAUM, Mr. CAMPBELL, and Mr. EXON):

S. J. Res. 18. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution relative to contributions and expenditures intended to affect elections for Federal, State, and local office; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CAMPAIGN REFORM CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I rise today to address a problem with which we are all too familiar—the ever-increasing cost of campaign spending. The need for limits on campaign expenditures is more urgent than ever, with the total cost of congressional campaigns skyrocketing from $446 million in 1990 to well over $590 million in 1994. For nearly a quarter of a century, Congress has tried to tackle runaway campaign spending; again and again, Congress has failed.

Let us resolve not to repeat the mistakes of past campaign finance reform efforts, which have bogged down in partisanship as Democrats and Republicans each tried to gore the other's sacred cows. During the 103d Congress there was a sign that we could move beyond this partisan bickering, when the Senate in a bipartisan fashion expressed its support for a limit on campaign expenditures. In May 1993, a nonbinding sense-of-the-Senate resolution was agreed to which advocated the adoption of a constitutional amendment empowering Congress and the States to limit campaign expenditures. During the 104th Congress, let us take the next step and adopt such a constitutional amendment—a simple, straightforward, nonpartisan solution.

As Prof. Gerald G. Ashdown has written in the New England Law Review, amending the Constitution to allow Congress to regulate campaign expenditures is ''the most theoretically attractive of the approaches-to-reform since, from a broad free speech perspective, the decision in Buckley is misguided and has worsened the campaign finance atmosphere.'' Adds Professor Ashdown: ''If Congress could constitutionally limit the campaign expenditures of individuals, candidates, and committees, along with contributions, most of the troubles * * * would be eliminated.''

Right to the point, in its landmark 1976 ruling in Buckley versus Valeo, the Supreme Court mistakenly equated a candidate's right to spend unlimited sums of money with his right to free speech. In the face of spirited dissents, the Court drew a bizarre distinction between campaign contributions on the grounds that '' * * * the governmental interest in preventing corruption and the appearance of corruption outweighs considerations of free speech.''

I have never been able to fathom why that same test—the governmental interest in preventing corruption and the appearance of corruption—does not overwhelmingly justify limits on campaign spending. However, it seems to me that the Court committed a far graver error by striking down spending limits as a threat to free speech. The fact is, spending limits in Federal campaigns would act to restore the free speech that has been eroded by the Buckley decision.

After all, as a practical reality, what Buckley says is: Yes, if you have personal wealth, then you have access to television, you have freedom of speech. But if you do not have personal wealth, then you are denied access to television. Instead of freedom of speech, you have only the freedom to shut up.

So let us be done with this phony charge that spending limits are somehow an attack on freedom of speech. As Justice Byron White points out, clear as a bell, in his dissent, both contribution limits and spending limits are neutral as to the content of speech and are not motivated by fear of the consequences of the political speech in general.

Mr. President, every Senator realizes that television advertising is the name of the game in modern American politics. In warfare, if you control the air, you control the battlefield. In politics, if you control the airwaves, you control the tenor and focus of a campaign.

Probably 80 percent of campaign communications take place through the medium of television. And most of that TV airtime comes at a dear price. In South Carolina, you are talking between $1000 and $2,000 for 30 seconds of primetime advertising. In New York City, it is anywhere from $30,000 to $40,000 for the same 30 seconds.

The hard fact of life for a candidate is that if you are not on TV, you are not truly in the race. Wealthy challengers as well as incumbents flushed with money go directly to the TV studio. Those without personal wealth are sidetracked to the time-consuming pursuit of cash.

The Buckley decision created a double bind. It upheld restrictions on campaign contributions, but struck down restrictions on how much candidates with deep pockets can spend. The Court ignored the practical reality that if my opponent has only $50,000 to spend in a race and I have $1 million, then I can effectively deprive him of his speech. By failing to respond to my advertising, my cash-poor opponent will appear unwilling to speak up in his own defense.

Justice Thurgood Marshall zeroed in on this disparity in his dissent to Buckley. By striking down the limit on what a candidate can spend, Justice Marshall said, ''It would appear to follow that the candidate with a substantial personal fortune at his disposal is off to a significant head start.''

Indeed, Justice Marshall went further: He argued that by upholding the limitations on contributions but striking down limits on overall spending, the Court put on additional premium on a candidate's personal wealth.

Justice Marshall was dead right. Our urgent task is to right the injustice of Buckley versus Valeo by empowering Congress to place caps on Federal campaign spending. We are all painfully aware of the uncontrolled escalation of campaign spending. The average cost of a winning Senate race was $1.2 million in 1980, rising to $2.1 million in 1984, and skyrocketing to $3.1 million in 1986, $3.7 million in 1988, and up to $4.1 million this past year. To raise that kind of money, the average Senator must raise over $13,200 a week, every week of his or her 6-year term. Overall spending in congressional races increased from $403 million in 1990 to more than $590 million in 1994—almost a 50-percent increase in 4 short years.

This obsession with money distracts us from the people's business. At worst, it corrupts and degrades the entire political process. Fundraisers used to be arranged so they didn't conflict with the Senate schedule; nowadays, the Senate schedule is regularly shifted to accommodate fundraisers.

I have run for statewide office 16 times in South Carolina. You establish a certain campaign routine, say, shaking hands at a mill shift in Greer, visiting a bid country store outside of Belton, and so on. Over the years, they look for you and expect you to come around. But in recent years, those mill visits and dropping by the country store have become a casualty of the system. There is very little time for them. We are out chasing dollars.

During my 1986 reelection campaign, I found myself raising money to get on TV to raise money to get on TV to raise money to get on TV. It is a vicious cycle.

After the election, I held a series of town meetings across the State. Friends asked, ''Why are you doing these down meetings: You just got elected. You've got 6 years.'' To which I answered, ''I'm doing it because it's my first chance to really get out and meet with the people who elected me. I didn't get much of a chance during the

campaign. I was too busy chasing bucks.'' I had a similar experience in 1992.

I remember Senator Richard Russell saying: ''They give you a 6-year term in this U.S. Senate 2 years to be a statesman, the next 2 years to be a politician, and the last 2 years to be a demagogue.'' Regrettably, we are no longer afforded even 2 years as statesmen. We proceed straight to politics and demagoguery right after the election because of the imperatives of raising money.

My proposed constitutional amendment would change all this. It would empower Congress to impose reasonable spending limits on Federal campaigns. For instance, we could impose a limit of, say, $800,000 per Senate candidate in a small State like South Carolina—a far cry from the millions spent by my opponent and me in 1992. And bear in mind that direct expenditures account for only a portion of total spending. For instance, my 1992 opponent's direct expenditures were supplemented by hundreds of thousands of dollars in expenditures by independent organizations and by the State and local Republican Party. When you total up spending from all sources, my challenger and I spent roughly the same amount in 1992.

And incidentally, Mr. President, let's be done with the canard that spending limits would be a boon to incumbents, who supposedly already have name recognition and standing with the public and therefore begin with a built-in advantage over challengers. Nonsense. I hardly need to remind my Senate colleagues of the high rate of mortality in upper Chamber elections. And as to the alleged invulnerability of incumbents in the House, I would simply note that more than 50 percent of the House membership has been replaced since the 1990 elections.

I can tell you from experience that any advantages of incumbency are more than counterbalanced by the obvious disadvantages of incumbency, specifically the disadvantage of defending hundreds of controversial votes in Congress.

I also agree with University of Virginia political scientist Larry Sabato, who has suggested a doctrine of sufficiency with regard to campaign spending. Professor Sabato puts it this way: ''While challengers tend to be underfunded, they can compete effectively if they are capable and have sufficient money to present themselves and their messages.''

Moreover, Mr. President, I submit that once we have overall spending limits, it will matter little whether a candidate gets money from industry groups, or from PAC's, or from individuals. It is still a reasonable—''sufficient,'' to use Professor Sabato's term—amount any way you cut it. Spending will be under control, and we will be able to account for every dollar going out.

On the issue of PAC's, Mr. President, let me say that I have never believed that PAC's per se are an evil in the current system. On the contrary, PAC's are a very healthy instrumentality of politics. PAC's have brought people into the political process: nurses, educators, small businesspeople, senior citizens, unionists, you name it. They permit people of modest means and limited individual influence to band together with others of mutual interest so their message is heard and known.

For years we have encouraged these people to get involved, to participate. Yet now that they are participating, we turn around and say, ''Oh, no, your influence is corrupting, your money is tainted.'' This is wrong. The evil to be corrected is not the abundance of participation but the superabundance of money. The culprit is runaway campaign spending.

To a distressing degree, elections are determined not in the political marketplace but in the financial marketplace. Our elections are supposed to be contests of ideas, but too often they degenerate into megadollar derbies, paper chases through the board rooms of corporations and special interests.

Mr. President, I repeat, campaign spending must be brought under control. The constitutional amendment I have proposed would permit Congress to impose fair, responsible, workable limits on Federal campaign expenditures.

Such a reform would have four important impacts. First, it would end the mindless pursuits of ever-fatter campaign war chests. Second, it would free candidates from their current obsession with fundraising and allow them to focus more on issues and ideas; once elected to office, we would not have to spend 20 percent of our time raising money to keep our seats. Third, it would curb the influence of special interests. And fourth, it would create a more level playing field for our Federal campaigns—a competitive environment where personal wealth does not give candidates an insurmountable advantage.

Finally, Mr. President, a word about the advantages of the amend-the-Constitution approach that I propose. Recent history amply demonstrates the practicality and viability of this constitutional route. Certainly, it is not coincidence that all five of the most recent amendments to the Constitution have dealt with Federal election issues. In elections, the process drives and shapes the end result. Election laws can skew election results, whether you are talking about a poll tax depriving minorities of their right to vote, or the absence of campaign spending limits giving an unfair advantage to wealthy candidates. These are profound issues which go to the heart of our democracy, and it is entirely appropriate that they be addressed through constitutional amendment.

And let us not be distracted by the argument that the amend-the-Constitution approach will take too long. Take too long? We have been dithering on this campaign finance issue since the early 1970's, and we haven't advanced the ball a single yard. It has been a quarter of a century, and no legislative solution has done the job.

The last five constitutional amendments took an average of 17 months to be adopted. There is no reason why we cannot pass this joint resolution, submit it to the States for a vote, and ratify the amendment in time for it to govern the 1996 election. Indeed, the amend-the-Constitution approach could prove more expeditious than the alternative legislative approach. Bear in mind that the various public financing bills that have been proposed would all be vulnerable to a Presidential veto. In contrast, this joint resolution, once passed by the Congress, goes directly to the States for ratification. Once ratified, it becomes the law of the land, and it is not subject to veto or Supreme Court challenge.

And, by the way, I reject the argument that if we were to pass and ratify this amendment, Democrats and Republicans would be unable to hammer out a mutually acceptable formula of campaign expenditure limits. A Democratic Congress and Republican President did exactly that in 1974, and we can certainly do it again.

Mr. President, this joint resolution will address the campaign finance mess directly, decisively, and with finality. The Supreme Court has chosen to ignore the overwhelming importance of media advertising in today's campaigns. In the Buckley decision, it prescribed a bogus if-you-have-the-money-you-can-talk version of free speech. In its place, I urge passage of this joint resolution, the freedom of speech in political campaigns amendment. Let us ensure equal freedom of expression for all who seek Federal office.

By Mr. BROWN:

S.J. Res. 19. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to limiting congressional terms; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

TERM LIMITS CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

● Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, today I rise to offer a joint resolution calling for the adoption of a constitutional amendment limiting congressional terms.

Congress is considering several measures that will change the way Congress does business. Congressional accountability will apply the laws to Congress. Unfunded mandate reform will reduce burdens on the States. The balanced budget amendment will fundamentally alter our budget process, and the line-item veto will end an era of midnight pork-barrel spending.

My amendment offers change of a different sort. Instead of changing our procedures, term limitations will change the way we think.