

spouses. Thus, almost all low-income seniors in Hibbing who would like to move to the Androy are not eligible to do so.

If the Secretary were to apply different income guidelines such as section 8 low-income housing guidelines to the low-income housing tax credit, the Androy Hotel and other buildings rehabilitated for low-income elderly residents could be occupied. There is a great need for more affordable housing in many communities, particularly for those on fixed incomes. Many senior citizens welcome the opportunity to move to facilities for seniors that are in their own communities.

I ask unanimous consent that our letter to Secretary of Housing and Urban Development Henry Cisneros be printed in the RECORD.

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

OCTOBER 2, 1996.

Hon. HENRY G. CISNEROS,  
Secretary, U.S. Department of Housing and  
Urban Development, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: We are writing to bring to your personal attention some unique situations in Illinois, Montana, and Minnesota relating to the use of the low income housing tax credit. Some serious problems have developed with certain facilities during the "rent up" phase in projects designed for senior citizens.

Senior citizens were supposed to live in these housing projects, but the income limits for the elderly populations are the problem. Senior citizens are uniquely over income in these areas in which the projects are located.

The Department of the Treasury has issued a notice explaining that, for purposes of determining qualifications as a low income housing project, the income of individuals and area gross income will be determined in a manner consistent with the determination of annual income and the estimates for median family income under Section 8 of the U.S. Housing Act of 1937.

Therefore, because of the authority which has been delegated to HUD regarding income determination for the low income tax credit, we would ask that you consider and review existing criteria and standards already in effect under Section 8 of the U.S. Housing Act of 1937 to determine if these guidelines provide any relief for these situations. There are special factors that create these situations in our states and probably others as well.

We would appreciate your review of this issue and look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

CAROL MOSELEY-BRAUN,  
PAUL WELLSTONE,  
MAX BAUCUS,  
U.S. Senators.

#### CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, before the Senate adjourns and we all go home and spend time with our families and our constituents, I wanted to join my good friend, Senator FEINGOLD, to discuss the issue of campaign finance reform.

This year, Senator FEINGOLD and Senator THOMPSON and myself introduced comprehensive campaign finance reform legislation. Our bill was the first bipartisan effort in this area in

over 10 years. We worked hard, and we fought a valiant fight. Unfortunately, we did not succeed. But I am here today to put the Senate on notice that the fight is far from over—as a matter of fact, it is just beginning.

Our effort is about restoring the public's faith in the Congress and the electoral system. It is about elections being won or lost based on ideology, not fundraising. It is about leveling the playing field between challengers and incumbents. And it is about bringing a dramatic change to the status quo.

Mr. President, poll after poll demonstrates that the public has lost faith in the Congress. One of the reasons this has occurred is because the public believes—rightly or wrongly—that special interests control the political and electoral system. In order to limit the ability of special interests to control the process, we must enact campaign finance reform.

Well, Mr. President, as I stated, we will continue in our efforts. We will be introducing a new campaign finance reform bill on the first day of the 105th Congress. And we will be taking all necessary steps to ensure that our bill is addressed early in the Congress.

During consideration in the 104th Congress, countless hearings were held on this matter. I believe we all learned a considerable amount from those hearings. But as every schoolchild knows, some day you have to move past the classroom, go into the real world, and put what you learned to good use. We are at that stage.

Mr. President, as I have often noted, if we do nothing on this matter we invite the contempt of the American people and such contempt is a poison that hurts our democracy. Simply, we must act to pass campaign finance reform.

In closing, Mr. President, I want to thank Senator THOMPSON and most importantly, my good friend, Senator FEINGOLD, for all they have done on this subject. I am deeply grateful to have them as my comrades-in-arms as we move forward to fight for this needed reform again.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I rise today to join with my colleague and good friend, the senior Senator from Arizona, to once again urge our colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join us in making a commitment to pass meaningful bipartisan campaign finance reform.

Just a few months ago, we had an abbreviated but spirited discussion here on the Senate floor about the issue of campaign reform. The Senator from Arizona and I, along with the Senator from Tennessee, Senator THOMPSON, brought to this floor the first bipartisan campaign finance reform bill in a decade.

The importance of the bipartisan nature of that effort should not be glossed over too quickly. For the previous 10 years, the battle over campaign reform had been marked by partisan skirmishes—Democrats accusing Republicans of defending the status

quo, Republicans accusing Democrats of attempting to rig a system to protect their congressional majorities. And not surprisingly, nothing was accomplished.

But last year, in what one newspaper called the "most hopeful and remarkable legislative development in Washington of 1995", three U.S. Senators of vastly differing political and philosophical ideologies, sat down in a room and drafted a comprehensive reform proposal that was designed to be fair to Democrats, Republicans, liberals and conservatives alike.

We certainly had our differences. I have long been a supporter of public financing. The Senator from Arizona believes we can encourage candidates to limit their campaign spending and reduce campaign costs by providing free television time to congressional candidates. The Senator from Tennessee is one of this Congress' most ardent advocates of congressional term limits. But despite these differences, we also found we had many commonalities in how we believe our political system should function.

For example, we each have significant misgivings about the role money plays in our electoral system. We shared a concern that more and more Americans are choosing not to run for public office because they lack the access to the millions of dollars necessary to run a competitive campaign. We were troubled that Americans have come to view their elected leaders and representatives with a depth of cynicism not seen since the early 1970's.

That is why we put together a proposal that could be supported by Democrats and Republicans alike. That proposal, for the first time ever, would have provided congressional candidates access to low-cost media and postage rates in exchange for a candidate's voluntary compliance with limits on their campaign spending. Specifically, candidates would have had to agree to three limits: a limit on their overall spending based on the size of their State, a strict limit on the amount of personal funds they expend during their campaign, and a requirement to raise at least 60 percent of their campaign funds from individuals residing in their home States.

The proposal had a number of other important provisions as well. The bill would have sharply limited the influence of political action committees. It would have reformed the congressional franking process which has seen its share of abuse in recent years. It would have restricted the practice of bundling campaign contributions to circumvent contribution limits. It would have provided candidates greater protection from independent expenditures and required greater accountability for those who engage in negative advertising.

And perhaps most importantly, it would have essentially shut down the soft money system—a system that has shown itself this year to be completely

out of control. Soft money, a term used to describe an unregulated and unlimited flow of money between the special interests and Washington lawmakers, is severely undermining and compromising the effectiveness of the Presidential system and is making a mockery of every single one of the limits we have in current law that governs how much individuals and entities may contribute to congressional candidates.

So what happened here on the Senate floor last June, Mr. President? After a limited debate we were unable to gain the 60 votes necessary to overcome a procedural hurdle and cut off a filibuster. But we did receive a remarkable 54 votes, including several from our colleagues on the other side of the aisle. Let me repeat that, Mr. President. A strong majority in the U.S. Senate voted in favor of advancing the McCain-Feingold reform proposal.

Some have said that this doomed any hope for campaign finance reform, that this was the end of the line for this issue. On the contrary Mr. President, this is clearly just the beginning for bipartisan campaign finance reform. It took us 3 years to reform our lobbying disclosure laws. It took us 3 years to finally reform the Senate's rules on the acceptance of lobbyist-provided gifts, meals, and vacation junkets. And it may take us just as long to see real campaign reform enacted into law.

I for one am fully confident that we will prevail. We will prevail because it is becoming increasingly difficult for opponents of campaign reform to defend an indefensible system that is crumbling all around them. To suggest that the current system is fair, is functional, and is worthy of the voters' trust is simply an absurd proposition and no one is buying it.

We have already begun to hear some of the numbers coming in and it is becoming clear that the current trend of skyrocketing campaign costs will continue through the 1996 elections. The distinguished Senator from Arizona and I will be back here during the opening days of the 105th Congress to discuss those numbers and to shine a spotlight on some of the darkest corners of our political system.

Two years ago at this time, my Republican colleagues were touting their Contract With America and the issues they hoped to address in the first 100 days of the new Congress. I said it countless times then that one issue that was conspicuously missing from that contract was campaign finance reform. I was, quite frankly, astonished that although other reform issues were mentioned, there was not a single word about what has to be considered the mother of all reform issues. It was entirely omitted from the contract.

Not surprisingly, we did not debate campaign finance reform in the first 100 days of the 104th Congress. Or the second 100 days. Or the third, or the fourth. In fact, we did not debate campaign finance reform here in the Senate until 18 months after the start of

the 104th Congress. Eighteen months, Mr. President. It was a pretty good strategy by our opponents. They knew that by waiting so long to schedule debate on campaign reform that it would be highly unlikely that there would be enough time in the legislative session for a proposal to work its way through the legislative process and become law.

In the House, the strategy was even simpler. They just refused to allow the bipartisan reform bill modeled after the McCain-Feingold bill to come up for a vote. By only allowing votes on a Democratic reform bill and a Republican reform bill, the House leadership guaranteed that no reform bill would leave the House alive.

So rather than throwing any kind of knockout punch, the Congress has chosen to bob and weave around the issue of campaign finance reform. This cannot be allowed to happen in the 105th Congress, and that is why the Senator from Arizona and I are joining today to call on our colleagues on both sides of the aisle to agree to debate campaign finance reform here on the Senate floor during the first 100 days of the 105th Congress. It does not matter if Republicans retain control of this body or if Democrats can reclaim the majority—campaign reform must be the subject of floor debate in the first 100 days of 1997, regardless of the outcome of the elections.

Mr. President, the campaign finance reform landscape has experienced a significant shift in recent years. When I arrived here in 1993 and in the years before that, there was certainly a significant block of Senators that believed that money had little role in the outcome of elections. They believed that the embodiment of true political reform was to have unlimited campaign spending coupled with even less regulation of the entire campaign finance system.

Some still cling to that viewpoint, Mr. President, but not many. I'd like to point to a vote on the floor of the House of Representatives just about 2 months ago. On July 25, the House voted on legislation backed by Speaker GINGRICH that had as its foundation the Speaker's view that our campaign system is not overfunded as most of us believe, but is in fact underfunded. That legislation, known as the Thomas bill, would have opened up the campaign finance system and permitted unlimited campaign spending to continue without providing any assistance to challengers and not a single reform of the soft money process.

What happened to that bill, Mr. President? Quite simply, it was obliterated on the House floor by a vote of 259 to 162. Nearly 70 Republican House Members, nearly 70 of them Mr. President, rebelled against the Speaker and voted against his bill.

We have seen some amazing things happen in the other body over the course of the last 2 years. We have seen some eye-opening votes over there. But I cannot think of another single vote

where so many Republican House Members defied Speaker GINGRICH and voted against a bill that he was so prominently a part of.

Mr. President, considering that the Speaker's point of view was so universally condemned on the floor of the House, and considering that the McCain-Feingold bill received a majority of votes in this body, I not only think that bipartisan campaign finance reform is a strong possibility, I think that it is a strong probability. Republicans want it, Democrats want it, incumbents want it, challengers need it, and most importantly, the American people are demanding it.

I would hope that our other colleagues, on both sides of the aisle, will join the senior Senator from Arizona and I in insisting that the 105th Congress address the issue of campaign finance reform in the first 100 days of the next congressional session. I want to once again thank my colleague and friend from Arizona for his perseverance on this issue.

#### NATIONAL STUDENT/PARENT MOCK ELECTION

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, it is my pleasure to highlight a program that brings a greater comprehension and appreciation of the democratic process to millions of American students from kindergarten through high school: the National Student/Parent Mock Election.

The benefits of this fine program cannot be underestimated. Students who have participated in the National Student/Parent Mock Election report that it had a profound effect on them and made them aware of the rights and the responsibilities inherent in their U.S. citizenship. By stressing the importance of voter participation early on, these students gain a greater understanding of the democratic process, particularly the fact that democracy does not happen by itself. It succeeds only if citizens are informed and participate.

Many of the "State Election Headquarters" which collect the votes from the schools will host spirited mock "conventions" complete with student "delegates" and "anchors" reporting the outcomes of the Presidential and Congressional elections. Taking part in these events gives students a sense of political ownership. Students also see first hand the work and effort that go into a political campaign.

State participation in the National Student/Parent Mock Election is crucial. For example, in my own state of Utah, Governor Michael Leavitt has proclaimed October 30 as "Mock Election Day." More than 46,000 Utah students have registered to vote, doubling voter turnouts from the last election.

The California Mock Election will employ a formal voter registration procedure so that students can better understand the voting process. Besides voting for the President and 52 Members of the House of Representatives,