

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is now closed.

Mr. DOLE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1996

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I am advised that this request has been cleared by the Democratic leader.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now turn to the consideration of H.R. 1854, the legislative branch appropriations bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1854) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments, as follows:

(The parts of the bill intended to be stricken are shown in boldface brackets, and the parts of the bill intended to be inserted are shown in italic.)

H.R. 1854

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I—CONGRESSIONAL OPERATIONS SENATE

EXPENSE ALLOWANCES

For expense allowances of the Vice President, \$10,000; the President Pro Tempore of the Senate, \$10,000; Majority Leader of the Senate, \$10,000; Minority Leader of the Senate, \$10,000; Majority Whip of the Senate, \$5,000; Minority Whip of the Senate, \$5,000; and Chairmen of the Majority and Minority Conference Committees, \$3,000 for each Chairman; in all, \$56,000.

REPRESENTATION ALLOWANCES FOR THE MAJORITY AND MINORITY LEADERS

For representation allowances of the Majority and Minority Leaders of the Senate, \$15,000 for each such Leader; in all, \$30,000.

SALARIES, OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

For compensation of officers, employees, and others as authorized by law, including agency contributions, \$69,727,000, which shall be paid from this appropriation without regard to the below limitations, as follows:

OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT

For the Office of the Vice President, \$1,513,000.

OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

For the Office of the President Pro Tempore, \$325,000.

OFFICES OF THE MAJORITY AND MINORITY LEADERS

For Offices of the Majority and Minority Leaders, \$2,195,000.

OFFICES OF THE MAJORITY AND MINORITY WHIPS

For Offices of the Majority and Minority Whips, \$656,000.

CONFERENCE COMMITTEES

For the Conference of the Majority and the Conference of the Minority, at rates of compensation to be fixed by the Chairman of each such committee, \$996,000 for each such committee; in all, \$1,992,000.

OFFICES OF THE SECRETARIES OF THE CON- FERENCE OF THE MAJORITY AND THE CON- FERENCE OF THE MINORITY

For Offices of the Secretaries of the Conference of the Majority and the Conference of the Minority, \$360,000.

POLICY COMMITTEES

For salaries of the Majority Policy Committee and the Minority Policy Committee, \$965,000 for each such committee, in all, \$1,930,000.

OFFICE OF THE CHAPLAIN

For Office of the Chaplain, \$192,000.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

For Office of the Secretary, \$12,128,000.

OFFICE OF THE SERGEANT AT ARMS AND DOORKEEPER

For Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, \$31,889,000.

OFFICES OF THE SECRETARIES FOR THE MAJORITY AND MINORITY

For Offices of the Secretary for the Majority and the Secretary for the Minority, \$1,047,000.

AGENCY CONTRIBUTIONS AND RELATED EXPENSES

For agency contributions for employee benefits, as authorized by law, and related expenses, \$15,500,000.

OFFICE OF THE LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL OF THE SENATE

For salaries and expenses of the Office of the Legislative Counsel of the Senate, \$3,381,000.

OFFICE OF SENATE LEGAL COUNSEL

For salaries and expenses of the Office of Senate Legal Counsel, \$936,000.

EXPENSE ALLOWANCES OF THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE, SERGEANT AT ARMS AND DOOR- KEEPER OF THE SENATE, AND SECRETARIES FOR THE MAJORITY AND MINORITY OF THE SENATE

For expense allowances of the Secretary of the Senate, \$3,000; Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate, \$3,000; Secretary for the Majority of the Senate, \$3,000; Secretary for the Minority of the Senate, \$3,000; in all, \$12,000.

CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE SENATE

INQUIRIES AND INVESTIGATIONS

For expenses of inquiries and investigations ordered by the Senate, or conducted pursuant to section 134(a) of Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, as amended, section 112 of Public Law 96-304 and Senate Resolution 281, agreed to March 11, 1980, \$66,395,000.

EXPENSES OF THE UNITED STATES SENATE CAUCUS ON INTERNATIONAL NARCOTICS CONTROL

For expenses of the United States Senate Caucus on International Narcotics Control, \$305,000.

SECRETARY OF THE SENATE

For expenses of the Office of the Secretary of the Senate, \$1,266,000.

SERGEANT AT ARMS AND DOORKEEPER OF THE SENATE

For expenses of the Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate, \$61,347,000.

MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS

For miscellaneous items, \$6,644,000.

SENATORS' OFFICIAL PERSONNEL AND OFFICE EXPENSE ACCOUNT

For Senators' Official Personnel and Office Expense Account, \$204,029,000.

OFFICE OF SENATE FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES

For salaries and expenses of the Office of Senate Fair Employment Practices, \$778,000.

SETTLEMENTS AND AWARDS RESERVE

For expenses for settlements and awards, \$1,000,000, to remain available until expended.

STATIONERY (REVOLVING FUND)

For stationery for the President of the Senate, \$4,500, for officers of the Senate and the Conference of the Majority and Conference of the Minority of the Senate, \$8,500; in all, \$13,000.

OFFICIAL MAIL COSTS

For expenses necessary for official mail costs of the Senate, \$11,000,000.

RESCISSION

Of the funds previously appropriated under the heading "SENATE", \$63,544,724.12 are rescinded.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SECTION 1. (a) On and after October 1, 1995, no Senator shall receive mileage under section 17 of the Act of July 28, 1866 (2 U.S.C. 43).

(b) On and after October 1, 1995, the President of the Senate shall not receive mileage under the first section of the Act of July 8, 1935 (2 U.S.C. 43a).

SEC. 2. (a) There is established in the Treasury of the United States within the contingent fund of the Senate a revolving fund, to be known as the "Office of the Chaplain Expense Revolving Fund" (hereafter referred to as the "fund"). The fund shall consist of all moneys collected or received with respect to the Office of the Chaplain of the Senate.

(b) The fund shall be available without fiscal year limitation for disbursement by the Secretary of the Senate, not to exceed \$10,000 in any fiscal year, for the payment of official expenses incurred by the Chaplain of the Senate. In addition, moneys in the fund may be used to purchase food or food related items. The fund shall not be available for the payment of salaries.

(c) All moneys (including donated moneys) received or collected with respect to the Office of the Chaplain of the Senate shall be deposited in the fund and shall be available for purposes of this section.

(d) Disbursements from the fund shall be made on vouchers approved by the Chaplain of the Senate.

SEC. 3. Funds appropriated under the heading, "Settlements and Awards Reserve" in Public Law 103-283 shall remain available until expended.

SEC. 4. Section 902 of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1983 (2 U.S.C. 88b-6) is amended by striking the second sentence and inserting the following: "The amounts so withheld shall be deposited in the revolving fund, within the contingent fund of the Senate, for the Daniel Webster Senate Page Residence, as established by section 4 of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1995 (2 U.S.C. 88b-7)."

SEC. 5. (a) Any payment for local and long distance telecommunications service provided to any user by the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate shall cover the total invoiced amount, including any amount relating to separately identified toll calls, and shall be charged to the appropriation for the fiscal year in which the underlying base service period covered by the invoice ends.

(b) As used in subsection (a), the term "user" means any Senator, Officer of the Senate, Committee, office, or entity provided telephone equipment and services by the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate.

SEC. 6. Section 4(b) of Public Law 103-283 is amended by inserting before "collected" the following: "(including donated moneys)".

SEC. 7. Section 1 of Public Law 101-520 (2 U.S.C. 61g-6a) is amended to read as follows:

"SECTION 1. (a)(1) The Chairman of the Majority or Minority Policy Committee of the Senate may, during any fiscal year, at his or her

election transfer funds from the appropriation account for salaries for the Majority and Minority Policy Committees of the Senate, to the account, within the contingent fund of the Senate, from which expenses are payable for such committees.

"(2) The Chairman of the Majority or Minority Policy Committee of the Senate may, during any fiscal year, at his or her election transfer funds from the appropriation account for expenses, within the contingent fund of the Senate, for the Majority and Minority Policy Committees of the Senate, to the account from which salaries are payable for such committees.

"(b)(1) The Chairman of the Majority or Minority Conference Committee of the Senate may, during any fiscal year, at his or her election transfer funds from the appropriation account for salaries for the Majority and Minority Conference Committees of the Senate, to the account, within the contingent fund of the Senate, from which expenses are payable for such committees.

"(2) The Chairman of the Majority or Minority Conference Committee of the Senate may, during any fiscal year, at his or her election transfer funds from the appropriation account for expenses, within the contingent fund of the Senate, for the Majority and Minority Conference Committees of the Senate, to the account from which salaries are payable for such committees.

"(c) Any funds transferred under this section shall be—

"(1) available for expenditure by such committee in like manner and for the same purposes as are other moneys which are available for expenditure by such committee from the account to which the funds were transferred; and

"(2) made at such time or times as the Chairman shall specify in writing to the Senate Disbursing Office.

"(d) The Chairman of a committee transferring funds under this section shall notify the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate of the transfer."

(b) The amendment made by this section shall take effect on October 1, 1995, and shall be effective with respect to fiscal years beginning on or after that date.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For salaries and expenses of the House of Representatives, \$671,561,000, as follows:

HOUSE LEADERSHIP OFFICES

For salaries and expenses, as authorized by law, \$11,271,000, including: Office of the Speaker, \$1,478,000, including \$25,000 for official expenses of the Speaker; Office of the Majority Floor Leader, \$1,470,000, including \$10,000 for official expenses of the Majority Leader; Office of the Minority Floor Leader, \$1,480,000, including \$10,000 for official expenses of the Minority Leader; Office of the Majority Whip, including the Chief Deputy Majority Whip, \$928,000, including \$5,000 for official expenses of the Majority Whip; Office of the Minority Whip, including the Chief Deputy Minority Whip, \$918,000, including \$5,000 for official expenses of the Minority Whip; Speaker's Office for Legislative Floor Activities, \$376,000; Republican Steering Committee, \$664,000; Republican Conference, \$1,083,000; Democratic Steering and Policy Committee, \$1,181,000; Democratic Caucus, \$566,000; and nine minority employees, \$1,127,000.

MEMBERS' REPRESENTATIONAL ALLOWANCES INCLUDING MEMBERS' CLERK HIRE, OFFICIAL EXPENSES OF MEMBERS, AND OFFICIAL MAIL

For Members' representational allowances, including Members' clerk hire, official expenses, and official mail, \$360,503,000: *Provided*, That no such funds shall be used for the purposes of sending unsolicited mass mailings within 90 days before an election in which the Member is a candidate.

COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

STANDING COMMITTEES, SPECIAL AND SELECT

For salaries and expenses of standing committees, special and select, authorized by House resolutions, \$78,629,000.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

For salaries and expenses of the Committee on Appropriations, \$16,945,000, including studies and examinations of executive agencies and temporary personal services for such committee, to be expended in accordance with section 202(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 and to be available for reimbursement to agencies for services performed.

SALARIES, OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

For compensation and expenses of officers and employees, as authorized by law, \$83,733,000, including: for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Clerk, including not to exceed \$1,000 for official representation and reception expenses, \$13,807,000; for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Sergeant at Arms, including the position of Superintendent of Garages, and including not to exceed \$750 for official representation and reception expenses, \$3,410,000; for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Chief Administrative Officer, \$53,556,000, including salaries, expenses and temporary personal services of House Information Systems, \$27,500,000, of which \$16,000,000 is provided herein: *Provided*, That House Information Systems is authorized to receive reimbursement from Members of the House of Representatives and other governmental entities for services provided and such reimbursement shall be deposited in the Treasury for credit to this account; for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Inspector General, \$3,954,000; for salaries and expenses of the Office of Compliance, \$858,000; Office of the Chaplain, \$126,000; for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Parliamentarian, including the Parliamentarian and \$2,000 for preparing the Digest of Rules, \$1,180,000; for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Law Revision Counsel of the House, \$1,700,000; for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Legislative Counsel of the House, \$4,524,000; and other authorized employees, \$618,000.

ALLOWANCES AND EXPENSES

For allowances and expenses as authorized by House resolution or law, \$120,480,000, including: supplies, materials, administrative costs and Federal tort claims, \$1,213,000; official mail for committees, leadership offices, and administrative offices of the House, \$1,000,000; reemployed annuitants reimbursements, \$68,000; Government contributions to employees' life insurance fund, retirement funds, Social Security fund, Medicare fund, health benefits fund, and worker's and unemployment compensation, \$117,541,000; and miscellaneous items including purchase, exchange, maintenance, repair and operation of House motor vehicles, interparliamentary receptions, and gratuities to heirs of deceased employees of the House, \$658,000.

CHILD CARE CENTER

For salaries and expenses of the House of Representatives Child Care Center, such amounts as are deposited in the account established by section 312(d)(1) of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1992 (40 U.S.C. 184g(d)(1)), subject to the level specified in the budget of the Center, as submitted to the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SEC. 101. Effective with respect to fiscal years beginning with fiscal year 1995, in the case of mail from outside sources presented to the Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives (other than mail

through the Postal Service and mail with postage otherwise paid) for internal delivery in the House of Representatives, the Chief Administrative Officer is authorized to collect fees equal to the applicable postage. Amounts received by the Chief Administrative Officer as fees under the preceding sentence shall be deposited in the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

SEC. 102. Effective with respect to fiscal years beginning with fiscal year 1995, amounts received by the Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives from the Administrator of General Services for rebates under the Government Travel Charge Card Program shall be deposited in the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

SEC. 103. The provisions of section 223(b) of House Resolution 6, One Hundred Fourth Congress, agreed to January 5 (legislative day, January 4), 1995, establishing the Speaker's Office for Legislative Floor Activities; House Resolution 7, One Hundred Fourth Congress, agreed to January 5 (legislative day, January 4), 1995, providing for the designation of certain minority employees; House Resolution 9, One Hundred Fourth Congress, agreed to January 5 (legislative day, January 4), 1995, providing amounts for the Republican Steering Committee and the Democratic Policy Committee; House Resolution 10, One Hundred Fourth Congress, agreed to January 5 (legislative day, January 4), 1995, providing for the transfer of two employee positions; and House Resolution 113, One Hundred Fourth Congress, agreed to March 10, 1995, providing for the transfer of certain employee positions shall each be the permanent law with respect thereto.

SEC. 104. (a) The five statutory positions specified in subsection (b), subsection (c), and subsection (d) are transferred from the House Republican Conference to the Republican Steering Committee.

(b) The first two of the five positions referred to in subsection (a) are—

(1) the position established for the chief deputy majority whip by subsection (a) of the first section of House Resolution 393, Ninety-fifth Congress, agreed to March 31, 1977, as enacted into permanent law by section 115 of the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1978 (2 U.S.C. 74a-3); and

(2) the position established for the chief deputy majority whip by section 102(a)(4) of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1990; both of which positions were transferred to the majority leader by House Resolution 10, One Hundred Fourth Congress, agreed to January 5 (legislative day, January 4), 1995, as enacted into permanent law by section 103 of this Act, and both of which positions were further transferred to the House Republican Conference by House Resolution 113, One Hundred Fourth Congress, agreed to March 10, 1995, as enacted into permanent law by section 103 of this Act.

(c) The second two of the five positions referred to in subsection (a) are the two positions established by section 103(a)(2) of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1986.

(d) The fifth of the five positions referred to in subsection (a) is the position for the House Republican Conference established by House Resolution 625, Eighty-ninth Congress, agreed to October 22, 1965, as enacted into permanent law by section 103 of the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1967.

(e) The transfers under this section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 105. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, or any rule, regulation, or other authority, travel for studies and examinations under section 202(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(b)) shall be governed by applicable laws

or regulations of the House of Representatives or as promulgated from time to time by the Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

(b) Subsection (a) shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act and shall apply to travel performed on or after that date.

SEC. 106. (a) Notwithstanding the paragraph under the heading "GENERAL PROVISION" in chapter XI of the Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1957 (2 U.S.C. 102a) or any other provision of law, effective on the date of the enactment of this section, unexpended balances in accounts described in subsection (b) are withdrawn, with unpaid obligations to be liquidated in the manner provided in the second sentence of that paragraph.

(b) The accounts referred to in subsection (a) are the House of Representatives legislative service organization revolving accounts under section 311 of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1994 (2 U.S.C. 96a).

SEC. 107. (a) Each fund and account specified in subsection (b) shall be available only to the extent provided in appropriation Acts.

(b) The funds and accounts referred to in subsection (a) are—

(1) the revolving fund for the House Barber Shops, established by the paragraph under the heading "HOUSE BARBER SHOPS REVOLVING FUND" in the matter relating to the House of Representatives in chapter III of title I of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1975 (Public Law 93-554; 88 Stat. 1776);

(2) the revolving fund for the House Beauty Shop, established by the matter under the heading "HOUSE BEAUTY SHOP" in the matter relating to administrative provisions for the House of Representatives in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1970 (Public Law 91-145; 83 Stat. 347);

(3) the special deposit account established for the House of Representatives Restaurant by section 208 of the First Supplemental Civil Functions Appropriation Act, 1941 (40 U.S.C. 174k note); and

(4) the revolving fund established for the House Recording Studio by section 105(g) of the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1957 (2 U.S.C. 123b(g)).

(c) This section shall take effect on October 1, 1995, and shall apply with respect to fiscal years beginning on or after that date.

SEC. 107A. For fiscal year 1996, subject to the direction of the Committee on House Oversight of the House of Representatives, of the total amount deposited in the account referred to in section 107(b)(3) of this Act from vending operations of the House of Representatives Restaurant System, the cost of goods sold shall be available to pay the cost of inventory for such operations.

SEC. 108. The House Employees Position Classification Act (2 U.S.C. 291, et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 3(1), by striking out "Doorkeeper, and the Postmaster," and inserting in lieu thereof "Chief Administrative Officer, and the Inspector General";

(2) in the first sentence of section 4(b), by striking out "Doorkeeper, and the Postmaster," and inserting in lieu thereof "Chief Administrative Officer, and the Inspector General";

(3) in section 5(b)(1), by striking out "Doorkeeper, and the Postmaster" and inserting in lieu thereof "Chief Administrative Officer, and the Inspector General"; and

(4) in the first sentence of section 5(c), by striking out "Doorkeeper, and the Postmaster," and inserting in lieu thereof "Chief Administrative Officer, and the Inspector General".

SEC. 109. (a) Upon the approval of the appropriate employing authority, an employee of the House of Representatives who is sepa-

rated from employment, may be paid a lump sum for the accrued annual leave of the employee. The lump sum—

(1) shall be paid in an amount not more than the lesser of—

(A) the amount of the monthly pay of the employee, as determined by the Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives; or

(B) the amount equal to the monthly pay of the employee, as determined by the Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives, divided by 30, and multiplied by the number of days of the accrued annual leave of the employee;

(2) shall be paid—

(A) for clerk hire employees, from the clerk hire allowance of the Member;

(B) for committee employees, from amounts appropriated for committees; and

(C) for other employees, from amounts appropriated to the employing authority; and

(3) shall be based on the rate of pay in effect with respect to the employee on the last day of employment of the employee.

(b) The Committee on House Oversight shall have authority to prescribe regulations to carry out this section.

(c) As used in this section, the term "employee of the House of Representatives" means an employee whose pay is disbursed by the Clerk of the House of Representatives or the Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives, as applicable, except that such term does not include a uniformed or civilian support employee under the Capitol Police Board.

(d) Payments under this section may be made with respect to separations from employment taking place after June 30, 1995.

SEC. 110. (a)(1) Effective on the date of the enactment of this Act, the allowances for office personnel and equipment for certain Members of the House of Representatives, as adjusted through the day before the date of the enactment of this Act, are further adjusted as specified in paragraph (2).

(2) The further adjustments referred to in paragraph (1) are as follows:

(A) The allowance for the majority leader is increased by \$167,532.

(B) The allowance for the majority whip is decreased by \$167,532.

(b)(1) Effective on the date of the enactment of this Act, the House of Representatives allowances referred to in paragraph (2), as adjusted through the day before the date of the enactment of this Act, are further adjusted, or are established, as the case may be, as specified in paragraph (2).

(2) The further adjustments and the establishment referred to in paragraph (1) are as follows:

(A) The allowance for the Republican Conference is increased by \$134,491.

(B) The allowance for the Republican Steering Committee is established at \$66,995.

(C) The allowance for the Democratic Steering and Policy Committee is increased by \$201,430.

(D) The allowance for the Democratic Caucus is increased by \$56.

JOINT ITEMS

For Joint Committees, as follows:

JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE

For salaries and expenses of the Joint Economic Committee, \$3,000,000, to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING

[(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)]

[For duties formerly carried out by the Joint Committee on Printing, \$750,000, to be divided into equal amounts and transferred to the Committee on House Oversight of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate.

For the purpose of carrying out the functions of the Joint Committee on Printing for the remainder of the One Hundred Fourth Congress only, the rules and structure of the committee will apply.]

For salaries and expenses of the Joint Committee on Printing, \$1,164,000, to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON TAXATION

For salaries and expenses of the Joint Committee on Taxation, **[\$6,019,000]** \$5,116,000, to be disbursed by the Clerk of the House.

For other joint items, as follows:

OFFICE OF THE ATTENDING PHYSICIAN

For medical supplies, equipment, and contingent expenses of the emergency rooms, and for the Attending Physician and his assistants, including (1) an allowance of \$1,500 per month to the Attending Physician; (2) an allowance of \$500 per month each to two medical officers while on duty in the Attending Physician's office; (3) an allowance of \$500 per month to one assistant and \$400 per month each to not to exceed nine assistants on the basis heretofore provided for such assistance; and (4) \$852,000 for reimbursement to the Department of the Navy for expenses incurred for staff and equipment assigned to the Office of the Attending Physician, which shall be advanced and credited to the applicable appropriation or appropriations from which such salaries, allowances, and other expenses are payable and shall be available for all the purposes thereof, \$1,260,000, to be disbursed by the Clerk of the House.

CAPITOL POLICE BOARD

CAPITOL POLICE

SALARIES

For the Capitol Police Board for salaries, including overtime, hazardous duty pay differential, clothing allowance of not more than \$600 each for members required to wear civilian attire, and Government contributions to employees' benefits funds, as authorized by law, of officers, members, and employees of the Capitol Police, **[\$70,132,000]** \$69,825,000, of which **[\$34,213,000]** \$33,906,000 is provided to the Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives, to be disbursed by the Clerk of the House, and \$35,919,000 is provided to the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate, to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate: *Provided*, That, of the amounts appropriated under this heading, such amounts as may be necessary may be transferred between the Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives and the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate, upon approval of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate.

GENERAL EXPENSES

For the Capitol Police Board for necessary expenses of the Capitol Police, including motor vehicles, communications and other equipment, uniforms, weapons, supplies, materials, training, medical services, forensic services, stenographic services, the employee assistance program, not more than \$2,000 for the awards program, postage, telephone service, travel advances, relocation of instructor and liaison personnel for the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center, and \$85 per month for extra services performed for the Capitol Police Board by an employee of the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate or the House of Representatives designated by the Chairman of the Board, **[\$2,560,000]** \$2,190,000, to be disbursed by the Clerk of the House of Representatives: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the cost of basic training for the Capitol Police at the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center

for fiscal year 1996 shall be paid by the Secretary of the Treasury from funds available to the Department of the Treasury.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISION

SEC. 111. Amounts appropriated for fiscal year 1996 for the Capitol Police Board under the heading "CAPITOL POLICE" may be transferred between the headings "SALARIES" and "GENERAL EXPENSES", upon approval of the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

CAPITOL GUIDE SERVICE AND SPECIAL SERVICES OFFICE

For salaries and expenses of the Capitol Guide Service and Special Services Office, \$1,991,000, to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate: *Provided*, That none of these funds shall be used to employ more than forty individuals: *Provided further*, That the Capitol Guide Board is authorized, during emergencies, to employ not more than two additional individuals for not more than one hundred twenty days each, and not more than ten additional individuals for not more than six months each, for the Capitol Guide Service.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISION

SEC. 112. (a) Section 441 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970 (40 U.S.C. 851) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(k) In addition to any other function under this section, the Capitol Guide Service shall provide special services to Members of Congress, and to officers, employees, and guests of Congress."

(b) Section 310 of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1990 (2 U.S.C. 130e) is repealed.

(c) The amendment made by subsection (a) and the repeal made by subsection (b) shall take effect on October 1, 1995.

STATEMENTS OF APPROPRIATIONS

For the preparation, under the direction of the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives, of the statements for the first session of the One Hundred Fourth Congress, showing appropriations made, indefinite appropriations, and contracts authorized, together with a chronological history of the regular appropriations bills as required by law, \$30,000, to be paid to the persons designated by the chairmen of such committees to supervise the work.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISION

SEC. 112. (a) Section 441 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970 (40 U.S.C. 851) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(k) In addition to any other function under this section, the Capitol Guide Service shall provide special services to Members of Congress, and to officers, employees, and guests of Congress."

(b) Section 310 of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1990 (2 U.S.C. 130e) is repealed.

(c) The amendment made by subsection (a) and the repeal made by subsection (b) shall take effect on October 1, 1995.

OFFICE OF COMPLIANCE

For salaries and expenses of the Office of Compliance, as authorized by section 305 of Public Law 104-1, the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1385), \$2,500,000.

OFFICE OF TECHNOLOGY ASSESSMENT

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For salaries and expenses necessary to carry out the orderly closure of the Office of Technology Assessment, \$3,615,000, of which \$150,000 shall remain available until September 30, 1997. Upon enactment of this Act, \$2,500,000 of the funds appropriated under this heading in Public

Law 103-283 shall remain available until September 30, 1996: *Provided*, That none of the funds made available in this Act shall be available for salaries or expenses of any employee of the Office of Technology Assessment in excess of 17 employees except for severance pay purposes.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SEC. 113. Upon enactment of this Act all employees of the Office of Technology Assessment for 183 days preceding termination of employment who are terminated as a result of the elimination of the Office and who are not otherwise gainfully employed may continue to be paid by the Office of Technology Assessment at their respective salaries for a period not to exceed 60 calendar days following the employee's date of termination or until the employee becomes otherwise gainfully employed whichever is earlier. A statement in writing to the Director of the Office of Technology Assessment or his designee by any such employee that he was not gainfully employed during such period or the portion thereof for which payment is claimed shall be accepted as prima facie evidence that he was not so employed.

SEC. 114. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, or any other provision of law, upon the abolition of the Office of Technology Assessment, all records and property of that agency (including Unix system, all computer hardware and software, all library collections and research materials, and all photocopying equipment), with the exception of realty and furniture, are hereby transferred to the jurisdiction and control of the Library of Congress, Congressional Research Service, to be used and employed in connection with its functions.

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For salaries and expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (Public Law 93-344), including not to exceed \$2,500 to be expended on the certification of the Director of the Congressional Budget Office in connection with official representation and reception expenses, \$23,188,000 \$25,788,000: *Provided*, That none of these funds shall be available for the purchase or hire of a passenger motor vehicle: *Provided further*, That none of the funds in this Act shall be available for salaries or expenses of any employee of the Congressional Budget Office in excess of [219] 244 full-time equivalent positions: *Provided further*, That any sale or lease of property, supplies, or services to the Congressional Budget Office shall be deemed to be a sale or lease of such property, supplies, or services to the Congress subject to section 903 of Public Law 98-63: *Provided further*, That the Director of the Congressional Budget Office shall have the authority, within the limits of available appropriations, to dispose of surplus or obsolete personal property by inter-agency transfer, donation, or discarding.

[In addition, for salaries and expenses of the Congressional Budget Office necessary to carry out the provisions of title I of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (Public Law 104-4), as authorized by section 109 of such Act, \$1,100,000.]

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISION

SEC. 113. Section 8402(c) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (7) as paragraph (8); and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (6) the following:

"(7) The Director of the Congressional Budget Office may exclude from the operation of this chapter an employee under the Congressional Budget Office whose employment is temporary or intermittent."

ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

OFFICE OF THE ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

SALARIES

For the Architect of the Capitol, the Assistant Architect of the Capitol, and other personal services, at rates of pay provided by law, \$8,569,000 \$8,876,000.

TRAVEL

Appropriations under the control of the Architect of the Capitol shall be available for expenses of travel on official business not to exceed in the aggregate under all funds the sum of \$20,000.

CONTINGENT EXPENSES

To enable the Architect of the Capitol to make surveys and studies, and to meet unforeseen expenses in connection with activities under his care, \$100,000.

CAPITOL BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

CAPITOL BUILDINGS

For all necessary expenses for the maintenance, care and operation of the Capitol and electrical substations of the Senate and House office buildings, under the jurisdiction of the Architect of the Capitol, including furnishings and office equipment; including not to exceed \$1,000 for official reception and representation expenses, to be expended as the Architect of the Capitol may approve; purchase or exchange, maintenance and operation of a passenger motor vehicle; and attendance, when specifically authorized by the Architect of the Capitol, at meetings or conventions in connection with subjects related to work under the Architect of the Capitol, \$22,832,000 \$23,132,000, of which \$3,000,000 \$2,950,000 shall remain available until expended: *Provided*, That hereafter expenses, based on full cost recovery, for flying American flags and providing certification services therefor shall be advanced or reimbursed upon request of the Architect of the Capitol, and amounts so received shall be deposited into the Treasury to the credit of this appropriation.

CAPITOL GROUNDS

For all necessary expenses for care and improvement of grounds surrounding the Capitol, the Senate and House office buildings, and the Capitol Power Plant, \$5,143,000, of which \$25,000 shall remain available until expended.

SENATE OFFICE BUILDINGS

For all necessary expenses for maintenance, care and operation of Senate Office Buildings; and furniture and furnishings to be expended under the control and supervision of the Architect of the Capitol, \$41,757,000, of which \$4,850,000 shall remain available until expended.

HOUSE OFFICE BUILDINGS

For all necessary expenses for the maintenance, care and operation of the House office buildings, \$33,001,000, of which \$5,261,000 shall remain available until expended.

CAPITOL POWER PLANT

For all necessary expenses for the maintenance, care and operation of the Capitol Power Plant; lighting, heating, power (including the purchase of electrical energy) and water and sewer services for the Capitol, Senate and House office buildings, Library of Congress buildings, and the grounds about the same, Botanic Garden, Senate garage, and air conditioning refrigeration not supplied from plants in any of such buildings; heating the Government Printing Office and Washington City Post Office, and heating and chilled water for air conditioning for the Supreme Court Building, Union Station complex, Thurgood Marshall Federal Judiciary Building and the Folger Shakespeare Library, expenses for which shall be advanced or reimbursed upon request of the Architect of the Capitol and amounts so received shall

be deposited into the Treasury to the credit of this appropriation, **[\$32,578,000] \$31,518,000**: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$4,000,000 of the funds credited or to be reimbursed to this appropriation as herein provided shall be available for obligation during fiscal year 1996.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

CONGRESSIONAL RESEARCH SERVICE SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of section 203 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 166) and to revise and extend the Annotated Constitution of the United States of America, **[\$75,083,000] \$60,084,000**: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation may be used to pay any salary or expense in connection with any publication, or preparation of material therefor (except the Digest of Public General Bills), to be issued by the Library of Congress unless such publication has obtained prior approval of either the Committee on House Oversight of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the compensation of the Director of the Congressional Research Service, Library of Congress, shall be at an annual rate which is equal to the annual rate of basic pay for positions at level IV of the Executive Schedule under section 5315 of title 5, United States Code.

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

CONGRESSIONAL PRINTING AND BINDING

For authorized printing and binding for the Congress and the distribution of Congressional information in any format; printing and binding for the Architect of the Capitol; expenses necessary for preparing the semi-monthly and session index to the Congressional Record, as authorized by law (44 U.S.C. 902); printing and binding of Government publications authorized by law to be distributed to Members of Congress; and printing, binding, and distribution of Government publications authorized by law to be distributed without charge to the recipient, **[\$88,281,000] \$85,500,000**: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall not be available for paper copies of the permanent edition of the Congressional Record for individual [Senators,] Representatives, Resident Commissioners or Delegates authorized under 44 U.S.C. 906: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be available for the payment of obligations incurred under the appropriations for similar purposes for preceding fiscal years.

This title may be cited as the "Congressional Operations Appropriations Act, 1996".

TITLE II—OTHER AGENCIES

BOTANIC GARDEN

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For all necessary expenses for the maintenance, care and operation of the Botanic Garden and the nurseries, buildings, grounds, and collections; and purchase and exchange, maintenance, repair, and operation of a passenger motor vehicle; all under the direction of the Joint Committee on the Library, \$3,053,000.

[CONSERVATORY RENOVATION

For renovation of the Conservatory of the Botanic Garden, \$7,000,000, to be available to the Architect of the Capitol without fiscal year limitation: *Provided*, That the total amount appropriated for such renovation for this fiscal year and later fiscal years may not exceed \$21,000,000.]

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SEC. 201. (a) Section 201 of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1993 (40 U.S.C. 216c note) is amended by striking out

"\$6,000,000" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "\$10,000,000".

(b) Section 307E(a)(1) of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1989 (40 U.S.C. 216c(a)(1)) is amended by striking out "plans" and inserting in lieu thereof "plants".

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Library of Congress, not otherwise provided for, including development and maintenance of the Union Catalogs; custody and custodial care of the Library buildings; special clothing; cleaning, laundering and repair of uniforms; preservation of motion pictures in the custody of the Library; preparation and distribution of catalog cards and other publications of the Library; hire or purchase of one passenger motor vehicle; and expenses of the Library of Congress Trust Fund Board not properly chargeable to the income of any trust fund held by the Board, **[\$195,076,000 (less \$1,165,000)] \$213,164,000**, of which not more than \$7,869,000 shall be derived from collections credited to this appropriation during fiscal year 1996 under the Act of June 28, 1902 (chapter 1301; 32 Stat. 480; 2 U.S.C. 150): *Provided*, That the total amount available for obligation shall be reduced by the amount by which collections are less than the \$7,869,000: *Provided further*, That of the total amount appropriated, \$8,458,000 is to remain available until expended for acquisition of books, periodicals, and newspapers, and all other materials including subscriptions for bibliographic services for the Library, including \$40,000 to be available solely for the purchase, when specifically approved by the Librarian, of special and unique materials for additions to the collections.

COPYRIGHT OFFICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Copyright Office, including publication of the decisions of the United States courts involving copyrights, **\$30,818,000**, of which not more than \$16,840,000 shall be derived from collections credited to this appropriation during fiscal year 1996 under 17 U.S.C. 708(c), and not more than \$2,990,000 shall be derived from collections during fiscal year 1996 under 17 U.S.C. 111(d)(2), 119(b)(2), 802(h), and 1005: *Provided*, That the total amount available for obligation shall be reduced by the amount by which collections are less than \$19,830,000: *Provided further*, That up to \$100,000 of the amount appropriated is available for the maintenance of an "International Copyright Institute" in the Copyright Office of the Library of Congress for the purpose of training nationals of developing countries in intellectual property laws and policies: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$2,250 may be expended on the certification of the Librarian of Congress or his designee, in connection with official representation and reception expenses for activities of the International Copyright Institute.

BOOKS FOR THE BLIND AND PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For salaries and expenses to carry out the provisions of the Act of March 3, 1931 (chapter 400; 46 Stat. 1487; 2 U.S.C. 135a), \$44,951,000, of which \$11,694,000 shall remain available until expended.

FURNITURE AND FURNISHINGS

For necessary expenses for the purchase and repair of furniture, furnishings, office and library equipment, \$4,882,000, of which \$943,000 shall be available until expended only for the purchase and supply of furniture, shelving, furnishings, and related costs necessary for the renovation and res-

toration of the Thomas Jefferson and John Adams Library buildings.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SEC. 202. Appropriations in this Act available to the Library of Congress shall be available, in an amount not to exceed \$194,290, of which \$58,100 is for the Congressional Research Service, when specifically authorized by the Librarian, for attendance at meetings concerned with the function or activity for which the appropriation is made.

SEC. 203. (a) No part of the funds appropriated in this Act shall be used by the Library of Congress to administer any flexible or compressed work schedule which—

(1) applies to any manager or supervisor in a position the grade or level of which is equal to or higher than GS-15; and

(2) grants such manager or supervisor the right to not be at work for all or a portion of a workday because of time worked by the manager or supervisor on another workday.

(b) For purposes of this section, the term "manager or supervisor" means any management official or supervisor, as such terms are defined in section 7103(a) (10) and (11) of title 5, United States Code.

SEC. 204. Appropriated funds received by the Library of Congress from other Federal agencies to cover general and administrative overhead costs generated by performing reimbursable work for other agencies under the authority of 31 U.S.C. 1535 and 1536 shall not be used to employ more than 65 employees and may be expended or obligated—

(1) in the case of a reimbursement, only to such extent or in such amounts as are provided in appropriations Acts; or

(2) in the case of an advance payment, only—

(A) to pay for such general or administrative overhead costs as are attributable to the work performed for such agency; or

(B) to such extent or in such amounts as are provided in appropriations Acts, with respect to any purpose not allowable under subparagraph (A).

SEC. 205. Not to exceed \$5,000 of any funds appropriated to the Library of Congress may be expended, on the certification of the Librarian of Congress, in connection with official representation and reception expenses for the Library of Congress incentive awards program.

SEC. 206. Not to exceed \$12,000 of funds appropriated to the Library of Congress may be expended, on the certification of the Librarian of Congress or his designee, in connection with official representation and reception expenses for the Overseas Field Offices.

SEC. 207. Under the heading "Library of Congress" obligatory authority shall be available, in an amount not to exceed **[\$86,912,000] \$99,412,000** for reimbursable and revolving fund activities, and **[\$5,667,000] \$7,295,000** for non-expenditure transfer activities in support of parliamentary development during the current fiscal year.

SEC. 208. Notwithstanding this or any other Act, obligatory authority under the heading "Library of Congress" for activities funded by the Agency for International Development in support of parliamentary development is prohibited, except for Russia, Ukraine, Albania, Slovakia, [and Romania,] Romania, and Egypt for other than incidental purposes.

[SEC. 209. (a) Section 206 of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1994 (2 U.S.C. 132a-1) is amended by striking out "Effective" and all that follows through "provided", and inserting in lieu thereof "Obligations for reimbursable activities and revolving fund activities performed by the Library of Congress and obligations exceeding \$100,000 for a fiscal year for any single gift

fund activity or trust fund activity performed by the Library of Congress are limited to the amounts provided for such purposes".

[(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect on October 1, 1996, and shall apply with respect to fiscal years beginning on or after that date.]

SEC. 209. *The Library of Congress may for such employees as it deems appropriate authorize a payment to employees who voluntarily retire during fiscal 1996 which payment shall be paid in accordance with the provisions of section 5597(d) of title 5, United States Code.*

SEC. 210. (a) **PURPOSE.**—*The purpose of this section is to reduce the cost of information support for the Congress by eliminating duplication among systems which provide electronic access by Congress to legislative information.*

(b) **DEFINITIONS.**—*For the purpose of this section, the term "legislative information" means information about legislation prepared by, or on behalf of, the entire Congress, or by the committees, subcommittees, or offices of the Congress, to include, but not limited to, the text of bills and amendments to bills; the Congressional Record; legislative activity recorded for the Record and/or the current Senate or House bill status systems; committee hearings, reports, and prints.*

(c) *Consistent with the provisions of any other law, the Library of Congress shall develop and maintain, in coordination with other appropriate Legislative Branch entities, a single legislative information retrieval system to serve the entire Congress.*

(d) *The Library shall develop a plan for creation of this system, taking into consideration the findings and recommendations of the study directed by House Report No. 103-517 to identify and eliminate redundancies in congressional information systems. This plan must be approved by the Senate Rules and Administration Committee and the House Oversight Committee. The Library shall provide these committees, as well as the Senate and House Appropriations Committees, with regular status reports on the implementation of the plan.*

(e) *In formulating its plan, the Library shall examine issues regarding efficient ways to make this information available to the public. This analysis shall be submitted to the Senate and House Appropriations Committees as well as the Senate Rules and Administration Committee and the House Oversight Committee for their consideration and possible action.*

ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL LIBRARY BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS STRUCTURAL AND MECHANICAL CARE

For all necessary expenses for the mechanical and structural maintenance, care and operation of the Library buildings and grounds, \$12,428,000, of which \$3,710,000 shall remain available until expended.

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE OFFICE OF SUPERINTENDENT OF DOCUMENTS SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses of the Office of Superintendent of Documents necessary to provide for the cataloging and indexing of Government publications and their distribution to the public, Members of Congress, other Government agencies, and designated depository and international exchange libraries as authorized by law, **[\$16,312,000] \$30,307,000: Provided**, That travel expenses, including travel expenses of the Depository Library Council to the Public Printer, shall not exceed \$130,000: *Provided further*, That funds, not to exceed \$2,000,000, from current year appropriations are authorized for producing and disseminating Congressional Serial Sets and other related Congressional/non-Congressional publications for 1994 and 1995 to depository and other designated libraries.

【ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISION】

【SEC. 210. The last paragraph of section 1903 of title 44, United States Code, is amended by striking out the last sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "The cost of production and distribution for publications distributed to depository libraries—

["(1) in paper or microfiche formats, whether or not such publications are requisitioned from or through the Government Printing Office, shall be borne by the components of the Government responsible for their issuance; and

["(2) in other than paper or microfiche formats—

["(A) if such publications are requisitioned from or through the Government Printing Office, shall be charged to appropriations provided to the Superintendent of Documents for that purpose; and】

["(B) if such publications are obtained elsewhere than from the Government Printing Office, shall be borne by the components of the Government responsible for their issuance."】

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE REVOLVING FUND

The Government Printing Office is hereby authorized to make such expenditures, within the limits of funds available and in accord with the law, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act as may be necessary in carrying out the programs and purposes set forth in the budget for the current fiscal year for the Government Printing Office revolving fund: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$2,500 may be expended on the certification of the Public Printer in connection with official representation and reception expenses: *Provided further*, That the revolving fund shall be available for the hire or purchase of passenger motor vehicles, not to exceed a fleet of twelve: *Provided further*, That expenditures in connection with travel expenses of the advisory councils to the Public Printer shall be deemed necessary to carry out the provisions of title 44, United States Code: *Provided further*, That the revolving fund shall be available for services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109 but at rates for individuals not to exceed the per diem rate equivalent to the rate for level V of the Executive Schedule (5 U.S.C. 5316): *Provided further*, That the revolving fund and the funds provided under the headings "OFFICE OF SUPERINTENDENT OF DOCUMENTS" and "SALARIES AND EXPENSES" together may not be available for the full-time equivalent employment of more than [3,550 workyears] 3,900 workyears by the end of fiscal year 1996: *Provided further*, That activities financed through the revolving fund may provide information in any format: *Provided further*, That the revolving fund shall not be used to administer any flexible or compressed work schedule which applies to any manager or supervisor in a position the grade or level of which is equal to or higher than GS-15: *Provided further*, That expenses for attendance at meetings shall not exceed \$75,000.

GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the General Accounting Office, including not to exceed \$7,000 to be expended on the certification of the Comptroller General of the United States in connection with official representation and reception expenses; services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109 but at rates for individuals not to exceed the per diem rate equivalent to the rate for level IV of the Executive Schedule (5 U.S.C. 5315); hire of one passenger

motor vehicle; advance payments in foreign countries in accordance with 31 U.S.C. 3324; benefits comparable to those payable under sections 901(5), 901(6) and 901(8) of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (22 U.S.C. 4081(5), 4081(6) and 4081(8)); and under regulations prescribed by the Comptroller General of the United States, rental of living quarters in foreign countries and travel benefits comparable with those which are now or hereafter may be granted single employees of the Agency for International Development, including single Foreign Service personnel assigned to AID projects, by the Administrator of the Agency for International Development—or his designee—under the authority of section 636(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2396(b)); **[\$392,864,000] \$374,406,000: Provided**, That not more than \$400,000 of reimbursements received incident to the operation of the General Accounting Office Building shall be available for use in fiscal year 1996: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 9105 hereafter amounts reimbursed to the Comptroller General pursuant to that section shall be deposited to the appropriation of the General Accounting Office then available and remain available until expended, and not more than \$8,000,000 of such funds shall be available for use in fiscal year 1996 and, in addition, the following sums are appropriated, to be available for the fiscal year beginning October 1, 1996 and ending September 30, 1997, for the necessary expenses of the General Accounting Office, in accordance with the authority, and on such terms and conditions, as provided for in fiscal year 1996, including \$7,000 for official representation and reception expenses, \$338,425,400: *Provided further*, That not more than \$100,000 of reimbursements received incident to the operation of the General Accounting Office Building shall be available for use in 1997: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 9105 hereafter amounts reimbursed to the Comptroller General pursuant to that section shall be deposited to the appropriation of the General Accounting Office then available and remain available until expended, and not more than \$6,000,000 of such funds shall be available in fiscal year 1997: *Provided further*, That this appropriation and appropriations for administrative expenses of any other department or agency which is a member of the Joint Financial Management Improvement Program (JFMIP) shall be available to finance an appropriate share of JFMIP costs as determined by the JFMIP, including the salary of the Executive Director and secretarial support: *Provided further*, That this appropriation and appropriations for administrative expenses of any other department or agency which is a member of the National Intergovernmental Audit Forum or a Regional Intergovernmental Audit Forum shall be available to finance an appropriate share of Forum costs as determined by the Forum, including necessary travel expenses of non-Federal participants. Payments hereunder to either the Forum or the JFMIP may be credited as reimbursements to any appropriation from which costs involved are initially financed: *Provided further*, That to the extent that funds are otherwise available for obligation, agreements or contracts for the removal of asbestos, and renovation of the building and building systems (including the heating, ventilation and air conditioning system, electrical system and other major building systems) of the General Accounting Office Building may be made for periods not exceeding five years: *Provided further*, That this appropriation and appropriations for administrative expenses of any other department or agency which is a member of the American Consortium on International Public Administration (ACIPA) shall be available to finance an appropriate share of ACIPA costs as determined by the ACIPA, including any expenses

attributable to membership of ACIPA in the International Institute of Administrative Sciences.

[ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISION]
ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

[SEC. 211. (a) Effective June 30, 1996, the functions of the Comptroller General identified in subsection (b) are transferred to the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, contingent upon the additional transfer to the Office of Management and Budget of such personnel, budget authority, records, and property of the General Accounting Office relating to such functions as the Comptroller General and the Director jointly determine to be necessary. The Director may delegate any such function, in whole or in part, to any other agency or agencies if the Director determines that such delegation would be cost-effective or otherwise in the public interest, and may transfer to such agency or agencies any personnel, budget authority, records, and property received by the Director pursuant to the preceding sentence that relate to the delegated functions. Personnel transferred pursuant to this provision shall not be separated or reduced in classification or compensation for one year after any such transfer, except for cause.

[(b) The following provisions of the United States Code contain the functions to be transferred pursuant to subsection (a): sections 5564 and 5583 of title 5; sections 2312, 2575, 2733, 2734, 2771, 4712, and 9712 of title 10; sections 1626 and 4195 of title 22; section 420 of title 24; sections 2414 and 2517 of title 28; sections 1304, 3702, 3726, and 3728 of title 31; sections 714 and 715 of title 32; section 554 of title 37; section 5122 of title 38; and section 256a of title 41.]

SEC. 211. (a) Section 732 of title 31, *United States Code*, is amended by adding a new subsection (h) as follows:

“(h) Notwithstanding the provisions of subchapter I of chapter 35 of title 5, United States Code, the Comptroller General shall prescribe regulations for the release of officers and employees of the General Accounting Office in a reduction in force which give due effect to tenure of employment, military preference, performance and/or contributions to the agency's goals and objectives, and length of service. The regulations shall, to the extent deemed feasible by the Comptroller General, be designed to minimize disruption to the Office and to assist in promoting the efficiency of the Office.”

SEC. 212. Section 753 of title 31, *United States Code*, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (b), (c), and (d) as (c), (d), and (e), respectively.

(2) by inserting after subsection (a) a new subsection (b) as follows:

“(b) The Board has no authority to issue a stay of any reduction in force action.”; and

(3) in the second sentence of subsection (c), as redesignated, by striking “(c)” and inserting “(d)”.

SEC. 213. The General Accounting Office may for such officers and employees as it deems appropriate authorize a payment to officers and employees who voluntarily separate on or before September 30, 1995, whether by retirement or resignation, which payment shall be paid in accordance with the provisions of section 5597(d) of title 5, *United States Code*.

TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. No part of the funds appropriated in this Act shall be used for the maintenance or care of private vehicles, except for emergency assistance and cleaning as may be provided under regulations relating to parking facilities for the House of Representatives issued by the Committee on House Oversight and for the Senate issued by the Committee on Rules and Administration.

SEC. 302. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for

obligation beyond the current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

SEC. 303. Whenever any office or position not specifically established by the Legislative Pay Act of 1929 is appropriated for herein or whenever the rate of compensation or designation of any position appropriated for herein is different from that specifically established for such position by such Act, the rate of compensation and the designation of the position, or either, appropriated for or provided herein, shall be the permanent law with respect thereto: *Provided*, That the provisions herein for the various items of official expenses of Members, officers, and committees of the Senate and House of Representatives, and clerk hire for Senators and Members of the House of Representatives shall be the permanent law with respect thereto.

SEC. 304. The expenditure of any appropriation under this Act for any consulting service through procurement contract, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3109, shall be limited to those contracts where such expenditures are a matter of public record and available for public inspection, except where otherwise provided under existing law, or under existing Executive order issued pursuant to existing law.

SEC. 305. (a) It is the sense of the Congress that, to the greatest extent practicable, all equipment and products purchased with funds made available in this Act should be American-made.

(b) In providing financial assistance to, or entering into any contract with, any entity using funds made available in this Act, the head of each Federal agency, to the greatest extent practicable, shall provide to such entity a notice describing the statement made in subsection (a) by the Congress.

SEC. 306. (a) Upon approval of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, and in accordance with conditions determined by the Committee on House Oversight, positions in connection with House parking activities and related funding shall be transferred from the appropriation “Architect of the Capitol, Capitol buildings and grounds, House office buildings” to the appropriation “House of Representatives, salaries, officers and employees, Office of the Sergeant at Arms”: *Provided*, That the position of Superintendent of Garages shall be subject to authorization in annual appropriation Acts.

(b) For purposes of section 8339(m) of title 5, *United States Code*, the days of unused sick leave to the credit of any such employee as of the date such employee is transferred under subsection (a) shall be included in the total service of such employee in connection with the computation of any annuity under subsections (a) through (e) and (o) of such section.

(c) In the case of days of annual leave to the credit of any such employee as of the date such employee is transferred under subsection (a) the Architect of the Capitol is authorized to make a lump sum payment to each such employee for that annual leave. No such payment shall be considered a payment or compensation within the meaning of any law relating to dual compensation.

SEC. 307. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for the relocation of the office of any Member of the House of Representatives within the House office buildings.

[SEC. 308. (a)(1) Effective October 1, 1995, the unexpended balances of appropriations specified in paragraph (2) are transferred to the appropriation for general expenses of the Capitol Police, to be used for design and installation of security systems for the Capitol buildings and grounds.

[(2) The unexpended balances referred to in paragraph (1) are—

[(A) the unexpended balance of appropriations for security installations, as referred to in the paragraph under the heading “CAPITOL BUILDINGS”, under the general headings “JOINT ITEMS”, “ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL”, and “CAPITOL BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS” in title I of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1995 (108 Stat. 1434), including any unexpended balance from a prior fiscal year and any unexpended balance under such headings in this Act; and]

[(B) the unexpended balance of the appropriation for an improved security plan, as transferred to the Architect of the Capitol by section 102 of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1989 (102 Stat. 2165).

[(b) Effective October 1, 1995, the responsibility for design and installation of security systems for the Capitol buildings and grounds is transferred from the Architect of the Capitol to the Capitol Police Board. Such design and installation shall be carried out under the direction of the Committee on House Oversight of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, and without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (41 U.S.C. 5). On and after October 1, 1995, any alteration to a structural, mechanical, or architectural feature of the Capitol buildings and grounds that is required for a security system under the preceding sentence may be carried out only with the approval of the Architect of the Capitol.

[(c)(1) Effective October 1, 1995, all positions specified in paragraph (2) and each individual holding any such position (on a permanent basis) immediately before that date, as identified by the Architect of the Capitol, shall be transferred to the Capitol Police.]

[(2) The positions referred to in paragraph (1) are those positions which, immediately before October 1, 1995, are—

[(A) under the Architect of the Capitol;

[(B) within the Electronics Engineering Division of the Office of the Architect of the Capitol; and

[(C) related to the design or installation of security systems for the Capitol buildings and grounds.

[(3) All annual leave and sick leave standing to the credit of an individual immediately before such individual is transferred under paragraph (1) shall be credited to such individual, without adjustment, in the new position of the individual.]

SEC. [309] 308. (a) Section 230(a) of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1371(a)) is amended by striking out “Administrative Conference of the United States” and inserting in lieu thereof “Board”.

(b) Section 230(d)(1) of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1371(d)(1)) is amended—

(1) by striking out “Administrative Conference of the United States” and inserting in lieu thereof “Board”; and

(2) by striking out “and shall submit the study and recommendations to the Board”.

SEC. [310] 309. Section 122(d) of the Military Construction Appropriations Act, 1994 (Public Law 103-110; 2 U.S.C. 141 note) is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: “The Provost Marshal (U.S. Army Military Police), Fort George G. Meade, is authorized to police the real property, including improvements thereon, transferred under subsection (a), and to make arrests on the said real property and within any improvements situated thereon for any violation of any law of the United States, the District of Columbia, or any State, or of any regulation promulgated pursuant thereto, and such authority shall be construed as authorizing the Provost Marshal, with the consent or upon the request of the Librarian

of Congress or his assistants, to enter any improvements situated on the said real property that are under the jurisdiction of the Library of Congress to make arrests or to patrol such structures.”.

[SEC. 311. (a)(1) Effective as prescribed by paragraph (2), the administrative jurisdiction over the property described in subsection (b), known as the Botanic Garden, is transferred, without reimbursement, to the Secretary of Agriculture. After such transfer, the Botanic Garden shall continue as a scientific display garden to inform and educate visitors and the public as to the value of plants to the well-being of humankind and the natural environment.

[(2) The transfer referred to in paragraph (1) shall take effect—

[(A) on October 1, 1996, with respect to the property described in subsection (b)(1)(A); and

[(B) on the later of October 31, 1996, or the date of the conveyance described in subsection (b)(1)(B), with respect to the property described in that subsection.

[(b)(1) The property referred to in subsection (a)(1) is the property consisting of—

[(A) Square 576 in the District of Columbia (bounded by Maryland Avenue on the north, First Street on the east, Independence Avenue on the south, and Third Street on the west) and Square 578 in the District of Columbia (bounded by Independence Avenue on the north, First Street on the east, and Washington Avenue on the southwest), other than the property included in the Capitol Grounds by paragraph (20) of the first section of Public Law 96-432 (40 U.S.C. 193a note);

[(B) the site known as the Botanic Garden Nursery at D.C. Village, consisting of 25 acres located at 4701 Shepherd Parkway, S.W., Washington, D.C. (formerly part of a tract of land known as Parcel 253/26), which site is to be conveyed by the District of Columbia to the Architect of the Capitol pursuant to Public Law 98-340 (40 U.S.C. 215 note);

[(C) all buildings, structures, and other improvements located on the property described in subparagraphs (A) and (B), respectively; and

[(D) all equipment and other personal property that, immediately before the transfer under this section, is located on the property described in subparagraphs (A) and (B), respectively, and is under the control of the Architect of the Capitol, acting under the direction of the Joint Committee on the Library.

[(c) Not later than the date of the conveyance to the Architect of the Capitol of the property described in subsection (b)(1)(B), the Architect of the Capitol and the Secretary of Agriculture shall enter into an agreement to permit the retention by the Architect of the Capitol of a portion of that property for legislative branch storage and support facilities and expansion of such facilities, and facilities to be developed for use by the Capitol Police.

[(d)(1) Effective October 1, 1996, all employee positions specified in paragraph (2) and each individual holding any such position (on a permanent basis) immediately before the transfer, as identified by the Architect of the Capitol, shall be transferred to the Department of Agriculture.

[(2) The employee positions referred to in paragraph (1) are those positions which, immediately before October 1, 1996, are under the Architect of the Capitol and are primarily related to the functions of the Botanic Garden.

[(3) All annual leave and sick leave standing to the credit of an individual immediately before such individual is transferred under paragraph (1) shall be credited to such individual, without adjustment, in the new position of the individual.

[(e)(1) Notwithstanding the transfer under this section, and without regard to the laws

specified in paragraph (2), the Architect of the Capitol shall retain full authority for completing, under plans approved by the Architect, the National Garden authorized by section 307E of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1989 (40 U.S.C. 216c), including the renovation of the Conservatory of the Botanic Garden under section 209(b) of Public Law 102-229 (40 U.S.C. 216c note). In carrying out the preceding sentence, the Architect—

[(A) shall have full responsibility for design, construction management and supervision, and acceptance of gifts;

[(B) shall inform the Secretary of Agriculture from time to time of the progress of the work involved; and

[(C) shall notify the Secretary of Agriculture when, as determined by the Architect, the National Garden, including the renovation of the Conservatory of the Botanic Garden, is complete.

[(2) The laws referred to in paragraph (1) are section 2 of the Act entitled “An Act providing for a comprehensive development of the park and playground system of the National Capital.”, approved June 6, 1924 (40 U.S.C. 71a), and the first section of the Act entitled “An Act establishing a Commission of Fine Arts.”, approved May 17, 1910 (40 U.S.C. 104).

[(f)(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), effective October 1, 1996, the unexpended balances of appropriations for the Botanic Garden are transferred to the Secretary of Agriculture.

[(2) Any unexpended balances of appropriations for completion of the National Garden, including the Conservatory of the Botanic Garden, under subsection (e) shall remain under the Architect of the Capitol.

[(g) After the transfer under this section—

[(1) under such terms and conditions as the Secretary of Agriculture may impose, including a requirement for payment of fees for the benefit of the Botanic Garden, the National Garden and the Conservatory of the Botanic Garden shall be available for receptions sponsored by Members of Congress; and

[(2) the Secretary of Agriculture, through the Botanic Garden, shall continue, with reimbursement, to propagate and provide such plant materials as the Architect may require for the United States Capitol Grounds, and such indoor plant materials and cut flowers as are authorized by policies of the House of Representatives and the Senate.]

SEC. [312] 310. Any amount appropriated in this Act for “HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Salaries and Expenses—Members’ Representational Allowances” shall be available only for fiscal year 1996. Any amount remaining after all payments are made under such allowances for such fiscal year shall be deposited in the Treasury, to be used for deficit reduction.

SEC. 311. Section 316 of Public Law 101-302 is amended in the first sentence of subsection (a) by striking “1995” and inserting “1996”.

This Act may be cited as the “Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1996”.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be considered, en bloc, agreed to, en bloc, and considered original text for the purpose of further amendment, and that no points of order be waived.

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

So the committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, let me indicate that we are happy to have the managers here this morning on the first appropriations bill. We hope to dispose of six appropriations bills before the August recess. This is cer-

tainly an indication that we are on target. We had these bills scheduled for tomorrow. We will do them today. Maybe we can do something else tomorrow. I wish the managers success, and I hope we can do it quickly.

Mr. MACK addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Florida [Mr. MACK].

Mr. MACK. Mr. President, I am pleased to present the fiscal year 1996 legislative branch appropriations bill, H.R. 1854, to the Senate. Simply put, with this bill the Congress leads the way in fulfilling our commitment to reduce the size, scope, and cost of the Federal Government.

But, of equal importance to keeping our promise to the American people in reducing the size and cost of Congress is making these reductions in a thoughtful and responsible manner. The bill we present today does not compromise the legislative and oversight responsibilities of Congress.

Mr. President, I would like to take a moment to describe the approach the committee took in arriving at these funding levels. This past January, I sent a letter to each of the Senate officers and legislative branch support agencies asking them to undergo a serious programmatic review of each of their activities and services they provide to Congress.

In doing so, they were asked to take a long and hard look at their core missions and statutory responsibilities. They were asked to explore ways of using technologies to make their operations more efficient and productive. They were asked to explore opportunities for consolidation and restructuring of their functions and services. Following their top to bottom review, the results were incorporated into new budget justifications which were presented in hearings before the subcommittee.

I am deeply appreciative to each of the Senate officers and agency heads. I want to thank in particular the former Secretary of the Senate, Ms. Sheila Burke and her successor, Mr. Kelly Johnston, and the Senate Sergeant at Arms, Howard O. Greene, for their cooperation. These offices met, and even exceeded their goals of reducing their budgets by 12.5 percent. Without their commitment and the dedication of their respective staffs the committee would not have been able to produce the legislation that the Senate considers today.

Mr. President, as any member of the committee will tell you, these decisions were not easy. But, we have, in great measure, accomplished what we set out to do, respond to the clear and unmistakable message sent by the American people last November—change the way we do business here in Washington, reduce spending, and bring runaway spending in control and balance the Federal budget.

I would like to summarize the highlights of the bill:

The total funding for the legislative branch appropriation is \$2,190,380,000, a reduction of just over \$200 million or 8.45 percent below the fiscal year 1995 level.

For the funding of the operations of the Senate the committee's recommendation is \$426.9 million a \$33.7 million reduction. In addition, the committee rescinds \$63.5 million of unobligated funds from previous years.

Within the Senate accounts the funding for committees reflects a 15-percent reduction. As I have already mentioned, the funding for the offices of the Secretary of the Senate and Sergeant at Arms are reduced by 12.5 percent.

Again, I want to reiterate or make the point that these reductions are from this year's level. This is not some reduction from some arbitrary, inflated baseline. These are reductions from this year's expenditures.

Mr. President, in last years bill the Senate passed into law a ban on unsolicited mass mailing which has resulted in tens of millions of dollars in savings to the taxpayer. Again, this year the committee freezes official mail cost at \$11 million.

The statutory allowances for Senator's offices are not reduced. The recommended funding for Members' office salaries and expenses should be sufficient to cover fiscal year 1996 expenditures.

Mr. President, S. 2, the Congressional Accountability Act, which was passed into law early this year, mandates that Congress comply with the very same employment and labor laws that private businesses must comply with. And, just like businesses all around the country, there is a cost to compliance. This bill includes \$2.5 million appropriation for the establishment of the new Office of Compliance. This is a new joint item with the House. Each Member should be aware that the costs associated with the Congressional Accountability Act will require future increases in expenditures. The committee has included report language that directs the offices of the Senate to make regular reports to the committee regarding issues of compliance and associated costs.

As to the major support agencies of Congress: the Library of Congress has level funding compared to fiscal year 1995, with the exception of \$3 million increase for the National Digital Library Program. I want to commend the Librarian of Congress, Dr. James Billington, for his efforts in strengthening the Library and the services it provides to the Nation. The digital library effort is one of several forward thinking programs initiated by the Library of Congress which will insure the Library's position as one of our leading institutions.

We have included a \$2.6 million increase for the Congressional Budget Office so that it may perform studies

mandated by the Unfunded Mandate Reform Act.

The GAO is reduced 15 percent from fiscal year 1995 levels and we have included an advance appropriation for fiscal year 1997 which will result in a two year reduction of 25 percent.

The Office of Technology Assessment is eliminated in the bill. The committee has included termination costs in fiscal year 1996 which total \$3.6 million.

Mr. President, each Member of the Senate should know that this bill complies with the specifics of the Senate budget resolution which provides a dramatic and necessary outline for balancing the Federal budget by the year 2002. The budget resolution specifies the reductions to the General Accounting Office and the elimination of the Office of Technology Assessment.

In regards to the two year 25 percent reduction in the funding for the General Accounting Office, I want to thank Senator ROTH, chairman of the Government Affairs Committee, and his staff for their cooperation in identifying and recommending needed changes at GAO. With their assistance, I am confident that the GAO will be able to perform its core statutory mission.

Also, I want to thank the Comptroller General, Charles Bowsher, for his help. He will tell you that the funding levels will be difficult and will force structural changes, but he is committed to making the General Accounting Office the model for the rest of the Federal Government in productivity and efficiency as we continue to restructure and downsize the Federal Government.

Mr. President, I expect an amendment to be offered that restores funding for the Office of Technology Assessment. I know that there are Members who feel strongly about this issue and we will debate the merits should it be offered. I must point out to the Members of the Senate that the Senate budget resolution specifies the elimination of OTA, and quite frankly, the services and information that OTA provides can be obtained from a great variety of sources that do not require a \$21 million dollars expenditure.

Mr. President, while this bill accomplishes our stated goal of reducing Congressional spending by \$200 million, much more needs to be done in the coming year. While the office of the Architect of the Capitol is reduced by 10 percent in title I of this bill, the Congress will undertake a much more thorough review of its structure and organization by way of a Joint House-Senate Leadership Taskforce. The taskforce will, with the assistance of the Architect of the Capitol, identify services and operations that could be more cost efficiently performed by outside contractors.

The committee report also directs the Government Printing Office to initiate a study to analyze the structure and services of the Superintendent of Documents and the Federal Depository

Library Program; the program which assures the American people ready and dependable access to government information.

While the committee would have preferred to make more substantial changes to the structure and funding of the Architect of the Capitol and the Government Printing Office, we clearly need more information before making these decision. Finally, I want to thank our ranking member, Senator MURRAY, as well as the other members of the subcommittee, for their hard work and cooperation in crafting this measure. Additionally, this year's bill builds upon the years of hard work and dedication of Senator REID, our former chairman. Senator REID extended a great deal of time and cooperation to me as ranking member, and I thank him for that.

Mr. President, I would yield the floor to our ranking member and floor manager, Senator MURRAY, for any statement she would wish to make.

Mrs. MURRAY. Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. President, I rise in support of the H.R. 1854, the fiscal year 1996 Legislative branch appropriation bill. I note that this is not the first year in which the committee has made the effort to constrain the spending of the legislative branch. As Senator MACK stated last year in his opening floor remarks on the fiscal year 1995 legislative branch appropriation bill, "This is the fourth year in a row now that we have held funding at or below the previous year's levels in real dollars." Mr. President, that means that this is the fifth year in a row that the Senate Appropriations Committee has reported a bill in which we have held funding at or below the previous year's levels—in fact, this year the committee-reported bill is over \$200 million below the level enacted for fiscal year 1995.

The chairman has provided in his remarks a detailed explanation of all of the recommendations contained in the committee-reported bill. Without repeating those details, I would simply direct all members to a summary table on pages 65 and 66 of the committee report for the two titles of the bill. For title I, congressional operations, the committee recommends a total of a little over \$1.5 billion. That is a reduction of \$126 million below the fiscal year 1995 appropriated level and \$275 million below the total budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for congressional operations. Title II of the bill, as shown on page 66 of the report, provides funding for other agencies for which the committee recommends a total of \$686 million. In total, as is depicted in the summary table, the bill as reported by the full committee provides \$2.1 billion, a reduction of just over \$200 million below the fiscal year 1995 enacted bill and a reduction of \$427 million below the budget estimates for fiscal year 1996.

There are a number of differences between the House-passed bill and the committee's recommendations, several

of which I would now like to address. First, for the Architect of the Capitol, the House bill did not fund the operations of the Flag Office. The Senate Appropriations Committee chose, instead, to continue that office but with the cost of this operation fully covered by the prices charged to the public for the flags themselves.

For certain security functions of the Architect of the Capitol, the House bill recommended the transfer of staff from the Architect of the Capitol to the Capitol Police. The Senate committee-reported bill disagrees with that recommendation and has left that security function within the Office of the Architect.

The committee-reported bill does not agree with the House recommendation that the Botanic Garden be transferred to the Department of Agriculture. In addition, the House provided \$7 million for the renovation of the Conservatory and capped the total project at \$21 million. The Senate committee-reported bill has deleted all funding for that purpose.

Finally, Mr. President, for the Office of Technology Assessment (OTA), the House-passed bill included a floor amendment which provided for the continuation of the functions of the OTA within the Congressional Research Service at a level of \$15 million. H.R. 1854, as reported by the Senate Appropriations Committee, includes a total of just over \$6 million for the OTA. This amount will allow for the orderly completion and distribution of approximately 30 reports which the OTA is currently undertaking and a maximum of 17 employees is provided for closing the Office. In addition, from within the amount appropriated for fiscal year 1996, \$150,000 is recommended to remain available until September 30, 1997, to provide for unemployment claims that may arise.

I would note, however, that during the committee markup of the bill, an amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from South Carolina, Senator HOLLINGS, which I supported, would have provided \$15 million for the OTA—the cost of which was offset by a 1.08-percent reduction of the salaries and expenses of certain of the congressional support agencies. That amendment was defeated by a rollcall vote of 11–13.

I believe that the OTA provides a valuable service for the Congress on a bipartisan basis and I will have more to say during this debate about the OTA in support of an amendment which I anticipate may be offered to overturn the committee's recommendation.

In conclusion, I again compliment the very able chairman of the subcommittee, Senator MACK. I have learned a lot during my first year as ranking member of this subcommittee, and I am pleased that we have been able to do our share in carefully examining the expenditures of the legislative branch to ensure that they are cost-effective and, where possible, we

have recommended reductions in keeping with our overall efforts to reduce Federal spending.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, are there committee amendments?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair advises the Senator from West Virginia that they have been adopted en bloc.

Mr. BYRD. The bill, as amended, is open to amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I shall offer an amendment.

Mr. President on previous occasions, I have come to the Senate floor to speak on the matter of honoraria and outside income earned by the media. While no overall disclosure policy exists within the communications industry, there does seem to be more scrutiny being paid to the practice of the press in accepting speaking fees.

It is an issue of increasing concern to me, and one that I believe deserves closer attention. I suspect that most journalists would agree that they have a unique and often unequalled influence on the American public. There is no match—none—no match for the leverage the media have over the public dissemination of information. In order to stay attuned with current events, we all must rely on the press' interpretation of each day's occurrences.

Some members of the press take the position that, as private citizens, they have no obligation—none—to disclose information to the public regarding the acceptance of outside income. Although I can appreciate that line of thinking, it represents a defensive position that has little basis in reality. From my point of view, the members of the media need to adopt a position regarding such income, a position that reflects some common sense. Of course, in a perfect world, all of us who affect public policy, either through the elective process or through the interpretation of that process, want to be thought of as being above reproach. We all want our work to be seen as benefiting the common good and, as a result, we do not expect our motives to be challenged. Unfortunately, human nature has to be factored into the equation. There is no doubt that the American people have a negative opinion of elected officials and a negative opinion of the press. Some of that attitude is well founded. Let us be honest, there are members of both of these professions who have behaved unethically in the past and thus have tainted all of us. There is no avoiding this fact, and to pretend otherwise is not only unrealistic but it is also disingenuous.

In response to the public's criticism, Members of Congress adopted disclosure rules that prohibit their acceptance of honoraria. I led the fight. This action was seen by some politicians at the time as an overreaction to criticism and an unnecessary effort, but the prevailing attitude was to let the sunshine in and take away the appearance

of unethical behavior. In point of fact, the Congress has gone even further, as I say, by adopting legislation that I sponsored to increase the salaries of Members of Congress, but also to prohibit the acceptance of honoraria, prohibit it entirely. That was my amendment.

Many members of the press, however, have adopted the position that, as private citizens, they should not be subject to this type of scrutiny. Though they are not elected officials, nevertheless, in reality they do retain a great deal of influence, massive influence within the political process. It is singularly the media's decision as to which topics of information are noteworthy and, as such, which topics should be reported on. As purveyors of the news, the press have enormous power, enormous power to persuade—far greater, in fact, than does any single politician, or group of politicians.

Edmund Burke recognized this when he referred to the fourth estate as having more power than any of the other estates.

It is this very power, unchecked and freewheeling, that journalists can no longer ignore and brush aside. There is as much need for the press to be made accountable to the public as there is for elected officials to be made accountable to the public. To resist public disclosure—that is all I am asking, just disclose outside earned income—to resist public disclosure as a matter of principle is unwise. Principle, however, is on the other side of the issue.

We all know that nothing gives a greater feeling of credibility than the willingness to show that there is nothing to hide. Lay it out. I have urged the members of the press to recognize their extraordinary position in our system of Government, and to face the inherent responsibility that comes with that position. I believe it is time for the communications industry as a whole to take the bull by the horns and develop its own standards. That is what I would like to see happen; the communications industry should develop its own standards with respect to disclosure of outside earned income. Journalists should forgo the narrow defense of their individual freedoms and face up to the broader obligation of trust which they bear in our political process.

I am offering an amendment, Mr. President, and it is a sense-of-the-Senate amendment—today—regarding the disclosure of outside income earned by accredited members of the Senate press corps. I am not talking about salaries. This does not infringe on anybody's constitutional rights. It does not infringe upon the freedom of the press, as set forth in the American Bill of Rights. There is nothing in that Bill of Rights that says you should not have an accounting to the public of some things.

This amendment is intended to provide a "truth in reporting requirement" for the media that cover this institution, this Senate. I repeat that I have grown increasingly concerned with the communication industry's inability or unwillingness to adopt ethical standards that properly reflect their role in our system of Government. In this day of instant access, the media's leverage over the dissemination of information is unequalled. Their power of persuasion goes well beyond the newspaper headlines or the nightly news report or the radio talk show. The members of the media, as the purveyors of our daily news, singularly decide which items are newsworthy and, as such, which items deserve the attention of the public.

Today's press, as I have said already, have enormous power, enormous power. There is nothing like it anywhere in the world. And it is time that they acknowledge the responsibility that comes with that power. Coupled with that fact is the American people's increasing cynicism of Washington. At a time when the public's distrust of Members of Congress and the public's distrust of journalists is at an all-time high, I believe it is important to take the necessary steps to instill confidence in the process of Government. Over the years, the press have been exceedingly critical—and rightly so—of particular elected officials who have abused their positions.

In 1991, in an effort to address the appearance of impropriety, the Congress passed legislation installing disclosure requirements that prohibit any Member from accepting compensation from outside groups. That was a positive step. Though there was resistance to this prohibition, the prevailing attitude was, as I said earlier, to let a little sunshine work its way into the Chamber and to take away the appearance of unethical behavior.

Recently, there have been reports of journalists receiving thousands of dollars in speaking fees, thousands of dollars in speaking fees from the very groups that they are covering. Despite this apparent conflict, some members—not all, but some members—of the press take the position that, as a private citizen they have no obligation—no obligation—to disclose information regarding their acceptance of outside earned income. They say, "That is nobody else's business. I am a private citizen. The public has no business in knowing what I take in speaking fees."

The impetus for my amendment is neither an attempt to hamper the media's ability to do their job nor is it an effort to infringe in any way upon their first amendment rights. Instead, the goal of the amendment is simply to apply a level of credibility to the press that reflects the importance of their profession.

It is my hope that there can be consensus in the Senate in requiring the media to disclose their earned outside income. And I intend to offer a sepa-

rate Senate resolution that would, hopefully, lead to the establishment of disclosure rules starting with the 104th Congress and set into place rules for a yearly filing by reporters who seek credentialing with the Senate Press Gallery.

I am not attempting to have any impact upon the House and its rules or regulations. But I would anticipate that the Rules Committee in the Senate would then hold hearings to ensure a complete airing of all views on the subject. Come one, come all. Let us hear what you have to say. Let us work together.

This is not an attempt to sandbag the press or to prevent their input or to influence their input. The point of this amendment is to show that it is time for the media to be accountable. I would prefer that they would voluntarily take the steps to make themselves accountable. I hope they will do that. But right now—today—their sphere of influence is unfettered and unequal.

For the press to simply resist public disclosure on a matter of principle is unwise, and it is unacceptable. I believe that the entire industry must realize its full responsibility—its full responsibility—to its viewers, to its readers, and to its listeners.

In light of that, this amendment is a beginning in the effort to address at the very least the perception of a media double standard. The media were right in saying that we elected officials ought to be accountable to the public, that we ought to disclose how much this group pays us for an appearance, or how much this group pays us for having a cup of coffee downtown at some club. We ought to disclose how much this or that group pays us for a 10-minute speech or for a 30-minute speech. Lay it out.

My amendment went further. At first we disclose it. And then my amendment said we will eliminate entirely the acceptance of honoraria for ourselves and on the part of our staffs. I am not saying the same with respect to the press. I am not saying they should eliminate it. I am simply saying they should disclose it. Let the sunshine in. Let their colleagues, let their coworkers know. Let everybody know. Let the public know.

It is time for journalists to forgo, as I say, the narrow defense of their individual freedoms to face up to the broader obligations of trust in our political process.

Mr. President, this is what the amendment says:

It is the sense of the Senate that the Senate should consider a resolution in the 104th Congress, 1st Session, that requires an accredited member of any of the Senate press galleries to file an annual public report with the Secretary of the Senate disclosing the identity of the primary employer of the member and of any additional sources of earned outside income received by the member, together with the amounts received from each such source.

(b) For purposes of this section, the term "Senate press galleries" means—

- (1) the Senate Press Gallery;
- (2) the Senate Radio and Television Correspondents Gallery;
- (3) the Senate Periodical Press Gallery; and
- (4) the Senate Press Photographers Gallery.

AMENDMENT NO. 1802

(Purpose: To express the sense of the Senate that the Senate should consider a resolution requiring each accredited member of the Senate Press Gallery to file an annual public report with the Secretary of the Senate disclosing the member's primary employer and any additional sources and amounts of earned outside income)

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I send my amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] proposes an amendment numbered 1802.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following:

SEC. . (a) It is the sense of the Senate that the Senate should consider a resolution in the 104th Congress, 1st Session, that requires an accredited member of any of the Senate press galleries to file an annual public report with the Secretary of the Senate disclosing the identity of the primary employer of the member and of any additional sources of earned outside income received by the member, together with the amounts received from each such source.

(b) For purposes of this section, the term "Senate press galleries" means—

- (1) the Senate Press Gallery;
- (2) the Senate Radio and Television Correspondents Gallery;
- (3) the Senate Periodical Press Gallery; and
- (4) the Senate Press Photographers Gallery.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD certain published articles pertinent to my remarks.

The first is entitled "Fee Speech," by Ken Auletta, from the September 12, 1994, New Yorker; the second, "Take the Money and Talk," by Alicia C. Shepard, which appeared in American Journalism Review; and "Where the Sun Doesn't Shine," by Jamie Stiehm, which appeared in the May/June 1995 issue of the Columbia Journalism Review.

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

[From the New Yorker magazine, Sept. 12, 1994]

FEE SPEECH

(By Ken Auletta)

The initial hint of anger from twenty-five or so members of the House Democratic leadership came on an hour-and-a-quarter-long bus ride from Washington to Airlie House, in rural Virginia, one morning last January. They had been asked by the Majority Leader, Richard A. Gephardt, of Missouri, to attend

a two-day retreat for the Democratic Message Group, and as the bus rolled southwest the convivial smiles faded. The members of the group began to complain that their message was getting strangled, and they blamed the media. By that afternoon, when the Democrats gathered for the first of five panels composed of both partisans and what were advertised as "guest analysts, not partisan advisers," the complaints were growing louder. The most prominent Democrats in the House—Gephardt; the Majority Whip, David E. Bonior, of Michigan; the current Appropriations Committee chairman, David R. Obey, of Wisconsin; the Democratic Congressional Campaign chairman, Vic Fazio, of California; Rosa L. DeLauro, of Connecticut, who is a friend of President Clinton's; and about twenty others—expressed a common grievance: public figures are victims of a powerful and cynical press corps. A few complained of what they saw as the ethical obtuseness of Sam Donaldson, of ABC, angrily noting that, just four days earlier, "Prime Time Live," the program that Donaldson co-anchors, had attacked the Independent Insurance Agents of America for treating congressional staff people to a Key West junket. Yet several months earlier the same insurance group had paid Donaldson a thirty-thousand-dollar lecture fee.

By four-thirty, when the third panel, ostensibly devoted to the changing role of the media, was set to begin, the Democrats could no longer contain their rage, lumping the press into a single, stereotypical category—you—the same way they complained that the press lumped together all members of Congress.

They kept returning to Donaldson's lecture fees and his public defense that it was ethically acceptable for him to receive fees because he was a private citizen, not an elected official. The Airlie House meeting was off the record, but in a later interview Representative Obey recalled having said of journalists, "What I find most offensive lately is that we get the sanctimonious-Sam defense: 'We're different because we don't write the laws.' Well, they have a hell of a lot more power than I do to affect the laws written."

Representative Robert G. Torricelli, of New Jersey, recalled have said, "What startles many people is to hear television commentators make paid speeches to interest groups and then see them on television commenting on those issues. It's kind of a direct conflict of interest. If it happened in government, it would not be permitted." Torricelli, who has been criticized for realizing a sixty-nine-thousand-dollar profit on a New Jersey savings-and-loan after its chairman advised him to make a timely investment in its stock, says he doesn't understand why journalists don't receive the same scrutiny that people in Congress do. Torricelli brought up an idea that had been discussed at the retreat and that he wanted to explore: federal regulations requiring members of the press to disclose outside income—and most particularly television journalists whose stations are licensed by the government. He said that he would like to see congressional hearings on the matter, and added, "You'd get the votes if you did the hearings. I predict that in the next couple of Congresses you'll get the hearings."

Gephardt is dubious about the legality of compelling press disclosure of outside income, but one thing he is sure about is the anger against the media which is rising within Congress. "Most of us work for more than money," he told me. "We work for self-image. And Congress's self-image has suffered, because, members think, journalistic ethics and standards are not as good as they used to be."

The press panel went on for nearly three hours, long past the designated cocktail hour of six. The congressmen directed their anger at both Brian Lamb, the C-SPAN chairman, and me—we were the two press representatives on the panel—and cited a number of instances of what they considered reportorial abuse. The question that recurred most often was this: Why won't journalists disclose the income they receive from those with special interests?

It is a fair question to ask journalists, who often act as judges of others' character. Over the summer, I asked it of more than fifty prominent media people, or perhaps a fifth of what can fairly be called the media elite—those journalists who, largely on account of television appearances, have a kind of fame similar to that of actors. Not surprisingly, most responded to the question at least as defensively as any politician would. Some of them had raised an eyebrow when President Clinton said he couldn't recall ten- or fifteen-year-old details about Whitewater. Yet many of those I spoke to could not remember where they had given a speech just months ago. And many of them, while they were unequivocal in their commentary on public figures and public issues, seemed eager to dwell on the complexities and nuances of their own outside speaking.

Sam Donaldson, whose annual earnings at ABC are about two million dollars, was forthcoming about his paid speeches: in June, he said that he had given three paid speeches so far this year and had two more scheduled. He would not confirm a report that he gets a lecture fee of as much as thirty thousand dollars. On being asked to identify the three groups he had spoken to, Donaldson—who on the March 27th edition of the Sunday-morning show "This Week with David Brinkley" had ridiculed President Clinton for not remembering that he had once lent twenty thousand dollars to his mother—said he couldn't remember. Then he took a minute to call up the information from his computer. He said that he had spoken at an I.B.M. convention in Palm Springs, to a group of public-information officers, and to the National Association of Retail Druggists. "If I hadn't consulted my computerized date book, I couldn't have told you that I spoke to the National Association of Retail Druggists," he said. "I don't remember these things."

What would Donaldson say to members of Congress who suggest that, like them, he is not strictly a private individual and should make full disclosure of his income from groups that seek to influence legislation?

"First, I don't make laws that govern an industry," he said. "Second, people hire me because they think of me as a celebrity; they believe their members or the people in the audience will be impressed." He went on, "Can you say the same thing about a member of Congress who doesn't even speak—who is hired, in a sense, to go down and play tennis? What is the motive of the group that pays for that?" He paused and then answered his own question: "Their motive, whether they are subtle about it or not, is to make friends with you because they hope that you will be a friend of theirs when it comes time to decide about millions of dollars. Their motive in inviting me is not to make friends with me."

Would he concede that there might be at least an appearance of conflict when he takes money from groups with a stake in, say, health issues?

Donaldson said, "At some point, the issue is: What is the evidence? I believe it's not the appearance of impropriety that's the problem. It's impropriety." Still, Donaldson did concede that he was rethinking his position; and he was aware that his bosses at

ABC News were reconsidering their relaxed policy.

Indeed, one of Donaldson's bosses—Paul Friedman, the executive vice-president for news—told me he agreed with the notion that on-air correspondents are not private citizens. "People like Sam have influence that far exceeds that of individual congressmen," Friedman said, echoing Representative Obey's point. "We always worry that lobbyists get special 'access' to members of government. We should also worry that the public might get the idea that special-interest groups are paying for special 'access' to correspondents who talk to millions of Americans."

Unlike Donaldson, who does not duck questions, some commentators chose to say nothing about their lecturing. The syndicated columnist George Will, who appears weekly as a commentator on the Brinkley show, said through an assistant, "We are just in the middle of book production here. Mr. Will is not talking much to anyone." Will is paid twelve thousand five hundred dollars a speech. Alicia C. Shepard reports in a superb article in the May issue of the *American Journalism Review*.

ABC's Cokie Roberts, who, according to an ABC official, earns between five and six hundred thousand dollars annually as a Washington correspondent and is a regular commentator on the Brinkley show in addition to her duties on National Public Radio, also seems to have a third job, as a paid speaker. Among ABC correspondents who regularly moonlight as speakers, Roberts ranks No. 1. A person who is in a position to know estimates that she earned more than three hundred thousand dollars for speaking appearances in 1993. Last winter, a couple of weeks after the Donaldson-"Prime Time" incident, she asked the Group Health Association of America, before whom she was to speak in mid-February, to donate her reported twenty-thousand-dollar fee to charity. Roberts did not return three phone calls—which suggests that she expects an openness from the Clinton Administration that she rejects for herself. On that March 27th Brinkley show, she described the Administration's behavior concerning Whitewater this way: "All of this now starts to look like they are covering something up."

Brit Hume, the senior ABC White House correspondent, earns about what Roberts does, and is said to trail only Roberts and Donaldson at ABC in lecture earnings. This could not be confirmed by Hume, for he did not return calls.

At CNN, the principal anchor, Bernard Shaw, also declined to be interviewed, and so did three of the loudest critics of Congress and the Clinton Administration; the conservative commentator John McLaughlin, who now takes his "McLaughlin Group" on the road to do a rump version of the show live, often before business groups; and the alternating conservative co-hosts of "Crossfire," Pat Buchanan and John Sununu.

David Brinkley did respond to questions, but not about his speaking income. Like Donaldson and others, he rejected the notion that he was a public figure. Asked what he would say to the question posed by members of Congress at the retreat, Brinkley replied, "It's a specious argument. We are private citizens. We work in the private marketplace. They do not."

And if a member of Congress asked about his speaking fee, which is reported to be eighteen thousand dollars?

"I would tell him it's none of his business," Brinkley said. "I don't feel that I have the right to ask him everything he does in his private life."

The syndicated columnist and television regular Robert Novak, who speaks more frequently than Brinkley, also considers himself a private citizen when it comes to the matter of income disclosure. "I'm not going to tell you how many speeches I do and what my fee is," he said politely. Novak, who has been writing a syndicated column for thirty-one years, is highly visible each weekend on CNN as the co-host of the "Evans & Novak" interview program and as a regular on "The Capital Gang."

What would Novak say to a member of Congress who maintained that he was a quasi-public figure and should be willing to disclose his income from speeches?

"I'm a totally private person," he said. "Anyone who doesn't like me doesn't have to read me. These people, in exchange for power—I have none—they have sacrificed privacy."

In fact, Novak does seem to view his privacy as less than total; he won't accept fees from partisan political groups, and, as a frequent critic of the Israeli government, he will not take fees from Arab-American groups, for fear of creating an appearance of a conflict of interest. Unlike most private citizens, Novak, and most other journalists, will not sign petitions, or donate money to political candidates, or join protest marches.

Colleagues have criticized Novak and Rowland Evans for organizing twice-a-year forums—as they have since 1971—to which they invite between seventy five and a hundred and twenty-five subscribers to their newsletter, many of whom are business and financial analysts. Those attending pay hundreds of dollars—Novak refuses to say how much—for the privilege of listening to public officials speak and answer questions off the record. "You talk about conflicts of interest!" exclaimed Jack Nelson, the Los Angeles Times Washington bureau chief. "It is wrong to have government officials come to speak to businesses and you make money off of it."

Mark Shields, who writes a syndicated column and is the moderator of "The Capital Gang" and a regular commentator on "The MacNeil/Lehrer NewsHour," is a busy paid lecturer. Asked how much he earned from speeches last year, he said, "I haven't even totalled it up." Shields said he probably gives one paid speech a week, adding, "I don't want, for personal reasons, to get into specifics."

Michael Kinsley, who is the liberal co-host of "Crossfire," an essayist for *The New Republic* and *Time*, and a contributor to *The New Yorker*, is also reluctant to be specific. "I'm in the worst of all possible positions," he said. "I do only a little of it. But I can't claim to be a virgin." Kinsley said he appeared about once every two months, but he wouldn't say what groups he spoke to or how much he was paid. "I'm going to do a bit more," he said. "I do staged debates—mini 'Crossfire's'—before business groups. If everyone disclosed, I would."

The New Republic's White House correspondent, Fred Barnes, who is a regular on "The McLaughlin Group" and appears on "CBS This Morning" as a political commentator, speaks more often than Kinsley, giving thirty or forty paid speeches a year, he said, including the "McLaughlin" road show. How would Barnes respond to the question posed by members of Congress?

"They're elected officials," he said. "I'm not an elected official. I'm not in government. I don't deal with taxpayers' money."

Barnes's "McLaughlin" colleague Morton M. Kondracke is the executive editor of *Roll Call*, which covers Congress. Kondracke said that he gave about thirty-six paid speeches annually, but he would not identify the sponsors or disclose his fee. He believes that col-

umnists have fewer constraints on their speechmaking than so-called objective reporters, since columnists freely expose their opinions.

Gloria Borger, a U.S. News & World Report columnist and frequent "Washington Week in Review" panelist, discloses her income from speeches, but only to her employer. Borger said she gave one or two paid speeches a month, but she wouldn't reveal her fee. "I'm not an elected official," she said.

Like Borger, Wolf Blitzer, CNN's senior White House correspondent, said that he told his news organization about any speeches he made. How many speeches did he make in the last year?

"I would guess four or five," he said, and repeated that each one was cleared through his bureau chief.

What would Blitzer say to a member of Congress who asked how much he made speaking and from which groups?

"I would tell him 'None of your business,'" Blitzer said.

Two other network chief White House correspondents NBC's Andrea Mitchell and CBS's Rira Braver—also do little speaking. "I make few speeches," Mitchell said. "Maybe ten a year. Maybe six or seven a year. I'm very careful about not speaking to groups that involve issues I cover." She declined to say how much she earned. For Braver, the issue was moot. I don't think I did any," she said, referring to paid speeches in the past year.

ABC's "Prime Time Live" correspondent Chris Wallace, who has done several investigative pieces on corporate-sponsored congressional junkets, said he made four or five paid speeches last year. "I don't know exactly," he said. Could he remember his fee?

"I wouldn't say," he replied.

Did he speak to business groups?

"I'm trying to remember the specific groups," he said, and then went on. "One was the Business Council of Canada. Yes, I do speak to business groups."

So what is the difference between Chris Wallace and members of Congress who accept paid junkets?

"I'm a private citizen," he said, "I have no control over public funds, I don't make public policy."

Why did Wallace think that he was invited to speak before business groups?

"They book me because they feel somehow that it adds a little excitement or luster to their event," he said. He has been giving speeches since 1980, he said, and "never once has any group called me afterward and asked me any favor in coverage."

But isn't that what public officials usually say when Wallace corners them about a junket?

Those who underwrite congressional junkets are seeking "access" and "influence," he said, but the people who hire him to make a speech are seeking "entertainment." When I mentioned Wallace's remarks to Norman Pearlstine, the former executive editor of the *Wall Street Journal*, he said, "By that argument, we ought not to distinguish between news and entertainment, and we ought to merge news into entertainment."

ABC's political and media analyst Jeff Greenfield makes a "rough guess" that he gives fifteen paid speeches a year, many in the form of panels he moderates before various media groups—cable conventions, newspaper or magazine groups, broadcasting and marketing associations—that are concerned with subjects he regularly covers. "It's like 'Nightline,' but it's not on the air," he said. He would not divulge his fee, or how much he earned in the past twelve months from speeches.

Greenfield argued that nearly everything he did could be deemed a potential conflict.

"I cover cable, but I cover it for ABC, which is sometimes in conflict with that industry," he said. Could he accept money to write a magazine piece or a book when he might one day report on the magazine publisher or the book industry? He is uneasy with the distinction that newspapers like the *Wall Street Journal* or the *Washington Post* make, which is to prohibit daily reporters from giving paid speeches to corporations or trade associations that lobby Congress and have agendas, yet allow paid college speeches. (Even universities have legislative agendas, Greenfield noted.) In trying to escape this ethical maze, Greenfield concluded, "I finally decided that I can't figure out everything that constitutes a conflict."

Eleanor Clift, of *Newsweek*, who is cast as the beleaguered liberal on "The McLaughlin Group," said that she made between six and eight appearances a year with the group. Her fee for a speech on the West Coast was five thousand dollars, she said, but she would accept less to appear in Washington. She would not disclose her outside speaking income, and said that if a member of Congress were to ask she would say, "I do disclose. I disclose to the people I work for. I don't work for the taxpayers."

Christopher Matthews, a nationally syndicated columnist and Washington bureau chief of the *San Francisco Examiner*, who is a political commentator for "Good Morning America" and co-host of a nightly program on America's Talking, a new, NBC-owned cable network, told me last June that he gave between forty and fifty speeches a year. He netted between five and six thousand dollars a speech, he said, or between two and three hundred thousand dollars a year. Like many others, he is represented by the Washington Speakers Bureau, and he said that he placed no limitations on corporate or other groups he would appear before. "To be honest, I don't spend a lot of time thinking about it," he said. "I give the same speech."

David S. Broder, of the *Washington Post*, who has a contract to appear regularly on CNN and on NBC's "Meet the Press," said that he averaged between twelve and twenty-four paid speeches a year, mostly to colleges, and that the speeches are cleared with his editors at the *Post*. He did not discuss his fee, but Howard Kurtz, the *Post*'s media reporter, said in his recent book "Media Circus" that Broder makes up to seventy-five hundred dollars a speech. Broder said he would support an idea advanced by Albert R. Hunt, the *Wall Street Journal*'s Washington editor, to require disclosure as a condition of receiving a congressional press card. To receive a press card now, David Holmes, the superintendent of the House Press Gallery, told me, journalists are called upon to disclose only if they receive more than five per cent of their income from a single lobbying organization. Hunt said he would like to see the four committees that oversee the issuing of congressional press cards—made up of five to seven journalists each—require full disclosure of any income from groups that lobby Congress. He said he was aware of the bitter battle that was waged in 1988, when one committee issued new application forms for press passes which included space for detailed disclosure of outside income.irate reporters demanded that the application form be rescinded, and it was. Today, the *Journal*, along with the *Washington Post*, is among the publications with the strictest prohibitions on paid speeches. Most journalistic organizations forbid reporters to accept money or invest in the stocks of the industries they cover. But the *Journal* and the *Post* have rules against reporters' accepting fees from any groups that lobby Congress or from any for-profit groups.

Hunt, who has television contracts with "The Capital Gang" and "Meet the Press," said that he averaged three or four speeches a year, mostly to colleges and civic groups, and never to corporations or groups that directly petition Congress, and that he received five thousand dollars for most speeches.

William Safire, the *Times* columnist, who is a regular on "Meet the Press," was willing to disclose his lecture income. "I do about fifteen speeches a year for twenty thousand dollars a crack," he said. "A little more for overseas and Hawaii." Where Safire parts company with Hunt is that he sees nothing wrong with accepting fees from corporations. He said that in recent months he had spoken to A.T. & T., the Pharmaceutical Research and Manufacturers of America, and Jewish organizations. Safire said that because he is a columnist his opinions are advertised, not hidden. "I believe firmly in Samuel Johnson's dictum 'No man but a blockhead ever wrote except for money,'" he went on. "I charge for my lectures. I charge for my books. I charge when I go on television. I feel no compunction about it. It fits nicely into my conservative, capitalist—with a capital 'C'—philosophy."

Tim Russert, the host of "Meet the Press," said that he had given "a handful" of paid speeches in the past year, including some to for-profit groups. He said that he had no set fee, and that he was wary of arbitrary distinctions that say lecturing is bad but income from stock dividends is fine. Russert also raised the question of journalists' appearing on shows like "Meet the Press," which, of course, have sponsors. "Is that a conflict? You can drive yourself crazy on this."

Few journalists drive themselves crazy over whether to accept speaking fees from the government they cover. They simply don't. But enticements do come from unusual places. One reporter, who asked to remain anonymous, said that he had recently turned down a ten-thousand dollar speaking fee from the Central Intelligence Agency. A spokesman for the C.I.A., David Christian, explained to me, "We have an Office of Training and Education, and from time to time we invite knowledgeable non-government experts to talk to our people as part of our training program." Does the agency pay for these speeches? "Sometimes we do, and sometimes we don't," he said. Asked for the names of journalists who accepted such fees, Christian said he was sorry but "the records are scattered."

Time's Washington columnist, Margaret Carlson, who is a regular on "The Capital Gang," laughed when I asked about her income from speeches and said, "My view is that I just got on the gravy train, so I don't want it to end." Carlson said she gave six speeches last year, at an average of five thousand dollars a speech, including a panel appearance in San Francisco before the American Medical Association (with Michael Kinsley, among others). She made a fair distinction between what she did for a fee and what Treasury Secretary Lloyd Bentsen tried to do in 1987, when, as Senate Finance Committee chairman, he charged lobbyists ten thousand dollars a head for the opportunity to join him for breakfast once a month. "We are like monkeys who get up on-stage," Carlson said, echoing Chris Wallace. "It's mud wrestling for an hour or an hour and a half, and it's over."

There are journalistic luminaries who make speeches but, for the sake of appearances, do not accept fees. They include the three network-news anchors—NBC's Tom Brokaw, ABC's Peter Jennings and CBS' Dan Rather—all of whom say that they don't charge to speak or they donate their fees to

charity. "We don't need the money," Brokaw said. "And we thought it created an appearance of conflict." Others who do not accept fees for speaking are Ted Koppel, of ABC's "Nightline"; Jim Lehrer, of "The MacNeil/Lehrer News Hour"; Bob Schieffer, CBS' chief Washington correspondent and the host of "Face the Nation"; and C-SPAN's Brian Lamb.

ABC's senior Washington correspondent, James Wooten, explained how, in the mid-eighties, he decided to change his ways after a last lucrative weekend: "I had a good agent and I got a day off on Friday and flew out Thursday after the news and did Northwestern University Thursday night for six thousand dollars. Then I got a rental car and drove to Milwaukee, and in midmorning I did Marquette for five or six thousand dollars. In the afternoon, I went to the University of Chicago, to a small symposium, for which I got twenty-five hundred to three thousand dollars. Then I got on a plane Friday night and came home. I had made fifteen thousand dollars, paid the agent three thousand, and had maybe two thousand in expenses. So I made about ten thousand dollars for thirty-six hours. I didn't have a set speech, I just talked off the top of my head." But his conscience told him it was wrong. "It's easy money," Wooten said.

As for me, *The New Yorker* paid my travel expenses to and from the congressional retreat. In the past twelve months, I've given two paid speeches; the first, at New York's Harmonic Club, was to make an opening presentation and to moderate a panel on the battle for control of Paramount Communications, for which I was paid twelve hundred dollars; the second was a speech on the future of the information superhighway at a Manhattan luncheon sponsored by the Baltimore-based investment firm of Alex, Brown & Sons, for which my fee was seventy-five hundred dollars. I don't accept lecture fees from communications organizations.

Like the public figures we cover, journalists would benefit from a system of checks and balances. Journalistic institutions, including *The New Yorker*, too seldom have rigorous rules requiring journalists to check with an editor or an executive before agreeing to make a paid speech; the rules at various institutions for columnists are often even more permissive. Full disclosure provides a disinfectant—the power of shame. A few journalistic institutions, recently shamed, have been taking a second look at their policies. In mid-June, ABC News issued new rules, which specifically prohibit paid speeches to trade associations or to any "for-profit business." ABC's ban—the same one that is in place at the *Wall Street Journal* and the *Washington Post*—prompted Roberts, Donaldson, Brinkley, Wallace, and several other ABC correspondents to protest, and they met in early August with senior news executives. They sought a lifting of the ban, which would allow them to get permission on a case-by-case basis. But a ranking ABC official says, "We can agree to discuss exceptions but not give any. Their basic argument is greed, for Christ's sake!" Andrew Lack, the president of NBC News, said that he plans to convene a meeting of his executives to shape an entirely new speaking policy. "My position is that the more we can discourage our people from speaking for a fee, the better," he said. And CBS News now stipulates that all speaking requests must be cleared with the president or the vice-president of news. Al Vecchione, the president of MacNeil/Lehrer Productions, admitted in June to having been embarrassed by the American Journalism Review piece. "We had a loose policy," he said. "I just finished rewriting our company policy." Henceforth, those associated with the program will no

longer accept fees to speak to corporate groups or trade associations that directly lobby the government. The New Yorker, according to its executive editor, Hendrik Hertzberg, is in the process of reviewing its policies.

Those who frequently lecture make a solid point when they say that lecture fees don't buy favorable coverage. But corruption can take subtler forms than the quid pro quo, and the fact that journalists see themselves as selling entertainment rather than influence does not wipe the moral slate clean. The real corruption of "fee speech," perhaps, is not that journalists will do favors for the associations and businesses that pay them speaking fees but that the nexus of television and speaking fees creates what Representative Obey called "an incentive to be even more flamboyant" on TV—and, to a lesser extent, on the printed page. The television talk shows value vividness, pithiness, and predictability. They prefer their panelists reliably pro or con, "liberal" or "conservative." Too much quirkiness can make a show unbalanced; too much complexity can make it dull. Time's Margaret Carlson told me, not entirely in jest, "I was a much more thoughtful person before I went on TV. But I was offered speeches only after I went on TV." Her Time colleague the columnist Hugh Sidey said that when he stopped appearing regularly on television his lecture income shrivelled. Obey wishes that it would shrivel for the rest of the pundit class as well. An attitude of scorn often substitutes for hard work or hard thought and it's difficult to deny that the over-all result of this dynamic is a coarsening of political discourse.

Celebrity journalism and the appearance of conflicts unavoidably erode journalism's claim to public trust. "My view is that you're going to start having character stories about journalists," Jay Rosen, a journalism professor at New York University and the director of the Project on Public Life and the Press, told me recently. "It's inevitable. If I were a big-name Washington journalist, I'd start getting my accounts together. I don't think journalists are private citizens."

[From the American Journalism Review,
June 1995]

TAKE THE MONEY AND TALK (By Alicia C. Shepard)

It's speech time and the Broward County Convention Center in Fort Lauderdale.

ABC News correspondent and NPR commentator Cokie Roberts takes her brown handbag and notebook off of the "reserved" table where she has been sitting, waiting to speak. She steps up to the podium where she is gushingly introduced and greeted with resounding applause.

Framed by palm fronds, Roberts begins her speech to 1,600 South Florida businesswomen attending a Junior League-sponsored seminar. Having just flown in from Washington, D.C., Roberts breaks the news of the hours-old arrest of a suspect in the Oklahoma City bombing. She talks of suffragette Susan B. Anthony, of how she misses the late House Speaker Tip O'Neill, of the Republican takeover on Capitol Hill. Then she gives her listeners the inside scoop on the new members of Congress.

"They are very young," says Roberts, 52. "I'm constantly getting it wrong, assuming they are pages. They're darling. They're wildly adept with a blow dryer and I resent them because they call me ma'am." The audience laughs.

After talking for an hour on "Women and Politics," Roberts answers questions for 20 minutes. One woman asks the veteran correspondent, who has covered Washington

since 1978, when there will be a female president.

"I think we'll have a woman president when a woman is elected vice president and we do in the guy," Roberts quips.

This crowd loves her. When Roberts finishes, they stand clapping for several minutes. Roberts poses for a few pictures and is whisked out and driven to the Miami airport for her first-class flight back to Washington.

For her trouble and her time, the Junior League of Greater Fort Lauderdale gave Roberts a check for \$35,000. "She's high, very high," says the League's Linda Carter, who lined up the keynote speakers. The two other keynote speakers received around \$10,000 each.

The organization sponsored the seminar to raise money for its community projects, using Roberts as a draw. But shelling out \$35,000 wouldn't have left much money for, say, the League's foster care or women's substance abuse programs or its efforts to increase organ donors for transplants.

Instead, Roberts' tab was covered by a corporate sponsor, JM Family Enterprises. The \$4.2 billion firm is an umbrella company for the largest independent American distributor of Toyotas. The second-largest privately held company in Florida, it provides Toyotas to 164 dealerships in five southern states and runs 20 other auto-related companies.

But Roberts doesn't want to talk about the company that paid her fee. She doesn't like to answer the kind of questions she asks politicians. She won't discuss what she's paid, whom she speaks to, why she does it or how it might affect journalism's credibility when she receives more money in an hour-and-a-half from a large corporation than many journalists earn in a year.

"She feels strongly that it's not something that in any way shape or form should be discussed in public," ABC spokeswoman Eileen Murphy said in response to AJR's request for an interview with Roberts.

Roberts' ABC colleague Jeff Greenfield, who also speaks for money, doesn't think it's a good idea to duck the issue. "I think we ought not not talk about it," he says. "I mean that's Cokie's right, obviously," he adds, but "if we want people to answer our questions, then up to a reasonable point, we should answer their questions."

The phenomenon of journalists giving speeches for staggering sums of money continues to dog the profession. Chicago Tribune Washington Bureau Chief James Warren has created a cottage industry criticizing colleagues who speak for fat fees. Washington Post columnist James K. Glassman believes the practice is the "next great American scandal." Iowa Republican Sen. Charles Grassley has denounced it on the Senate floor.

A number of news organizations have drafted new policies to regulate the practice since debate over the issue flared a year ago (see "Talk is Expensive," May 1994). Time magazine is one of the latest to do so, issuing a flat-out ban on honoraria in April. The Society for Professional Journalists, in the process of revising its ethics code, is wrestling with the divisive issue.

The eye-popping sums star journalists receive for their speeches, and the possibility that they may be influenced by them, have drawn heightened attention to the practice, which is largely the province of a relatively small roster of well-paid members of the media elite. Most work for the television networks or the national news weeklies; newspaper reporters, with less public visibility, aren't asked as often.

While the crescendo of criticism has resulted in an official crackdown at several news organizations—as well as talk of new

hardline policies at others—it's not clear how effective the new policies are, since no public disclosure system is in place.

Some well-known journalists, columnists and "Crossfire" host Michael Kinsley and U.S. News & World Report's Steven V. Roberts among them, scoff at the criticism. They assert that it's their right as private citizens to offer their services for whatever the market will bear, that new policies won't improve credibility and that the outcry has been blown out of proportion.

But the spectacle of journalists taking big bucks for speeches has emerged as one of the high-profile ethical issues in journalism today.

"Clearly some nerve has been touched," Warren says. "A nerve of pure, utter defensiveness on the part of a journalist trying to rationalize taking [honoraria] for the sake of their bank account because the money is so alluring."

A common route to boarding the lecture gravy train is the political talk show. National television exposure raises a journalist's profile dramatically, enhancing the likelihood of receiving lucrative speaking offers.

The problem is that modulated, objective analysis is not likely to make you a favorite on "The Capital Gang" or "The McLaughlin Group." Instead, reporters who strive for objectivity in their day jobs are often far more opinionated in the TV slugfests.

Time Managing Editor James R. Gaines, who issued his magazine's recent ban on accepting honoraria, sees this as another problem for journalists' credibility, one he plans to address in a future policy shift. "Those journalists say things we wouldn't let them say in the magazine. . . ." says Gaines, whose columnist Margaret Carlson appears frequently on "The Capital Gang." "It's great promotion for the magazine and the magazine's journalists. But I wonder about it when the journalists get into that adversarial atmosphere where provocation is the main currency."

Journalists have been "buckraking" for years, speaking to trade associations, corporations, charities, academic institutions and social groups. But what's changed is the amount they're paid. In the mid-1970s, the fees peaked at \$10,000 to \$15,000, say agents for speakers bureaus. Today, ABC's Sam Donaldson can get \$30,000, ABC's David Brinkley pulls in \$18,000 and the New York Times' William Safire can command up to \$20,000.

When a \$4.2 billion Toyota distributor pays \$35,000 for someone like Cokie Roberts, or a trade association pays a high-profile journalist \$10,000 or \$20,000 for an hour's work, it inevitably raises questions and forces news executives to re-examine their policies.

That's what happened last June at ABC. Richard Wald, senior vice president of news, decided to ban paid speeches to trade associations and for-profit corporations—much to the dismay of some of ABC's best-paid correspondents. As at most news organizations, speaking to colleges and nonprofits is allowed.

When Wald's policy was circulated to 109 employees at ABC, some correspondents howled (see Free Press, September 1994). Protests last August from Roberts, Donaldson, Brinkley, Greenfield, Brit Hume and others succeeded only in delaying implementation of the new guidelines. Wald agreed to "grandfather in" speeches already scheduled through mid-January. After that, if a correspondent speaks to a forbidden group, the money must go to charity.

"Why did we amend it? Fees for speeches are getting to be very large," Wald says. "When we report on matters of national interest, we do not want it to appear that folks

who have received a fee are in any way beholden to anybody other than our viewers. Even though I do not believe anybody was every swayed by a speech fee. I do believe that it gives the wrong impression. We deal in impressions."

The new policy has hurt, says ABC White House correspondent Ann Compton. Almost a year in advance, Compton agreed to speak to the American Cotton Council. But this spring, when she spoke to the trade group, she had to turn an honorarium of "several thousand dollars" over to charity. Since the policy went into effect, Compton has turned down six engagements that she previously would have accepted.

"The restrictions how have become so tight, it's closed off some groups and industries that I don't feel I have a conflict with," says Compton, who's been covering the White House off and on since 1974. "It's closed off, frankly, the category of organizations that pay the kind of fees I get." She declines to say what those fees are.

And it has affect her bank account. "I've got four kids . . ." Compton says. "It's cut off a significant portion of income for me."

Some speakers bureaus say ABC's new policy and criticism of the practice have had an impact.

"It has affect us, definitely," says Lori Fish of Keppler Associates in Arlington, Virginia, which represents about two dozen journalists. "More journalists are conscious of the fact that they have to be very particular about which groups they accept honoraria from. On our roster there's been a decrease of some journalists accepting engagements of that sort. It's mainly because of media criticism."

Other bureaus, such as the National Speakers Forum and the William Morris Agency, say they haven't noticed a difference. "I can't say that the criticism has affected us," says Lynn Choquette, a partner at the speakers forum.

Compton, Donaldson and Greenfield still disagree with Wald's policy but, as they say, he's the boss.

"I believe since all of us signed our contracts with the expectation that the former ABC policy would prevail and took that into account when we agreed to sign our contracts for X amount," Donaldson says, "it was not fair to change the policy mid-stream." Donaldson says he has had to turn down two speech offers.

Greenfield believes the restrictions are unnecessary.

"When I go to speak to a group, the idea that it's like renting a politician to get his ear is not correct," he says. "We are being asked to provide a mix of entertainment and information and keep audiences in their seats at whatever convention so they don't go home and say, 'Jesus, what a boring two-day whatever that was.'"

Most agree it's the size of the honoraria that is fueling debate over the issue. "If you took a decimal point or two away, nobody would care," Greenfield says. "A lot of us are now offered what seems to many people a lot of money. They are entertainment-size sums rather than journalistic sizes."

And Wald has decided "entertainment-size sums" look bad for the network, which has at least a dozen correspondents listed with speakers bureaus. It's not the speeches themselves that trouble Wald. "You can speak to the American Society of Travel Agents or the Electrical Council," he says, "as long as you don't take money from them."

But are ABC officials enforcing the new policy? "My suspicion is they're not, that they are chickenshit and Cokie Roberts will do whatever the hell she wants to do and they don't have the balls to do anything," says the Chicago Tribune's Warren, whose newspaper allows its staff to make paid speeches only to educational institutions.

There's obviously some elasticity in ABC's policy. In April, Greenfield, who covers media and politics, pocketed \$12,000 from the National Association of Broadcasters for speaking to 1,000 members and interviewing media giants Rupert Murdoch and Barry Diller for the group. Wald says that was acceptable.

He also says it was fine for Roberts to speak to the Junior League-sponsored business conference in Fort Lauderdale, even though the for-profit JM Family Enterprises paid her fee.

"As long as the speech was arranged by a reasonable group and it carried with it no tinct from anybody, it's okay," says Wald. "I don't care where they [the Junior League] get their money."

Even with its loopholes, ABC has the strictest restrictions among the networks. NBC, CBS and CNN allow correspondents to speak for dollars on a case-by-case basis and require them to check with a supervisor first. Last fall, Andrew Lack, president of NBC News, said he planned to come up with a new policy. NBC spokesperson Lynn Gardner says Lack has drafted the guidelines and will issue them this summer. "The bottom line is that Andrew Lack is generally not in favor of getting high speaking fees," she says.

New Yorker Executive Editor Hendrik Hertzberg also said last fall that his magazine would review its policy, under which writers are supposed to consult with their editors in "questionable cases." The review is still in progress. Hertzberg says it's likely the magazine will have a new policy by the end of the year.

"There's something aesthetically offensive to my idea of journalism for American journalists to be paid \$5,000, \$10,000 or \$20,000 for some canned remarks simply because of his or her celebrity value," Hertzberg says.

Rewriting a policy merely to make public the outside income of media personalities guarantees resistance, if not outright hostility. Just ask John Harwood of the Wall Street Journal's Washington bureau. This year, Harwood was a candidate for a slot on the committee that issues congressional press passes to daily print journalists.

His platform included a promise to have daily correspondents list outside sources of income—not amounts—on their applications for press credentials. Harwood's goal was fuller disclosure of outside income, including speaking fees.

"I'm not trying to argue in all cases it's wrong," says Harwood. "But we make a big to-do about campaign money and benefits lawmakers get from special interests and I'm struck by how many people in our profession also get money from players in the political process."

Harwood believes it's hypocritical that journalists used to go after members of Congress for taking speech fees when journalists do the same thing. (Members of Congress are no longer permitted to accept honoraria.)

"By disclosing the people who pay us," says Harwood, "we let other people who may have a beef with us draw their own conclusions. I don't see why reporters should be afraid of that."

But apparently they are. Harwood lost the election.

"I'm quite certain that's why John lost," says Alan J. Murray, the Journal's Washington bureau chief, who made many phone calls on his reporter's behalf. "There's clearly a lot of resistance," adds Murray, whose newspaper forbids speaking to for-profit companies, political action committees and anyone who lobbies Congress. "Everybody likes John. But I couldn't believe how many people said—even people who I suspect have very little if any speaking incomes—that it's

just nobody's business. I just don't buy that."

His sentiment is shared in the Periodical Press Gallery on Capitol Hill, where magazine reporters applying for press credentials must list sources of outside income. But in the Radio-Television Correspondents Gallery, where the big-name network reporters go for press credentials, the issue of disclosing outside income has never come up, says Kenan Block, a "MacNeil/Lehrer NewsHour" producer.

"I've never heard anyone mention it here and I've been here going on 11 years," says Block, who is also chairman of the Radio-Television Correspondents Executive Committee. "I basically feel it's not our place to police the credentialed reporters. If you're speaking on the college circuit or to groups not terribly political in nature, I think, if anything, people are impressed and a bit envious. It's like, 'More power to them.'"

But the issue of journalists' honoraria has been mentioned at Block's program.

Al Vecchione, president of McNeil/Lehrer Productions, says he was "embarrassed" by AJR's story last year and immediately wrote a new policy. The story reported that Robert MacNeil accepted honoraria, although he often spoke for free; partner Jim Lehrer said he had taken fees in the past but had stopped after his children got out of college.

"We changed [our policy] because in reading the various stories and examining our navel, we decided it was not proper," Vecchione says. "While others may do it, we don't think it's proper. Whether in reality it's a violation or not, the perception is there and the perception of it is bad enough."

MacNeil/Lehrer's new policy is not as restrictive as ABC's, however. It says correspondents "should avoid accepting money from individuals, companies, trade associations or organizations that lobby the government or otherwise try to influence issues the NewsHour or other special * * * programs may cover."

As is the case with many of the new, stricter policies, each request to speak is reviewed on a case-by-case basis. That's the policy at many newspapers and at U.S. News.

Newsweek tightened its policy last June. Instead of simply checking with an editor, staffers now have to fill out a form if they want to speak or write freelance articles and submit it to Ann McDaniel, the magazine's chief of correspondents.

"The only reason we formalized the process is because we thought this was becoming more popular than it was 10 years ago," McDaniel says. "We want to make sure [our staff members] are not involved in accepting compensation from people they are very close to. Not because we suspect they can be bought or that there will be any improper behavior but because we want to protect our credibility."

Time, on the other hand, looked at all the media criticism and decided to simply end the practice. In an April 14 memo. Managing Editor Gaines told his staff, "The policy is that you may not do it."

Gaines says the new policy was prompted by "a bunch of things that happened all at once." He adds that "a lot of people were doing cruise ships and appearances and have some portion of their income from that, so their ox is gored."

The ban is not overwhelmingly popular with Time staffers. Several, speaking on a not-for-attribution basis, argue that it's too tough and say they hope to change Gaines' mind. He says that won't happen, although he will amend the policy to allow paid speeches before civic groups, universities and groups that are "clearly not commercial."

"Academic seminars are fine," he says. "If some college wants to pay expenses and a

\$150 honorarium, I really don't have a problem with that."

Steve Roberts, a senior writer with U.S. News & World Report and Cokie Roberts' husband, is annoyed that some media organizations are being swayed by negative publicity. He says there's been far too much criticism of what he believes is basically an innocuous practice. Roberts says journalists have a right to earn as much as they can by speaking, as long as they are careful about appearances and live by high ethical standards.

"This whole issue has been terribly overblown by a few cranks," Roberts says. "As long as journalists behave honorably and use good sense and don't take money from people they cover, I think it's totally legitimate. In fact, my own news organization encourages it."

U.S. News not only encourages it, but its public relations staff helps its writers get speaking engagements.

Roberts says U.S. News has not been intimidated by the "cranks," who he believes are in part motivated by jealousy. "I think a few people have appointed themselves the critics and watchdogs of our profession. I, for one, resent it."

His chief nemesis is Jim Warren, who came to Washington a year-and-a-half ago to take charge of the Chicago Tribune's bureau. Warren, once the Tribune's media writer, writes a Sunday column that's often peppered with news flashes about which journalist is speaking where and for how much. The column includes a "Cokie Watch," named for Steve Roberts' wife of 28 years, a woman Warren has written reams about but has never net.

"Jim Warren is a reprehensible individual who has attacked me and my wife and other people to advance his own visibility and his own reputation," Roberts asserts. "He's on a crusade to make his own reputation by tearing down others."

While Warren may work hard to boost his bureau's reputation for Washington coverage, he is best known for his outspoken criticism of fellow journalists. Some reporters cheer him on and fax him tips for "Cokie Watch." Others are highly critical and ask who crowned Warren chief of the Washington ethics police.

Even Warren admits his relentless assault has turned him into a caricature.

"I'm now in the Rolodex as iconoclast, badass Tribune bureau chief who writes about Cokie Roberts all the time," says Warren, who in fact doesn't. "But I do get lots of feedback from rank-and-file journalists saying, 'Way to go. You're dead right.' It obviously touches a nerve among readers."

So Warren writes about Cokie and Steve Roberts getting \$45,000 from a Chicago bank for a speech and the traveling team of television's "The Capital Gang" sharing \$25,000 for a show at Walt Disney World. He throws in parenthetically that Capital Gang member Michael Kinsley "should know better."

Kinsley says he would have agreed a few years ago, but he's changed his tune. He now believes there are no intrinsic ethical problems with taking money for speaking. He does it, he wrote in The New Republic in May, for the money, because it's fun and it boosts his ego.

"Being paid more than you're worth is the American dream," he wrote. "I see a day when we'll all be paid more than we're worth. Meanwhile, though, there's no requirement for journalists, alone among humanity, to deny themselves the occasional fortuitous tastes of this bliss."

To Kinsley, new rules restricting a reporter's right to lecture for largesse don't accomplish much.

"Such rules merely replace the appearance of corruption with the appearance of propriety," he wrote. "What keeps journalists on

the straight and narrow most of the time is not a lot of rules about potential conflicts of interest, but the basic reality of our business that a journalist's product it out there for all to see and evaluate."

The problem, critics say, is that without knowing who besides the employer is paying a journalist, the situation isn't quite that clear-cut.

Jonathan Salant, president of the Washington chapter of the Society of Professional Journalists, cites approvingly a remark by former Washington Post Executive Editor Ben Bradlee in AJR's March issue: "If the Insurance Institute of America, if there is such a thing, pays you \$10,000 to make a speech, don't tell me you haven't been corrupted. You can say you haven't and you can say you will attack insurance issues in the same way, but you won't. You can't."

Salant thinks SPJ should adopt an absolute ban on speaking fees as it revises its ethics code. Most critics want some kind of public disclosure at the very least.

Says the Wall Street Journal's Murray, "You tell me what is the difference between somebody who works full time for the National Association of Realtors and somebody who takes \$40,000 a year in speaking fees from Realtor groups. It's not clear to me there's a big distinction. I'm not saying that because you take \$40,000 a year from Realtors that you ought to be thrown out of the profession. But at the very least, you ought to disclose that."

And so Murray is implementing a disclosure policy. By the end of the year, the 40 journalists working in his bureau will be required to list outside income in a report that will be available to the public.

"People are not just cynical about politicians," says Murray. "They are cynical about us. Anything we can do to ease that cynicism is worth doing."

Sen. Grassley applauds the move. Twice he has taken to the floor of the Senate to urge journalists to disclose what they earn on the lecture circuit.

"It's both the amount and doing it," he says. "I say the pay's too much and we want to make sure the fee is disclosed. The average worker in my state gets about \$21,000 a year. Imagine what he or she thinks when a journalist gets that much for just one speech?"

Public disclosure, says Grassley, would curtail the practice.

Disclosure is often touted as the answer. Many journalists, such as Kinsley and Wall Street Journal columnist Al Hunt—a television pundit and Murray's predecessor as bureau chief—have said they will disclose their engagements and fees only if their colleagues do so as well.

Other high-priced speakers have equally little enthusiasm for making the information public. "I don't like the idea," says ABC's Greenfield. "I don't like telling people how much I get paid."

But one ABC correspondent says he has no problem with public scrutiny. John Stossel, a reporter on "20/20," voluntarily agreed to disclose some of the "absurd" fees he's earned. Last year and through March of this year Stossel raked in \$160,430 for speeches—\$135,280 of which was donated to hospital, scholarship and conservation programs.

"I just think secrecy in general is a bad thing," says Stossel, who did not object to ABC's new policy. "We [in the media] do have some power. We do have some influence. That's why I've come to conclude I should disclose, so people can judge whether I can be bought."

(Stossel didn't always embrace this notion so enthusiastically. Last year he told AJR he had received between \$2,000 and \$10,000 for a luncheon speech, but wouldn't be more precise.)

Brian Lamb, founder and chairman of C-SPAN, has a simpler solution, one that also has been adopted by ABC's Peter Jennings, NBC's Tom Brokaw and CBS' Dan Rather and Connie Chung. They speak, but not for money.

"I never have done it," Lamb says. "It sends out one of those messages that's been sent out of this town for the last 20 years: Everybody does everything for money. When I go out to speak to somebody I want to have the freedom to say exactly what I think. I don't want to have people suspect that I'm here because I'm being paid for it."

On February 20, according to the printed program, Philip Morris executives from around the world would have a chance to listen to Cokie and Steve Roberts at 7 a.m. while enjoying a continental breakfast. "Change in Washington: A Media Perspective with Cokie and Steve Roberts," was the scheduled event at the PGA resort in Palm Beach during Philip Morris' three-day invitational golf tournament.

A reporter who sent the program to AJR thought it odd that Cokie Roberts would speak for Philip Morris in light of the network's new policy. Even more surprising, he thought, was that she would speak to a company that's suing ABC for libel over a "Day One" segment that alleged Philip Morris adds nicotine to cigarettes to keep smokers addicted. The case is scheduled to go to trial in September.

At the last minute, Cokie Roberts was a no-show, says one of the organizers. "Cokie was sick or something," says Nancy Schaub of Event Links, which put on the golf tournament for Philip Morris. "Only Steve Roberts came."

Cokie Roberts won't talk to AJR about why she changed her plans. Perhaps she got Dick Wald's message.

"Of course, it's tempting and it's nice," Wald says of hefty honoraria. "Of course, they [ABC correspondents] have rights as private citizens. It's not an easy road to go down. But there are some things you just shouldn't do and that's one of them."

[From the Columbia Journalism Review, May-June 1995]

WHERE THE SUN DOESN'T SHINE—FINANCIAL DISCLOSURE FOR JOURNALISTS DOESN'T FLY
(By Jamie Stiehm)

Journalists don't like to politick on their own behalf; they'd much rather cover politics as a spectator sport. But every so often a few souls in Washington are asked—if not told—by their bureau chiefs to run for the prestigious Standing Committee of Correspondents in one of the congressional press galleries. In the case of the daily newspaper gallery, this is an inner circle, democratically elected, that makes important logistical decisions affecting coverage of both Congress and the national political conventions. Hence the tendency of the bigger newspapers and wire services to exercise their clout to get their people in there.

So this year, chances are that if he had kept quiet, John Harwood of the Wall Street Journal, the only candidate from one of the "Big Four" national newspapers, would have won. But instead, Harwood chose to ignite a controversial issue that has divided the journalistic community ever since Ken Auletta's September 12 New Yorker article made it the talk of the town: whether journalists should disclose to their peers and the public their "outside income"—that is, income earned from speeches and sources other than their day jobs.

"I think it's time we do a better job of disclosing the sort of potential conflicts we so often expose in the case of public officials," Harwood wrote to 2,000 colleagues in a cam-

paign letter. In an interview, he adds, "Given the impact the media have on public policy discussions, we should be willing to subject ourselves to more scrutiny."

This philosophy did not play too well with the masses. As they paid campaign calls around town, Harwood and the Journal's Washington bureau chief, Alan Murray, could hardly help noticing that the disclosure proposal did not excite enthusiasm. "I was surprised," Murray states flatly, "to find out so many of my colleagues oppose the right thing to do."

Yet only a handful of daily gallery members, the so-called celebrity journalists who make substantial money from speaking engagements, would likely have serious outside income to disclose. (Harwood himself says that he earned only \$300 last year from an outside source, for a speech he gave to the World Affairs Council.) The vast majority of the gallery members are beat reporters who might reasonably resent what some see as an invasion of privacy. "What business of the gallery is it what my income is?" says Stephen Green, of Copley News Service, who also ran and lost. "People who are paying your salary should decide whether you have a conflict or not." Alan Fram of The Associated Press, the big winner, opposed disclosure partly on the ground that reporters are private citizens, not public officials.

Fram and Green see "philosophical perils," as Green put it, in "licensing" reporters by requiring them to reveal certain facts and activities. "That opens up a door we don't want to walk through," says Fram. "What's the next step? Voting registration?"

Of the three press galleries that accredit reporters on Capitol Hill—the daily, periodical, and radio-TV galleries—only the periodical press gallery requires members to list all sources of earned income. This rule has always applied to the periodical gallery, largely because it receives more applications from people who might be moonlighting as trade association lobbyists, government consultants, or corporate newsletter writers.

Harwood argues that he only wants the daily gallery to do what the periodical gallery already does: put the sources, not the amounts, of outside income on record for any other gallery member to look up. He would go one step further, however, and make records available to the general public, not just journalistic peers: "Put the judgment out there."

Would writing these things down prevent anything impure from taking place? Maybe: environmental lawyers, for example, have found that the most effective laws are the "sunshine" statutes that made certain polluting practices less common simply by requiring companies to report them.

Anyway, the results are in. Out of a field of five, Harwood lost narrowly to the three winners: Fram of AP, Sue Kirchhoff of Reuters, and Bill Welch of USA Today, none of whom share his views. Is financial disclosure for journalists an idea whose time has come? If Harwood's loss is a good sounding of the current state of journalistic opinion, the answer is: not yet.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. MACK addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida is recognized.

Mr. MACK. Mr. President, I am prepared to accept the amendment of the distinguished Senator from West Virginia because it is the beginning, not the end, and it is a sense-of-the-Senate resolution that will begin the process for a complete hearing on the matter. As I understand it, it is a sense-of-the-

Senate resolution that in essence calls for a separate Senate resolution to be offered in the future during the 104th Congress that would in essence call for the Rules Committee to begin the process of complete hearings on the issue.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MACK. Mr. President, while I have indicated that I am prepared to accept the amendment, I think it is fair to say that there are questions with respect to the concept as it relates to members of the Senate Press Gallery only, as I understand it.

Mr. BYRD. It pertains only to the credentialing of members of the Senate Press Gallery.

Mr. MACK. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I do believe that several of the points that the Senator from West Virginia made during his comments with respect to the amendment were, in fact, on target, specifically the issue as to the power of the press in choosing what to cover. There is a tendency for us in public life to hear—and I guess from time to time believe—that we have been inaccurately quoted. My own experience is that has not really been a problem. The issue which I think is important—the issue which I think the publishers of newspapers have said themselves—is that the power of the press is really to choose what to cover and what not to cover.

My point for making this is that the individuals who are members of the Press Gallery in the Senate, frankly, and from my perspective, are not the ones that determine what is going to be covered and what is not.

So I think that frankly there will have to be a complete hearing on the issue to make a determination about whether the Senate in fact should move on this concept. But at this point, as I said a moment ago, I am prepared to accept the amendment.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator, the manager of the bill, for his comments and for his support in offering to accept the amendment.

Mrs. MURRAY addressed the Chair.

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

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I have listened carefully to the words of the Senator from West Virginia on his sense-of-the-Senate resolution and am also willing to accept the amendment on the grounds that I see it as the precursor to having a hearing on this so that all sides can be aired. I would want to make sure that we were not precluding anyone's ability to be in the Press Gallery with this kind of amendment. I think those kinds of questions and answers can be gathered. I understand that is what this amendment is trying to attain and with that would not object to it.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I thank the minority manager. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate?

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

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

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LOTT. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HELMS] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DEWINE). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber who desire to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 60, nays 39, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 312 Leg.]

YEAS—60

Akaka	Feingold	Mikulski
Baucus	Ford	Moseley-Braun
Bennett	Glenn	Murkowski
Bond	Grams	Murray
Boxer	Grassley	Nunn
Bradley	Gregg	Pell
Breaux	Harkin	Pressler
Bumpers	Hatfield	Pryor
Burns	Heflin	Reid
Byrd	Hollings	Robb
Campbell	Inouye	Rockefeller
Chafee	Jeffords	Shelby
Coats	Johnston	Simpson
Cohen	Kennedy	Smith
Conrad	Kohl	Snowe
Craig	Lautenberg	Stevens
Daschle	Leahy	Thomas
Dole	Lott	Thurmond
Dorgan	Mack	Warner
Faircloth	McConnell	Wellstone

NAYS—39

Abraham	Feinstein	Levin
Ashcroft	Frist	Lieberman
Biden	Gorton	Lugar
Bingaman	Graham	McCain
Brown	Gramm	Moynihan
Bryan	Hatch	Nickles
Cochran	Hutchison	Packwood
Coverdell	Inhofe	Roth
D'Amato	Kassebaum	Santorum
DeWine	Kempthorne	Sarbanes
Dodd	Kerrey	Simon
Domenici	Kerry	Specter
Exon	Kyl	Thompson

NOT VOTING—1

Helms

So the amendment (No. 1802) was agreed to.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LEAHY. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MCCAIN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I commend the Appropriations Committee for bringing this bill to the floor. Sen-

ator HATFIELD, Senator BYRD, Senator MACK, and Senator MURRAY, in my view, have crafted a bill that reduces the amount we will spend on the legislative branch by over \$200 million and an amount which is \$427 million below the fiscal 1995 budget estimate.

This is an excellent piece of legislation. It is certainly not perfect, but I, again, congratulate the managers of the bill for an outstanding effort to reduce spending on the legislative branch. Obviously, it is where we must begin if we are going to ask other sectors of America to experience spending cuts as well. I thank my colleagues.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I want to share with the Senate my congratulations to the subcommittee, in particular the subcommittee chairman, Senator CONNIE MACK, because we started out this year on our side of the aisle—and I am very pleased this has become bipartisan—with the suggestion that if we are going to fix the fiscal policy of our Nation, we ought to start by fixing our own House, and we ought to save some money for the taxpayers in terms of what we spend on the U.S. Senate.

I happen to cochair our Republican task force with my friend CONNIE MACK. We recommended that we take \$200 million out of the Senate's expenditures out of the legislative budget. I am pleased to report that we were taken almost literally by the chairman. He saved \$200.041 million. So if every subcommittee that was charged with reducing the expenditures of our Government looked to the budget resolution for its assumptions, or to what my friend, CONNIE MACK, looked to—it was a resolution by the Republicans to take \$200 million out—if everybody did their jobs that well, this would be a pretty good year.

Frankly, I want to make one other point. I am not saying that the budget resolution assumption should be adopted by any committee because I understand the Budget Act said the appropriators will make the final decision. It also said on the entitlement, the committees that write the law change the law. If we do not start getting rid of some agencies of our Federal Government, some functions of the Government, some programs of the Government, we are just putting off for another year what is inevitable. It will just get worse, not better. Good programs will have to be reduced, rather than those that are marginal and perhaps not needed.

Why do I state that? Because in this appropriations bill, this subcommittee has succeeded in doing away with one of the many service organizations that help the U.S. Senate do its work. As I understand it, over a 2-year phase, we will eliminate what we recommended in our early resolutions to the subcommittee. We will be getting rid of one of those service organizations, is that not correct?

Mr. MACK. That is correct. I just say to the Senator that there probably will

be an amendment proposed later in the morning, or in the early afternoon, to restore the Office of Technology Assessment.

Again, we did take the direction from both the early resolution by our conference but also the budget resolution that said, if we are going to meet this target, we are going to have to make not only reductions, but we are going to have to eliminate some of the agencies, and we have done that. I thank the Senator for his help on that.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I am not prejudging that vote. I am speaking to the bill as it currently is. I was a member of the appropriations committee that voted to sustain their work with reference to the service organization we say we should get rid of over 2 years. I hope that the U.S. Senate, every time we have an issue like this—and it will come up today—that we not always think how can we save it and make sure it is still around and look at it again.

Sooner or later, you have to make decisions that you do not need everything, everything in the budget, and that the Senate does not need everything that currently serves the Senate. If you do not start doing that, then I do not believe we have a lot of credibility. I do not believe the American people are going to buy it for a minute that we ought to be cutting other programs, and we cannot get rid of one organization that helps us do our job.

Sooner or later, we have to be examples, and it has to be real, not rhetoric. I commend the subcommittee and its chairman. I hope the debate will center around, can we really do with less and still do our jobs? I believe we can. I do not see any shortage of professional talent helping us around here, scientific or otherwise. We have so many groups of science institutions that can help us, I do not know that we need our own \$22 million science service organization. That is what the issue will be.

I yield the floor and thank the chairman for his work and his ranking member for her diligent work.

AMENDMENT NO. 1803

(Purpose: Expressing the sense of the Senate that the 104th Congress should consider comprehensive campaign finance reform legislation)

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. FEINGOLD], for himself, Mr. MCCAIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. WELLSTONE, Mr. BRADLEY, Mr. SIMON, Mr. BIDEN, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. AKAKA, and Mr. GRAHAM, proposes an amendment numbered 1803.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

Mr. MACK. I object, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will continue reading.

The bill clerk read as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following new section:

SEC. . CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM.

(a) FINDINGS.—

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following new section:

SEC. . CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) the current system of campaign finance has led to public perceptions that political contributions and their solicitation have unduly influenced the official conduct of elected officials;

(2) the failure to limit campaign expenditures in any way has caused individuals elected to the United States Senate to spend an increase portion of their time in office raising campaign funds, interfering with the ability of the Senate to carry out its constitutional responsibilities;

(3) the public faith and trust in Congress as an institution has eroded to dangerously low levels and public support for comprehensive congressional reforms is overwhelming; and

(4) reforming our election laws should be a high legislative priority of the 104th Congress.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that as soon as possible before the conclusion of the 104th Congress, the United States Senate should consider comprehensive campaign finance reform legislation that will increase the competitiveness and fairness of elections to the United States Senate.

AMENDMENT NO. 1804 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1803

(Purpose: To express the sense of the Senate in regard to the consideration of certain legislative issues)

Mr. MACK. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Florida [Mr. MACK], for Mr. MCCONNELL, proposes an amendment numbered 1804 to amendment No. 1803.

In lieu of the language proposed to be inserted, insert the following:

It is the sense of the Senate that before the conclusion of the 104th Congress, comprehensive welfare reform, food stamp reform, Medicare reform, Medicaid reform, superfund reform, wetlands reform, reauthorization of the Safe Drinking Water Act, reauthorization of the Endangered Species Act, immigration reform, Davis-Bacon reform, State Department reauthorization, Defense Department reauthorization, Bosnia arms embargo, foreign aid reauthorization, fiscal year 1996 and 1997 Agriculture appropriations, Commerce, Justice, State appropriations, Defense appropriations, District of Columbia appropriations, Energy and Water Development appropriations, Foreign Operations appropriations, Interior appropriations, Labor, Health and Human Services and Education appropriations,—

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

Mr. MACK. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will continue reading.

The bill clerk continued reading as follows:

Legislative Branch appropriations, Military Construction appropriations, Transportation appropriations, Treasury and Postal appropriations, and Veterans Affairs, Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies appropriations, reauthorization of the Older Americans Act, reauthorization of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, health care reform, job training reform, child support enforcement reform, tax reform, and a "Farm Bill" should be considered.

Mr. MACK. Mr. President, 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. MACK. 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. MACK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator FEINGOLD be recognized to speak for up to 20 minutes on the pending amendment, No. 1803, to be followed by 20 minutes for debate prior to a motion to table under the control of Senator MCCAIN, and that following the conclusion or yielding back of time, Senator DOLE or his designee be recognized to make a motion to table the Feingold amendment, and that no further amendments be in order prior to the motion to table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MACK. Mr. President, I further ask that once the motion to table is made, the amendment be laid aside until 2:30 in order to consider other amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FEINGOLD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. FEINGOLD. I thank the Chair. I thank the Senator from Florida for his cooperation. I am working on an agreement on this amendment.

I have offered this amendment today concerning the need for campaign finance reform because I firmly believe that there is a broad majority of Senators on both sides of the aisle who believe our campaign finance laws are in need of significant repair.

My resolution asks the Members of the U.S. Senate whether they believe we have a seriously flawed system of campaign financing and whether they believe we should consider changing it during the 104th Congress.

It is a simple proposition, but I think it is a very important one. I could not be more delighted that this resolution has bipartisan support in its cosponsorship. It includes the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCCAIN], the Senator from California [Mrs. FEINSTEIN], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. JEFFORDS], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. WELLSTONE], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SIMON], the Senator from Vermont

[Mr. LEAHY], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BRADLEY], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BIDEN], the Senator from Florida [Mr. GRAHAM], and the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. AKAKA].

Mr. President, this resolution does not propose any specific reforms. It does not mention spending limits or public financing or PAC contributions or any of the other proposals that have been connected in the past with campaign finance. It merely says that sometime during the next year and a half this Chamber should consider legislation that will restore a greater degree of fairness and competitiveness to the elections that are involved to elect people to the Senate.

Why is this necessary? It seemed that significant campaign finance reform was going to be achieved in the 103d Congress. Unfortunately, the effort fell apart as House and Senate negotiators were unable to bridge their differences. I am the first to say there was blame on the part of both parties for this falling apart, but I am offering this resolution today because there has not been any sort of indication that the Senate will be considering this issue either this year or next year. It is not even mentioned in the Republican contract. It is not on the majority leader's list of items we need to do before the August recess. I am afraid that it might not even be on the list of the things we need to do before the turn of the century if we do not pass some kind of resolution.

It is clear that the campaign spending in our political system is spiraling out of control. The FEC recently released some startling numbers with respect to the level of spending in the 1994 elections. According to the FEC, the 1994 elections were the most expensive in history, sporting a price tag of \$724 million. That is a 62-percent increase—Mr. President, a 62-percent increase—from aggregate spending just 4 years earlier in 1990.

The effect of this escalation in spending to me is a sort of politics of exclusion as it becomes increasingly difficult for average working Americans to run for public office. It is very distressing that candidates are first and foremost judged on their fundraising ability and their personal wealth rather than their merits as candidates. I think most of us would agree that the democratic political system should encourage individuals to run for elective office but that is not what our current system does.

If anything, the current system sends a message that political campaigns are expressly reserved for the very few who have the ability to do what the current system requires of them to run an effective campaign, and we all know it. The message we get is that if you cannot raise and spend millions of dollars, you are not really an effective or viable candidate.

If you are a powerful member of the Senate Appropriations Committee, as was my opponent in 1992, and you have

the ability to raise nearly \$6 million for a campaign, then the current system, of course, accommodates you. If you are independently wealthy and if you decide you would like to use your wealth to run for elective office, as the current trend seems to me, then the current system also accommodates you.

If you are a schoolteacher and serve part time in the city council and decide you would like to run for the U.S. Senate, then the current system tells you that based on your income level, employment status, and other such factors, you are automatically a long-shot candidate. Your positions on the issues are at best secondary. Your experience as a teacher and your record on the city council is secondary. Why? Because you lack substantial campaign funds, or a war chest as it is called now, that will inhibit you from getting your message across to a statewide electorate. This makes you a long shot, and the thought of not running at all has to cross your mind.

This has to change. Unfortunately, despite the nearly universal agreement that something needs to be done to curtail campaign spending and improve the election process, time and time again Congress fails to pass the needed legislation. So I offer this resolution today because there needs to be, first of all, a clear statement that campaign finance reform should be on the agenda for this Congress. It is not even mentioned, as I said before, in the Republican contract, and we need to figure out a way to get it onto the agenda.

The only effort that has been made in the whole Congress this session on campaign finance reform was to take away the campaign finance system we have that has helped make Presidential elections more fair. Thankfully, we defeated that effort, and we did it on a bipartisan vote. It is now time to refocus our efforts on fixing the congressional system and to find answers to a disturbing question. That is, how, Mr. President, can we expect ordinary Americans to run for elected office when the price tag is literally, literally millions of dollars and the costs escalated at a rate of over 60 percent in the past 4 years?

I know recently there was a handshake between the Speaker of the other body and the President about a commission. I noticed there was no Member of this body who was a party to that agreement, so it did not terribly impress me in part for that reason. But the Speaker recently just backed off of that anyway, so let us not assume that any sort of commission will even be created let alone believe that it will make a difference.

There is no reason at all for this body not to move forward on this. We cannot pretend that this is not a pressing problem, and we cannot pretend that we do not know how to deal with it. Congress has to demonstrate to the American people that it can act responsibly and decisively and that it

can approach this problem in a bipartisan manner.

On another front, Mr. President, the set of figures recently released by the FEC gives us some telling data, surprising data. For example, contributions by political action committees to all congressional candidates back in 1990 totaled \$149 million. Now, this went up slightly in 1992 to \$178 million but stayed in 1994 at \$178 million. So, Mr. President, PAC contributions, even though many people would like to see them eliminated, have been fairly level over the past three election cycles.

On the other hand, and this is what really shocked me, contributions and loans from candidates themselves—in other words, those who contribute to their own campaigns—increased at a rate of 37 percent from the 1992 level. So personal contributions to your own campaign is now sort of the new growth industry in the area of campaign financing.

That means the greatest increase in campaign financing comes from candidates that finance themselves. That translates into an electoral system tailored only for those who either have access to a large base of campaign contributors or another group, those who have the personal wealth and means to afford an expensive political campaign. Either way, again, the schoolteacher that serves on the city council is becoming increasingly less likely to have any chance at all of seeking this office and attaining it.

Mr. President, not too long ago, I heard one of the candidates for President, the Senator from Texas, say something that I found kind of fascinating. Announcing his bid for the Republican nomination to the White House in 1996, the Senator from Texas stated that he had the most reliable friend you can have in American politics, and that is ready money.

There was a time when the most reliable friend you could have in politics was a strong record on the issues, substantial grassroots support, or maybe even the endorsement of a large newspaper in your State. But a candidate for the Presidency has indicated that he may be the best candidate in 1996 not because of his stance on the issues, not because of his popularity with the voters in his party, but because he has the most money, or at least did at that time, of the eligible candidates.

Those remarks are simply an accurate portrayal of what our election system has become. It is not so much about your stance on the issues or the speeches you give on the campaign trail or even the countless volunteers that the Senator from Minnesota and I remember so well from our campaigns who usually sit in unairconditioned offices all day stuffing envelopes for you.

Sadly enough, our election system has become all about money—who has it, who can raise the most, and who can spend the most. It is no longer one person, one vote. It is more \$1, one vote, or \$1 million, 1 million votes.

I was a supporter last year of S. 3, the campaign finance reform bill, and that bill was filibustered. I did not believe that it was a perfect bill, but on balance I believe it represented a substantial improvement over the current system and it clearly would have installed a level of fairness back into our campaign system.

On the first day of the 104th Congress, I introduced S. 46, another attempt to try to reform our campaign system. I do not hold out any false hopes that my bill will become law in the near future. That is why I am certainly willing to compromise on this issue and to work with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to write a bill that will somehow get us off the road we are on of further protecting incumbents and encouraging multimillion dollar campaigns.

I do, however, in working with the Senator from Arizona, who has been a tremendous partner in this issue, believe that certain principles have to be included. A good bill has to provide incentives to keep campaign spending down to a reasonable level, and it has to provide some sort of assistance to legitimate but underfunded challengers, so that our elections will indeed be competitive and fair. I also want to see candidates raise more of their funds in their own home States rather than constantly crisscrossing the country looking for funding from the west to the east coast.

Mr. President, for the past several months, the Senate has been diverting almost all of its attention to the Republican Contract With America. This was the campaign that said, "Put us in power and we will change the way Washington does business." But it is disappointing again that this subject has not really come up. How can you change "business as usual" without suggesting that we need to change the outrageous degree of fundraising, the disproportionate influence of out-of-State special interests, and the lack of competitive challengers to well-placed incumbents?

Though it was not part of the contract, I know there are Members on the other side of the aisle who truly are committed to comprehensive campaign finance reform. And I continue to believe that we can have a bipartisan reform bill. In fact, Mr. President, just look at very recent history. We have had statements by the Senator from Kentucky indicating:

The 102nd Congress is faced with many challenges, not the least of which is ensuring the credibility of this institution and the electoral process of our Nation. To that end I [Senator McConnell], along with the Senate Republican leader, Senator Dole . . . am introducing the Comprehensive Campaign Finance Reform Act. This bill is the most sweeping legislation ever put forth on this issue. [This reform act] would restore integrity and competitiveness to our electoral process while preserving constitutional rights and our 200-year-old democratic freedoms.

That is from January 1991, by the Senator from Kentucky.

More recently, in January 1993, the now majority leader stated:

Just as Congress needs reforming, so, too, does the way in which you are elected to Congress. And today, as we have done before, Senate Republicans will be introducing legislation to reform our campaign finance system. . . .

Again, this is an area in which I think we are going to need bipartisan effort if we are to have a meaningful campaign finance reform bill. . . .

So I hope that we can maybe impose some deadline—30, 60 days—for Democrats and Republicans to work out a bipartisan package.

The majority leader then went on to say:

If ever there was an issue that cried out for bipartisan cooperation, it is campaign finance. Senator Boren of Oklahoma and Senator McConnell of Kentucky are this Chamber's acknowledged campaign finance reform experts. Perhaps if Senator Mitchell and I gave them 30 days to get together and hammer out a comprehensive reform proposal, they would succeed.

And, finally, Mr. President, simply a copy of the front page of S. 7, which is the legislation by the majority leader and many other Members on the other side of the aisle calling for Federal campaign finance reform.

So it is clear that the other side is on record in favor of doing this.

Let me simply reserve the remainder of my time at this point and say that this is the amendment which we worked, on a bipartisan basis, to put together that can at least start us on the real road to campaign finance reform, not just a resolution, not just a commission, but a true bipartisan effort that I hope will bear fruit.

Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CAMPBELL). The Senator has 6 minutes 8 seconds.

Mr. FEINGOLD. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator—may I withhold?

Mr. MCCAIN. Will the gentlemen yield 3 minutes to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona has 20 minutes under the unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. MCCAIN. OK.

Mr. FEINGOLD. I yield the floor.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I yield myself whatever time I may consume.

While my friend from Florida is here, I want to talk about two aspects of this situation. One is what just transpired that brought us to this time agreement. As my colleague from Florida knows, I served 12 years in both the House and the Senate in the minority status. And one of the things that frustrated me enormously as a member of the minority was that I was unable to get issues that were important to me and my constituents before this body.

I will say that the previous majority leader on the other side of the aisle, on numerous occasions I went to Senator Mitchell and said, "Senator Mitchell, I want a vote on this issue. I'll be glad to agree to a time agreement. I will be glad to have whatever parameters you decide so as not to interfere with the functioning of this body." I will tell

you, Mr. President, Senator Mitchell always granted me that vote.

For us to start in with parliamentary maneuvering not allowing people who have a reasonable amendment with an agreement for a reasonable time frame, I think is a betrayal, frankly, of what we were seeking over the last 12 years in my experience in the minority. The Senator from Wisconsin spent all day yesterday on the floor waiting to be recognized. The Senator from Wisconsin was willing to have a reasonable time agreement so he could get a simple sense-of-the-Senate resolution before this body with an up-or-down vote on it or a tabling motion.

Now, it seems to me—it seems to me—that if we are going to conduct business around here with comity, if someone has a reasonable request—a reasonable request—we should grant that request. Now, this was a sense-of-the-Senate resolution about a strongly held view by the Senator from Wisconsin. And I hope in the future we can avoid this kind of thing and sit down and say, OK, what will the arrangements be? If not today, next week or next month or even next year. But filling up the tree with parliamentary maneuvering, I think, is beneath us.

I want to make one additional point, Mr. President, if I may. Campaign finance reform is something that the American people want. In 1994 the American people said, "We do not like the way you do business in Washington. We do not like the way you do business." And they also said, "We do not like the way you get there." I know, that message was clear. And I am confident, because I believe in representative government, Mr. President, that sooner or later we will address this issue, because it is the will of the people. They do not like what is going on. Now we may make it worse, I do not know. I think we can make it better. But no average citizen in America believes that the system under which we elect Presidents of the United States and the system under which we elect representatives to Congress is a fair and equitable system, because of the role that money plays in these campaigns.

If I could just, as an aside, say to my friend from Wisconsin—just an aside—if he is going to quote Republicans now, it would be fair if he quoted the latest deal that people can have that the Democratic National Committee gave if you want to have breakfast with the President or meetings with the President, all those good deals. Let us put some balance in this now. Let us not make it a partisan issue. There are egregious activities on both sides on this issue.

But getting back to the fundamental point, I do not believe, Mr. President, that 1 or 2 or 5 or 10 Senators will be able to block the will of the American people.

Now, what the Senator from Wisconsin and I are seeking to do is set forth

a framework, which we will be introducing this week, for campaign finance reform that has the fundamental elements that we believe are the will of the American people. We want to engage in a debate. We want—it is not a perfect document—we want to engage in the kind of consensus building that will lead us to a fundamental reform of the system that most Americans think is broken. And I think we have that obligation. I would like to work with all of my colleagues and any of them on this issue. But I greatly fear that unless we do this, unless we embark on this very difficult effort, the American people will lose further confidence in us and their system of government and the way we select our leaders, whether it be a Presidential campaign or any other.

So, I think it is an important issue, and I think the Senator from Wisconsin had the right to see at least what the will of the Senate is here. Maybe his motion will be tabled. I do not know. But the fact is that we need to get about addressing this issue, and we proved in the last few years that we cannot do it on a partisan basis. It has to be on a nonpartisan basis.

Mr. President, I thank my colleagues and I want to thank whoever worked out the agreement for this time agreement and the tabling motion to give the Senator from Wisconsin an opportunity to get a vote on this issue as to what the will of the Senate is.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Will the Senator from Arizona yield for a question?

Mr. MCCAIN. Yes; I will be glad to yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Let me, first of all, ask the question and say that I fully agree with the Senator from Arizona that it certainly would not be accurate to assign to only one party the blame on this issue. In fact, in my comments I indicated that this thing went down last session not just because of a Republican filibuster but also, I think, because of substantial Democratic opposition in the other body. That has to be said. There have been many different analyses of what happened on November 8, but I ask the Senator from Arizona if he does not think in part the problem of the Democrats had to do with the failure to reform this system when they were in control?

Mr. MCCAIN. I agree with my colleague on that. But I also think there is no doubt that on both sides of the aisle there was such a strong preference for the status quo that clearly the issue was not given the priority that it deserved, which I think was the primary reason for its failure. I will say, it was a bipartisan failure as well.

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

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I will take a moment of my time. I want to comment, in light of the comments of the Senator from Arizona. I have only been here 2½ years, but I have never seen a greater demonstration of bipartisanship and courage as I have seen on

the part of the Senator from Arizona in his willingness to try to make sure a Member of the minority party and himself have an opportunity to raise an issue of this kind.

That is exactly the kind of conduct that the American people have been crying out for, and it has been a tremendous experience for me to know that in this body, that people assume is so partisan, that these kinds of experiences do and can occur.

So I want to thank him at this point, and I look forward to working with him on this issue.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield the floor?

Mr. FEINGOLD. I do yield and reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, how much time do I have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 5 minutes 20 seconds.

Mr. FEINGOLD. I yield 4 minutes to the Senator from Minnesota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota has 4 minutes.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I am very pleased to be an original cosponsor of this amendment with the Senator from Wisconsin and the Senator from Arizona. As I understand the amendment, it really says nothing more than we should, during this Congress, take up this issue of campaign finance reform. It is an extremely reasonable amendment, one I think that should engender the support of Democrats and Republicans.

A very good friend of mine who is going to be leaving the Senate, PAUL SIMON, wrote a book not too long ago, and I had a chance to read a rough draft. The first chapter was on campaign finance reform. I said to the Senator, "That should have been the first chapter, because this is really the root issue."

I think it is the root issue and really the root problem for several reasons. I only have 4 minutes today, but we will be coming back to this over and over again, because I think we are going to insist on this reform during this Congress.

First of all, it is a root issue, Mr. President, because I think, in a way, this mix of money and politics, which really becomes the imperative of American politics, if you will, this money chase, it undercuts democracy and it undercuts democracy for two reasons.

First of all, it undercuts the very idea that each person in Colorado, Minnesota, Washington, or Florida should count as one and no more than one, because that is not really what is going on any longer to the extent that big money has such a dominant influence in politics.

Second of all, it undercuts democracy because it represents corruption, but not the corruption of individual officeholders, but rather a more systemic

type of corruption where too few people have too much wealth and power. That is what is skeptical, cynical about public affairs, and all of us, Republicans and Democrats alike, have the strongest possible self-interest in having your citizens really believing in politics and public affairs. But when people see this influence of money, they become very cynical.

Mr. President, it also has a lot to do, unfortunately, with representation or lack of representation. I remember during the telecommunications bill—and I am not trying to pick on any group of people—but the reception room was packed with people. Some people just march on Washington every day, they are lobbyists or others, they represent a lot of big money, they make big campaign contributions.

I have to say, when we talk about low-income energy assistance, which I think we will be talking about, cuts in low-income energy assistance or nutrition programs for children, whatever, you never see that mix of money and politics. Those citizens are just as much citizens as any group of citizens having the same representation. I think something is terribly wrong.

So, Mr. President, I have introduced bills in the past, I have introduced a bill this Congress, offered amendments, and have given enough speeches about the need for campaign finance reform. I say to the Senator from Wisconsin, I am proud to be part of this effort. I think we ought to pass this bill, and we ought to pass it this Congress. I think it is the strongest and most important thing we can do.

I also have to tell you, Mr. President, that from my own point of view—Mr. President, how much more time do I have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 20 seconds.

Mr. FEINGOLD. May I intervene here to say to the Senator from Minnesota, if he will yield for a moment, the Senator from Arizona has some additional time which he has indicated he will be willing to yield to the Senator from Minnesota, if the Senator wants more time.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin. I think probably 5 minutes more will be fine.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that 5 minutes of the time of the Senator from Arizona be given to the Senator from Minnesota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from Minnesota has 5 minutes of the time of the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin.

I say to my colleague from Wisconsin, I view all of these reform efforts—the gift ban and lobbying disclosure, which we take up on Monday, and the campaign finance reform—to be just critical measures, because I think people have to believe in this process or they are not going to believe in the products of this process.

I think people feel that politics has become a game they cannot play. I think people feel like this is a political process that does not represent them well. I think people feel like only a few people are well represented in politics.

We have to make our political process more accountable, more honest, more open, with more integrity, and I cannot think of a better way to do it than to take strong action and pass a comprehensive gift ban and lobbying disclosure bill next week—I know we are going to have spirited, long, hard, tough debate about that—and, in addition, pass this campaign finance reform bill sometime this Congress. Again, the only thing this amendment says is we should take this up.

Mr. President, I will make one final point. I am now up for reelection. I was so hoping we could pass a campaign finance reform bill. I absolutely hate the system and the way in which we have to raise money. I think almost every single Senator does.

I said in Minnesota, and for several years, I will only raise \$100; if nothing changed, I will have to raise money to run against other people. With all the ads on TV, communications becomes the weapon of electoral conflict and all of us end up having to do that.

But, quite frankly, all of us ought to get together in a bipartisan way once and for all to pass a reform bill that really would, I think, make this political system operate in a much more effective way, not just for Democrats and not just for Republicans, but for all the people in this country. I think that is critically important.

We have gone through this debate before and, quite often, any time there is any kind of campaign finance reform bill, people say, even if there is a minimum amount of public money—maybe we can do without any—even if there is a minimum amount, people say this is food stamps for politicians.

It is not. The elections do not belong to the politicians, they belong to the people back in our States. I think the Senator from Arizona is absolutely on the mark when he says that one of the strong messages that has come from people—it came in the 1990 election in Minnesota; it came in the 1992 election the Senator from Wisconsin was involved in; and the 1994 election—is people want to see change, people want to see reform.

So, Mr. President, I hope that all of my colleagues will vote for this amendment. This amendment just says we make a commitment to bring this question up. We make a commitment, Democrats and Republicans together, to introduce a bill and to pass this legislation. I think this amendment ought to receive 100 votes because, quite frankly, I think that is the sacred trust we have of people in our country. They want us to make this change. They want more democracy, not less. They want more opportunities for people to run for office. They want more openness in the political process. They

yearn for a political process they can believe in. What better thing could we do than to take up campaign finance reform, along with gift ban and lobbying disclosure, and pass a reform bill of which all of us can be proud.

Mr. FEINGOLD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. FEINGOLD. I ask unanimous consent that I may be yielded such time as I may require, on the time of the Senator from Arizona.

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

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Minnesota. He and I have worked together on many issues. We sat down, as he indicated, in the beginning of this Congress and listed a couple of our top priorities of what we would like to see happen here. At the very top of the list was our shared belief that if there is anything that needs to be changed in this country, it is the way we finance campaigns. Three Members of this body, including the Senator from Minnesota, myself, and the Senator from Washington, Senator MURRAY, did get elected even though we were not Members of Congress and were not personally wealthy. But we all know we are the exceptions to the rule.

Mr. WELLSTONE. How does the Senator know that I am not personally wealthy?

Mr. FEINGOLD. I saw the recent reports on the Members of the Senate. You were not high on the list. I regret to say that neither was I.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I stand corrected.

Mr. FEINGOLD. We all had campaigns that people watched. Do you know why? Because we were not supposed to win, because of big money. Even though we happen to be sitting here and it is a wonderful thing to have this opportunity, there are thousands and thousands of Americans as well qualified as any one of us who decided not to get into the fray because of the money, because of the absolutely daunting nature of the amount of money that is required to run for the U.S. Senate.

Mrs. MURRAY. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. FEINGOLD. Yes.

Mrs. MURRAY. I compliment the Senator on his amendment that comes before us today and for his perseverance on this critically important topic of campaign finance reform.

Let me just say that I agree with you. We need more people running for office in this country. We need the best and the brightest. It is indeed a sad note that people decide not to run, not to be here, simply because the daunting task of raising millions of dollars overwhelms them. That is not, to me, what this country is about or what democracy is about.

Until we reform the campaign finance laws and level the playing field, we are not going to get back to a point that allows everyone to be here and to

speak out on the important issues of the day. I commend the Senator for the amendment, and I urge its adoption.

Mr. FEINGOLD. I thank the Senator. As I look at Senator MURRAY and the Senator from Minnesota, I know we were all serious candidates. But we know that among the things that got attention were things like Senator MURRAY's tennis shoes and I had a blue van with an Elvis Presley "endorsement." The Senator from Minnesota had a green bus. I think those were fine and they had to do with a serious process that was connected with it. I do not think it should be necessary for somebody to just happen to hit the right moment and right sense of the people in their State. We ought to be able to get our message out with fairness and equality.

As I look at the Senators, I want to compliment the Senator from Washington in helping us get this agreement. She is trying to get this appropriations bill approved. She is managing it for the Democratic side. We did want to get this on other bills, as we indicated. We thought there were perhaps slightly more appropriate vehicles, such as the telecommunications bill. This is where you get the daunting nature of the task and the discouragement of candidates. If you look at the contributions in the report of Common Cause on the telecommunications bill, among the levels of contributions to Members of this body from groups involved with that bill, one Senator received \$273,000. Many others received in the one hundred ninety thousands and in the one hundred seventy thousands. There are over 20 people who got over \$100,000 in campaign contributions in connection with that issue.

We thought that would be a good bill to do it on, but people urged us to let that bill alone. Now the regulatory reform bill—that is the one on which I spent a lot of time here trying to attach it to. I heard one Senator in this body say that in the 23 years he has been here, he has never seen the business community more unified on an issue. That is sort of good news and bad news. Of course, we all want to be probusiness when we can, but when you have complete unanimity in the business community, I think sometimes you have to take a look at the other side, and what people who might be affected by it would do. The report of Public Citizen, again, shows enormous levels of contributions. Senators receiving over \$300,000 in contributions from the interests in that issue, and many others in the \$200,000 or \$100,000 category. That is just an interest relating to that one particular bill. So we decided to use this bill as a vehicle to make this simple statement. I believe, Mr. President, that this is the beginning.

People often say, what is the point of a sense-of-the-Senate resolution? Well, what we are trying to do, as the Senator from Arizona knows, is to try to take the first step. You have to take

the first step, which is to get everybody on record either for or against the concept of campaign finance reform. It is regrettable that we are a quarter of the way through the 104th Congress and we have not even taken that first step.

But I hope today, when the tabling motion is made, that the Members consider what the view of the people of this country is. I am confident that whether you are Republican or Democrat, the American people are generally disgusted with the way these campaigns are financed. Perhaps the California Senate race was the most extreme example. When you tell someone that a person spent \$28 million of his own money trying to get elected to the U.S. Senate, they really wonder whether they have anything to do with the process at all anymore. How can they possibly even dream of running for the U.S. Senate if that is the kind of ante that is required?

So, Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

The Chair informs the Senator from Wisconsin that he has 2 minutes 55 seconds remaining.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. MACK. 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. DOLE. 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. DOLE. Mr. President, I have listened to the debate on this issue. The debate has not changed. I came to the conclusion years ago that we are never going to get campaign finance reform if we leave it up to the two parties, because there is always the case that the party in the majority will obviously try to fix it to suit them and make it a little better for the majority than members of the minority.

That has been true in the past, and I assume it will be true today. In fact, I suggested a number of times that we have a commission of outsiders with no ax to grind to take a look at campaign finance reform. I guess that is pretty much what Speaker GINGRICH and President Clinton suggested to each other up in New Hampshire.

In any event, it seems to me that with all the things we have yet to do in this Congress, and certainly campaign finance reform is important, we have regulatory reform right now. It means a lot more to most families than campaign finance reform. It costs each family about \$6,000 per year, and we are about 2 votes short of getting 60 votes to move on regulatory reform. It is much more important than campaign finance reform. We are taking money out of someone's pocket. They may not

care a thing about politics and never contributed a nickel to anyone. We cannot do that, because we cannot get the votes on the other side.

We have welfare reform to take up. It will take a long time. I just suggest that this may be a matter of great priority with a few Members of the Senate. It does affect all Members. We can all reach down and find some horror stories.

In fact, we could go to the White House if we had \$100,000—I think that is the going rate to do business with the President—\$100,000. They have different packages for different people of different economic circumstances. That does raise eyebrows, when people say, “I have to see the President. It is \$100,000”—I guess that is per couple. That is only \$50,000 apiece.

Maybe that is what the people have in mind here. I assume this would apply to the executive branch as well as the Congress. There are excesses. There are people who get elected without a lot of money. I am finding out right now in the Presidential race, the worst part of the job is trying to raise the money. I do not ask people for money. I will not call people. I will not make telephone calls. I do not like to do that. I do not mind somebody else asking, but I do not like to ask.

In any event, this may have some merit, but with all the other things we have on our plate, and with part of the August recess already slipping away, I know this says “by the end of the 104th Congress,” and it seems to me that it will be even more difficult next year because then we are in an election year, when everybody wants to be involved in politics, politics becomes the focus of a lot of people.

Mr. President I move to table the underlying amendment, No. 1803, and 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. Under the previous order, amendment No. 1803 is set aside until 2:30 p.m. today.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I will just conclude, we are making some progress. I think the American people are probably happy that now the laws we impose on them also apply to Congress. We have done that this year. That was a big step in the right direction. It probably means we will not pass so many crazy laws because they now also apply to Congress.

On Monday, we will take up gift ban reform and lobbying reform. We will overhaul that. We are also considering a constitutional amendment later on this year to limit terms of Members of the House and the Senate.

It is not that we are not aware that some of these things, I think, cry out for action. We are addressing more, in this first year, than we have addressed in the years past. We will continue to try to make improvements, so that the American people understand that. But

I think also we need to keep our eye on the ball. A lot of these other issues do not mean a great deal to the American people, too.

AMENDMENT NO. 1805

(Purpose: To stop the practice of hiring elevator operators for automatic elevators)

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I rise to offer an amendment and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. BROWN], proposes an amendment numbered 1805.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 3, line 26, add at the end the following, “The account for the Office of Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper is reduced by \$10,000, provided that there shall be no new elevator operators hired to operate automatic elevators.”

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, this budget that is brought to the floor, I think, deserves commendation of all of the Members. This is an extraordinary departure from past policies. It involves literally a 16-percent cut that the President had requested for funding for Congress, and virtually a 9-percent real cut, actually a little over that, 9.13-percent real cut, over what we spent in the past year.

I am not aware of any Congress that has taken such dramatic action in the history of our country, to reduce its expenditures. Certainly in terms of dollars that have been cut from the budget, this has to be the all-time record winner. I think the distinguished chairman and the ranking member deserve a great deal of credit for bringing this kind of proposal to the floor.

It reflects a sincere and real interest in coping with some of our problems with regard to the budget. It does it in a very important way. It does it by setting an example.

It not only talks about reducing spending, but it proposes a budget for the Senate itself that reduces spending. That, I think, is the critical key element, if we are to have credibility in trying to deal with our budget problems. It is no secret to anyone here that this country has the biggest deficit of any nation in the world. It is no secret here that this country has the biggest trade deficit of any nation in the world. It is no secret here that we have one of the lowest savings rates of any major industrialized country in the world.

The American people believe it is long past time we ought to face up to these problems. So this budget that is for the Senate itself sends an important message. It sends an important message, not because we are the biggest part of Federal spending, it sends a very important message because we set an example. You cannot say one thing and do another, and that is what has been the problem with so many past Congresses. They talked about deficit reduction, but each year they increased spending and they increased spending on themselves.

So I look at this budget with great admiration for the fine people who spent long hours to try to find real savings, and they have done it.

There is one item that I think deserves attention and it is included in the amendment that I brought forward. It does not call for the dismissal of any elevator operators, but it does suggest that we should not hire new ones. As elevator operators on the automatic elevators retire, this measure contemplates that we would not replace them. I think it is important. Some will say, "Oh, come on," but I believe it is very important because we have to set an example. If our efforts to deal with the deficit are to have any credibility at all, we have to be willing in our own House to set the example.

How do the American people respond when they hear we hire elevator operators to operate automatic elevators? I will tell you, real people think it is nuts. Real people, who work for a living every day, real people who have to pay the tax bills every day, think it is ludicrous for us to have people push the buttons for us.

Over the years I have heard almost every kind of excuse for hiring patronage employees to operate the elevators. I must tell you, it is my perception the major reason this phenomenon occurs is, first, because people did it in the past, and, second, because many of these positions are patronage.

Over the years, I have heard people talk about how critical it was to get here on time for votes and that having the elevator operators was a key element in that. I have no doubt that the people who say that are sincere. I must tell you, I think it is bunk. If people want to get here for votes on time, they come. We do not have elevator operators in the office buildings. We do have elevator operators on the elevators reserved for Senators, and that may be a different question for a different day. But those seem to operate just fine.

I have every confidence that every Member of the Senate is capable of pushing the buttons to move the elevator from the bottom floor to the second floor in order to arrive here in time for votes. I have every confidence they are able to push the button from the second floor, to push the B button to get down to the basement. To suggest Members of this body cannot move through the elevators without elevator operators on automatic elevators is absurd.

But more important, there is a very important point that Members should consider with this. If we are not willing to eliminate elevator operators on automatic elevators, what kind of confidence can this country have if we are going to deal with \$200 billion to \$300 billion deficits? What kind of belief can they have that we are going to stick with a budget plan that lasts 7 years? If we are not willing to make even a modicum of effort to control spending in our own house, on an item as frivolous

as this, how can they believe that we intend to reduce the deficit by hundreds of billions of dollars? The answer is they will not. And the answer is, it is important Americans believe that we have a new Government and new commitment and a new willingness to deal with problems.

Is this a small item? Of course it is. But the symbolism is terribly important.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida. [Mr. MACK].

Mr. MACK. Mr. President, the Senator from Colorado has gained a tremendous reputation over the years for his efforts to reduce Federal spending, and I compliment him on that. I was interested in his comments about having "every confidence that Members can push the buttons on the automatic elevators." That was an unquestioned level of confidence. It has been a long time since I have heard that level of confidence in our colleagues. But I accept that comment.

I would say to the Senator, I am prepared to accept the amendment but it does, in fact, go counter to the approach that the committee has taken with respect to reducing the expenditures of the Federal Government, particularly the Congress, the legislative branch. We had a very significant request, if you will, or directive given to us, to reduce the legislative branch budget by over \$200 million, which, in fact, we have accomplished with about \$41,000 to spare. We accomplished that, however, not by having the committee try to find every item throughout the legislative branch that any of us, or either of us, thought was important to cut. I will say to my friend and colleague that I think it is more important that we give a direction, or a directive, to the individuals responsible for the various functions of the legislative branch, indicating to them what we think they should do as far as a total is concerned, and ask them to, in essence, make the best judgment about how to reach that goal. I believe with our having taken that approach, we have been successful in our effort.

The Sergeant at Arms was given a directive of a reduction of 12.5 percent. The Sergeant at Arms came back with a little bit over 14 percent, and should be complimented for that achievement.

But as I indicated a moment ago, even though I have a different approach in bringing about significant reductions to the legislative branch, I am prepared to accept the amendment.

Mr. BROWN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I would be remiss if I did not note that our new Sergeant at Arms has done a very admirable job. He has already cut the number of elevator operators from 20 to 10, and saved over \$118,000 in this fiscal year. So I would not want a moment to pass without recognizing what I think is a very dramatic change in

policy by the new Sergeant at Arms. I think this amendment will help affirm that very significant effort.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate? The Senator from Washington is recognized.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I, too, will not object to accepting this amendment. Let me just add, I concur with the manager of the amendment, Senator MACK, who I think has done an outstanding job working with the different departments. The Sergeant at Arms did come back with a 14.5-percent cut. They are definitely going to be looking at how they can do that in the coming months when we will see the effect of that. It is, I think, difficult for us to micromanage them from this point, but I am willing to accept this amendment.

Let me at this point say, in doing so, I also want to send my compliments to our current elevator operators, whom I think many of us do not take the time to say "thank you" to so often. They are always kind and courteous and efficient. I appreciate the fact that they find me in the crowds. I know that is not a problem that some of the other Members have.

But they are always here, they are always smiling, they are on time. I think oftentimes when we have amendments like that, it is seen as a slam on some people who are doing a very efficient job, and, I think, one that we do not say "thank you" for, often enough.

So let me take this opportunity to thank them for the job that they do for all of us.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further debate, the question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 1805) was agreed to.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. INHOFE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 1806

(Purpose: Expressing the sense of the Senate regarding war crimes in the Balkans)

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I send a resolution to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I ask that it be modified to be put in the form of an amendment to the pending bill.

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

The clerk will report the amendment.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SPECTER] proposes an amendment numbered 1806.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place insert the following new section:

SEC. . (a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) war and human tragedy have reigned in the Balkans since January 1991;

(2) the conflict has occasioned the most horrendous war crimes since Nazi Germany and the Third Reich's death camps;

(3) these war crimes have been characterized by "ethnic cleansing", summary executions, torture, forcible displacement, massive and systematic rape, and attacks on medical and relief personnel committed mostly by Bosnian Serb military, para-military, and police forces;

(4) more than 200,000 people, mostly Bosnian Muslims, have been killed or are missing, 2.2 million are refugees, and another 1.8 million have been displaced in Bosnia;

(5) the final report of the Commission of Experts on War Crimes in the Former Yugoslavia, submitted to the United Nations Security Council on May 31, 1995, documents more than 3500 pages of detailed evidence of war crimes committed in Bosnia;

(6) the decisions of the United Nations Security Council have been disregarded with impunity;

(7) Bosnian Serb forces have hindered humanitarian and relief efforts by the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, the International Committee of the Red Cross, and other relief efforts;

(8) Bosnian Serb forces have incessantly shelled relief outposts, hospitals, and Bosnian population centers;

(9) the rampage of violence and suffering in Bosnia and Herzegovina continues unchecked and the United Nations and NATO remain unable or willing to stop it; and

(10) the feeble reaction to the Bosnian tragedy is sending a message to the world that barbaric warfare and inhumanity is to be rewarded: Now, therefore, be it

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the Senate hereby—

(1) condemns the war crimes and crimes against humanity committed by all sides to the conflict in the Balkans, particularly the Bosnian Serbs; and

(2) condemns the policies and actions of Bosnian Serb President Radovan Karadzic and Bosnian Serb military commander Ratko Mladic and urges the Special Prosecutor of the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia to expedite the review of evidence for their indictment for such crimes.

(3) It is the sense of the Senate that the Special Prosecutor for the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia should investigate the recent and ongoing violations of international humanitarian law in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

(4) The Senate urges the President to make all information, including intelligence information, on war crimes and war criminals available to the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia.

(5) It is the sense of the Senate that the President should not terminate economic sanctions, or cooperate in the termination of such sanctions, against the Governments of Serbia and Montenegro unless and until the President determines and certifies to Congress that President Slobodan Milosovic of Serbia is cooperating fully with the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, this amendment is being offered so that the Senate will have an opportunity to articulate a forceful condemnation of the war crimes and crimes against humanity, committed by all sides in the conflict in the Balkans, particularly the Bosnian Serbs, so that the Senate will have an opportunity in the final analysis to condemn the policies and actions of the Bosnian Serb President, Radovan Karadzic, and the Bosnian Serb military commander, Ratko Mladic, and urge the special prosecutor in the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia to expedite the review of evidence for their indictment for such crimes.

I had spoken on this subject generally on Tuesday evening following the introduction of the resolution by our distinguished majority leader calling for lifting the arms embargo so that the Bosnian Moslems may have an opportunity to defend themselves.

I support the action of the majority leader in urging the adoption of that resolution. It seems to me that the mission of the U.N. forces in Bosnia has been a mission impossible when they are charged to keep the peace when there is no peace to keep. U.N. forces ought to be withdrawn so that they can no longer be held hostage and so that then the Bosnian Moslems may have an opportunity to defend themselves under article 51 of the U.N. Charter, and that there may be appropriate help from the United Nations, NATO, and the United States by way of massive airstrikes. But there has not been a condemnation of the action of the Bosnian Serbs by this body, and I think that is very important.

The conduct of the Bosnian Serbs has been on a level of brutality and inhumanity which has been virtually unparalleled at least since World War II, and the nations of the world have stood by and have watched these atrocities and ethnic cleansing go on without a denunciation of this kind of conduct.

Hopefully, the International Criminal Tribunal will ultimately bring to justice all of those involved up to and including the highest levels. While the Western democracies articulate values of decency and humanity, we have sat back and have watched this atrocious conduct unfold.

There is little left of dignity and honor or basic human dignity in what has gone on in Bosnia, and at the very minimum this conduct ought to be condemned in the most forceful possible terms, which is what this resolution calls for.

I have introduced it for that purpose and to speak briefly on some of the underlying factors. I have told the managers of the bill that I would not insist on a rollcall. There is no reason to take an additional 20 minutes of the Senate's time to have what would most probably be a unanimous vote.

However, these are matters which ought to be called to the attention of the American people and the people of

the world as forcefully as possible. It is my hope that the President of the United States will speak out on this subject, and that the President of the United States will use the forcefulness of the bully pulpit of the White House to acquaint the American people with what is occurring.

We have seen confirmed reports of the Bosnian Serbs rounding up young men, 11 and 12 years of age, and slitting their throats and placing them in heaps. We have seen the photographs in the public press of young Moslem women from Bosnia going into the fields and hanging themselves because that kind of suicide is preferable to the kind of brutality which is being inflicted by the Bosnian Serbs. We have seen the active reports from the safe havens of the United Nations which have been invaded by the Bosnian Serbs, taking away elderly women, taking away elderly men, committing the most atrocious kind of conduct.

I am not going to take a great deal of time here today, with the pendency of the other legislation. But I would cite just a couple of examples which are illustrative:

The Bosnian Serbs going to a Moslem victim and cutting off two fingers of each victim's hand so as to make the sign of the cross; and then they cut the prisoner's nose and ears off; and finally cut their throats, causing death.

Another example, a woman hiding in a barn with her husband and two young daughters, ages 13 and 7. Five Chetniks, Serbian paramilitaries, find them, beckon the father over, and in the sight of his two young daughters and wife, brutally murder him with a gun without his having uttered a word.

In the presence of an elderly woman, the husband is accosted by Bosnian Serbs, as they were fleeing, slicing his throat right in front of her, causing death.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that examples be admitted into the RECORD, without going through them in detail at this moment which chronicles and specifies the kinds of blatant atrocities which are being perpetrated by the Bosnian Serbs.

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

EXAMPLES OF WAR CRIMES OR CRIMES AGAINST HUMANITY IN THE FORMER YUGOSLAVIA

EXAMPLE 1

The Final Report of the Commission of Experts to Investigate War Crimes in the Former Yugoslavia reveals the existence of 150 mass graves containing between 5 and 3,000 bodies and over 700 detention facilities in which, up until March 1994, an estimated 500,000 persons were imprisoned, murdered, tortured, and raped.

The estimated number of tortured persons is over 50,000.

The estimated number of raped women is over 20,000.

The Serb policy of ethnic cleansing included total forceful transfer of civilian populations from Serb controlled areas in flagrant violation of international humanitarian law as well as the destruction of public and private property, including religious and cultural heritage.

All of the above constitute war crimes and crimes against humanity and could even rise to the level of genocide.

EXAMPLE 2

The camp commanders.—Zeljko Meakic:

A. Complicit in the killing of, and in the causing of serious bodily or mental harm to, and in the deliberate infliction of conditions of life on, Bosnian Muslims and Bosnian Croats people, intending to bring about their physical destruction as a national, ethnic or religious group

B. Held individually responsible for the crimes committed by his close subordinates (deputies and shift commanders) and by the guards who regularly and openly killed, raped, tortured, beat and otherwise subjected prisoners to conditions of constant humiliation, degradation, and fear of death.

C. Personally beat the prisoners upon arrival with batons and other weapons

D. Kicked one prisoner who was tortured in the chest.

EXAMPLE 3

Zoran Zigic and Dusan Knezevic ordered prisoners to drink water like animals from puddles on the ground, jumped on their backs and beat them until they were unable to move; as the victims were removed in a wheelbarrow, one of the Serbs discharged the contents of a fire extinguisher into the mouth of one of the victims.

EXAMPLE 4

Dusan Tadik and others: Belonged to a group of Serbs from outside the camp, who called on one day prisoners out of their rooms, severely beat them with various objects and kicked them on their heads and bodies. After one of the four prisoners was beaten, two other prisoners were called on and ordered by a member of the group to lick his buttocks and genitals, and then to sexually mutilate him; one of the two covered the prisoner's mouth to silence his screams, and the other bit off the prisoner's testicle. This prisoner and two other died from the attack; the fourth one, who was severely injured, was thrown onto the back of a truck with the dead and driven away.

EXAMPLE 5

Most recently, in the wake of the fall of Srebrenica, there are numerous accounts of new Serbian cruelty: throats slit, women raped before women and children were packed on buses for a mass ethnic deportation.

Twenty-year-old woman made her way into a grove of trees near the refugee camp at night and hung herself.

Hundreds of men were reportedly killed by Serbs and thousands taken away for investigation of "possible war crimes."

One refugee reported that the buses carrying the Muslims were stopped outside Srebrenica and Serbs took young men and women off. "They made us watch while they cut the men's throats and raped the women." (New York Times, 15 July)

EXAMPLE 6

In Potocari, where there was a U.N. base to which many refugees fled, there were accounts of Bosnian Serb soldiers coming into the factories where refugees were spending the night.

"They took some young boys with them, kids who were probably between 12 and 17 years old. Later we heard screaming outside. . . . On Wednesday morning we went outside.

. . . I saw seven of the boys with their throats cut, and two others hanging from a tree."

The same night, Serb soldiers reportedly abducted three women, ages 12, 14, and 23. When the three returned several hours later, they were naked and covered with scratches and bruises, and the two youngest were bleeding from the assault. At dawn, the 14 year-old "slipped off to the side. She took a scarf she had with her, tied it around her neck and hanged herself from a beam."

Wednesday morning, the Serbs "took about 15 women. When the women started to scream, the Chetniks [Serb soldiers] covered their mouths and dragged them away. We left the factory on buses a few hours later and by the time we left none of the women had come back." (New York Times, July 17, 1995)

EXAMPLE 7

Thousands of thin and exhausted Bosnian Muslim men have begun pouring into Tuzla after being missing since the fall of Srebrenica a week ago.

One soldier told of seeing a father shoot his badly wounded son when he could carry his child no farther.

Others said they saw comrades commit suicide during the long walk by pulling the pins on hand grenades and holding them to their necks or by standing next to them as they exploded.

"There were dozens and dozens of dead bodies on my trail."

U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees said about 19,000 of Srebrenica's 42,000 residents still are not officially accounted for. (Gazette-Montreal, July 18, 1995)

Another U.N. official relayed the following account: "One woman told us that her husband was grabbed by the Bosnian Serbs as they were fleeing Srebrenica and they slit his throat right in front of her. She said she saw the bodies of at least eight other men whose throats had also been cut.

EXAMPLE 8

A report from the Bosnian War Crimes Commission in 1992 claimed that since the beginning of the war, at least 260,000 people had passed through concentration camps and prisons set up by the Serbs while 10,000 people had been killed in them.

EXAMPLE 9

The Report described the mutilation and torture of men, women and children by Serbs: "One account . . . claims that Serbian fighters burned alive elderly people who refused to leave their homes and forced mothers to drink the blood of their murdered children." (The Daily Telegraph August 3, 1992)

EXAMPLE 10

One candidate for prosecution would be Gen. Ratko Mladic, the commander of Serbian forces in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Mladic was the Yugoslav Army commander in the Serbian-controlled area of Knin in Croatia before being transferred to Bosnia to head army forces there. Following the army's nominal withdrawal from Bosnia, he stayed on as Serbian commander and was overheard on Serbian radio frequencies discrediting subordinates who questioned artillery attacks on the residential neighborhood of Velesice in Sarajevo because of the number of Serbian residents there. "Burn it all," Mladic instructed his troops, ordering them to shell the area with the heaviest weapons in the Serbian arsenal: 155-millimeter howitzers. (The Nation, August 31, 1992)

EXAMPLE 11

Zerina Hodzic's account of what happened to her husband is typical: I was hiding in the barn with my husband Rifet age 35 and our two daughters ages 13 and 7. Five Chetniks Serbian paramilitaries found us and pointed

their index fingers at my husband and beckoned him toward them. One of the Chetniks shot him without ever having uttered a word.

Mr. SPECTER. A summary, Mr. President, was contained in the final report of the Commission of Experts to Investigate War Crimes in the Former Yugoslavia. That report specifies the existence of some 150 mass graves containing between 5,000 and 3,000 bodies each, and 700 detention facilities where up to 300,000 persons were imprisoned, murdered, tortured, and raped; with tortures estimated at some 50,000, and rapes estimated at some 20,000.

And I will further call attention, Mr. President, to the fact that in the proceedings in the international criminal tribunal for the former Yugoslavia, that Bosnian Serb commanders are being held responsible for atrocities. In the case of two of the commanders, they were held responsible for the acts of their subordinates, which gives rise to an expectation that officials at the highest level may be held responsible in the International Criminal Tribunal.

Mr. President, it is a difficult matter as to how far the United States and NATO can go in assisting the Bosnian Moslems. I have said on this floor that I am opposed to the use of ground forces in that arena. It is an open question as to whether other support can be given, such as heavy bombing, which could perhaps bring about a balance of power between the Bosnian Serbs and the Bosnian Moslems, giving the Bosnian Moslems an opportunity to defend themselves. But there are a wide range of options.

I believe that if the people of this country understood the intensity of the barbarism which is going on, when you have acts like cutting off ears and cutting off noses, slicing the throats of young boys, and have the brutal conduct leading young women to hang themselves rather than be subjected to the atrocities from the Bosnian Serbs, there might well be a different public reaction. And there might well be a different leadership reaction if the President would speak out to the Nation as a whole, using the force of his bully pulpit. Some people watch C-SPAN 2 and some people hear and see what we are doing. But it is too hard for people to follow the atrocities that are occurring, too hard for people to follow the fine print in all the newspapers to see exactly what is going on. But if the people of America were aware of what is going on, I think there would be widespread public outrage, just as outrage has been expressed by this Senator and others on this Senate floor.

So it is minimal, but I think the least that we can do, to express our outrage and to have the voice of the Senate speak out in condemning the action of the Bosnian Serbs, condemning the action of the Serbian President Radovan Karadzic and the Serbian military leader Slobodan Milosevic, and asking the special prosecutor

of

the tribunal to review the issue of indictment, that if we will not act directly in a military sense, that at least we will put those people on notice that what they are doing will not be ignored, and will be subject for criminal prosecution at a later date, by analogy to the Nuremberg war trials. The day of reckoning may come, and those leaders and all those that can be identified will face the death penalty in a court of law for their acts of brutality in Bosnia today.

I yield the floor.

Mr. BENNETT addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. BENNETT. First, let me commend my friend from Pennsylvania for his leadership on this issue. I was unaware that the Senate did not yet issue a statement of the denunciation of these kinds of atrocities. I agree with him absolutely that it is time we did so. And I appreciate what he has done here today.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I might be allowed to proceed as in morning business.

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

TERM LIMITS

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, if I may be allowed a moment or two to speak personally, I would like to refer to events that took place in the Senate yesterday and tie them back to my campaign, which is fast fading into memory, but some portions of which are pretty firmly etched in my memory as I am sure is the case with everyone here.

During the campaign, one of the issues that was raised continually by my constituents was the issue of term limits, because they said they had the feeling that the system was so unresponsive back here in Washington that something had to be done structurally to shake it up. Knowing a little bit about the Senate and the way it worked, I suggested to some of my constituents that while we debated the overall issue of term limits, which probably will require a constitutional amendment, there was something else that could be done quickly without a constitutional amendment that could change the character and perhaps free up the way things are done in the Senate. Specifically, I suggested to my constituents that it would be a good thing if we limited the terms of committee chairs in this body so that someone who assumed a committee chair would not assume the posture of divine right in that circumstance and then stay there forever and ever, dispensing whatever favors or power goes along with that assignment.

My constituents liked that and indeed many of them said to me as they came to me in the closing days of the campaign, "We are going to vote for you but we want your personal pledge when you get there you really will

work for significant change in the way business is done."

Of course, as you do in a political campaign, when somebody says that to you, you say, "Why, of course you have my pledge that I really will work to see that that is done."

When I arrived here in January of 1993 and suggested term limits for committee chairs, I found a very interesting circumstance. Among my fellow freshmen Senators, one of whom is on the floor here today, there was great sympathy, there was great agreement: Yes, we need to limit term limits, if you will, the time of committee chairs. Among the freshmen Republicans, we had unanimity on that issue. But there were only six of us. And we were told when you have been here a little longer, when you understand how the system works a little better, you will not be quite so zealous to call for the term limits of committee chairs.

Well, when I went back home, I found myself hoping people did not ask me, "What have you done to carry out your campaign pledge to see to it that there would be some structural reform in the way the Senate does its business?"

When I did get asked, I would say, "I am trying." And then when they pressed for details, I would say, "Well, I am in concert with all my fellow freshmen"—the Republican six, as we became finally, with the addition of KAY BAILEY HUTCHISON—"We are working hard." And my constituents would begin to get that look on their face that says, "Yeah, we heard that before. You're going to try to do something but, in fact, nothing is really going to change, and the longer you are back there, the more you are going to become part of the system and everything is going to stay the way it's always been."

There was another election that took place. The distinguished occupant of the chair was part of that, and instead of 6 Republican freshmen, all of a sudden we had 11 Republican freshmen. And added to the 6, that gave us 17, which constituted a sufficient block of the Republican conference that all of a sudden we were being listened to in ways we had not been when there were just 6 of us.

Mr. President, as you well know, yesterday the Republicans had a marathon session talking about the way things should be structured in the Republican conference. And out of that session came an action which I applaud wholly; that is, the Republicans have agreed to term limit the chairmanship of a Senate standing committee. I wish we could amend the rules of the Senate itself so that it was written into the Senate rules and had the protection of the two-thirds requirement so that it could not be altered, except by a subsequent vote of 67 Senators. I do not think we can do that. I do not think the votes are on the floor to do that.

But I can now, with a clear conscience and a smile on my face, say to my constituents: "I may not have been

able to work successfully to change the rules of the Senate, but I have joined with my colleagues in an effort, successfully, to term limit chairmen, at least those who are Republicans."

If I may be allowed a slightly partisan note, Mr. President, I hope that will be the case for many years to come; that is, that all of the chairs of all of the committees will be Republicans for at least as long as I serve in the body. In that case, our failure to change the Senate rules will not make any difference.

I think the Republican conference needs to be congratulated for taking this step. It demonstrates a willingness to allow those of us who are newcomers more of an opportunity to hold positions of responsibility perhaps sooner than would otherwise be the case. It allows for fresh ideas and fresh approaches to come into the system more openly than would have been the case if we had stayed with the old rule.

There is still much that I would like to do in the name of congressional reform. If I could sit down and write the rules all by myself, I would change a lot of the rules around here, and I have introduced a bill to do that. At the moment, it has only attracted a single cosponsor. That is one of my fellow freshmen. Maybe I could work to get another 10 names or so on it, but I recognize the reality of this place. It is going to take a little more time and maybe, Mr. President, another election or two before we start some of the fundamental restructuring of the Senate rules that I would like to see happen.

But I am delighted that we have not waited for those elections to take place and for that time to come. In the Republican conference, we have moved with dispatch and, I may say, a large majority. I do not want to leave the impression that the decision to term limit committee chairs was a close one and that those of us who are freshmen or sophomores had a difficult time winning a very narrow victory. As we made our case, our more senior brethren, and on occasion sister or two, decided we were right and the vote was not close. The vote was 38 to 15 saying we will, in fact, recognize the call that is out there among the American people to bring the procedures in this body up to date with modern approaches and opening it up so that those who do not want to make a full-time career out of service in the Senate but simply come here for a term or two, will, in fact, still have the opportunity to receive leadership assignments and represent their constituents in that circumstance.

When people talk to me about the overall issue of term limits, I tell them in my case, you do not have to worry about it. At my age, term limits are built in. Some say to me, "Well, look at the senior Senator from South Carolina. Maybe you will be here 20 or 30 years." If that is the case, I will be in my nineties, and I think I would rather