

speed limit on an unremarkable two-mile strip of interstate highway. What do you do with motorists who come zooming through at, say, 32 mph?

You don't want to send the message that anyone can violate the speed laws with impunity; speed kills, and you have to believe that those who enacted the limits did so in the interest of public safety.

On the other hand, how many licenses would you snatch, and how many drivers would you send to jail for doing something that (it seemed to you) endangered the public not a whit?

Laws ought both to have some purpose and to advance that purpose. The purpose of the fund-raising laws is clear and commendable; to prevent the buying and selling of public office. But how does the law that has Al Gore in such trouble advance that purpose? It forbids solicitation or receipt of contributions in any federal "room or building occupied in the discharge of official duties." Did Gore solicit campaign contributions from his office phone? Sure he did. Clinton, too. Would the republic have been more secure if they had toddled off to the corner drugstore to make the calls? (Waiting until they got home after work would have been no solution; both live in buildings "occupied in the discharge of official duties.")

People who study these things say the prohibition, part of the civil service reform of a century ago, was designed to keep public officials from pressuring their staffs into making contributions. It did not contemplate telephoned solicitations made to private citizens.

But that's not all that bothers me about the investigations. Thompson's hearings are supposed to have some legislative purpose and, in truth, one keeps hearing about the need for campaign finance reform. But one could be forgiven for wondering if the true purpose isn't to bolster Republican Thompson's own presidential prospects and to destroy Democrat Gore's.

That is, perhaps, a small point. This isn't: The Supreme Court has said money is speech. If that makes sense (and it does to me), how can it make sense to put arbitrary limits on the amount of speech that's permissible?

That's not a trick question; it worries me a lot. It's inconceivable that there should be limits on the amount of time, doorbell-ringing, envelope-stuffing or other forms of political "speech" supporters can contribute to candidates of their choice. Why should we countenance limits on money speech?

The obvious answer is that we don't like the idea of rich people buying influence over public officials or otherwise subverting the government to their private purposes. (It's easy, though not necessarily fair, to assume that the purposes of the rich are more likely to be against the public interest than are the purposes of, say, organized labor.)

Maybe there's no way out of the dilemma. Either we allow free speech in all its forms, or we arbitrarily limit it for people we don't trust. The latest attempt to split the difference—allowing larger amounts of "speech" on behalf of political parties and smaller amounts for candidates—has pretty much come a cropper. Soft money/hard money indeed!

Public financing of campaigns is the most frequently offered solution. But how do you ensure fairness to lesser-known candidates, and how do you ensure the free speech rights of those who talk with their pocketbooks?

We have two things going on at the same time: a serious campaign-finance dilemma and a juicy campaign-finance scandal.

Guess which one will get the attention.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from

Washington is recognized for 10 minutes.

RETURNING MORE FREEDOM TO OUR LOCAL SCHOOLS

Mr. GORTON. Madam President, yesterday, President Clinton assailed my proposal to give more money to schools all across the country and restore authority for directing those funds to parents and teachers and school board members. The debate about the future of our public schools is vitally important to the future of this country. A front-page Washington Post article today notes: ". . . more parents than ever are choosing alternatives to public education for their children. . ." and are doing so in such great numbers that the phenomenon is starting to resemble a revolution. We should read this as a warning signal that parents are beginning to lose faith in their public schools. We must act decisively to restore that faith, improve education, and prepare our children for their future. More of what we are doing now is not enough.

On one point, the President and I do agree: We can improve public education. We part company, however, on who can best make decisions to improve our public schools. I believe that parents and teachers and local school board officials will make the greatest strides in improving education because they are in our homes and classrooms and high schools with our kids. But with his remarks yesterday, President Clinton says to parents and teachers: I don't trust you.

I find it remarkable that the President believes that restoring decision-making authority to parents and teachers and our elected school board members is somehow dangerous. The Gorton education reform amendment increases the amount of money school districts have to work with, thus, expanding the programs they can target to both disadvantaged and high-achieving students.

A recent study found that if Federal education funds for kindergarten through high school are sent directly to school districts, as the Gorton education reform amendment proposes, school districts would receive an additional \$670 million. Why would they receive more? Because the funds would bypass the Department of Education and State educational bureaucracies and save that amount in administrative application and compliance costs. Washington State school districts would receive \$12.5 million more to target to their most needy students; Arkansas schools would receive \$7 million in increased education funds; Mississippi would get \$9 million to target disadvantaged students and other school programs.

President Clinton and opponents of giving parents and teachers a larger role in our children's education presume that local school districts will act irresponsibly if Federal strings dis-

appear. This adds insult to injury. How can the President say with a straight face that programs would be "abolished" just because a bureaucrat does not direct them? Those who share the schools and classrooms with our children every day are not going to squander an opportunity to use an increase in Federal funds to address the problems they see every day.

It is also extremely disingenuous to state that my proposal would somehow "close the Department of Education," as President Clinton suggested yesterday. Higher education and dozens of functions relating to education in general will remain in the Department—perhaps too many such functions—but hundreds of bureaucrats who now write rules and regulations to inflict on every school in America will go, and their salaries will be used to hire new teachers and provide better education in every school in our Nation.

Just on Sunday, Madam President, the Columbus Dispatch, in an editorial, summarized the dispute in this fashion:

It's hard to see what the U.S. Department of Education has accomplished in its 20 years of existence to improve this country's system of schooling. The Senate's block grant approach is worth a try.

The will to change and improve our public school system and restore parents' faith in the quality of education it can provide to our kids is there. It is at home in our cities and towns and communities. Will we untie parents' and teachers' hands and let them do their jobs? The biggest point I believe today's Washington Post article makes clear is that parents are not turning to the Federal Government to improve their kids' education—parents and teachers are coming up with alternative solutions because they want the best possible education for their kids.

We must return and restore more freedom, not less, to our local schools, so that we can restore the public's faith in public education.

Mr. GLENN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FAIRCLOTH). The Senator from Ohio.

CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, I want to address the campaign finance matter that we have been involved with this year. I would like to start off by saying that I think sometimes we give the impression, with all of our horror stories about some of the things that have happened in campaign finance over the past few years, both on Capitol Hill and in the Presidential elections in both parties—that we sometimes emphasize to the point where we might add to the cynicism of the people of this country instead of helping placate or correct some of the reasons for that kind of cynicism.

I want to add that I think the majority of elected officials here in Washington, the majority of the people that run for office, whether high political office here in Washington, in the Congress, or even running for the Presidency or Vice Presidency, or the people

back home running for State offices, are by and large some of the finest, most dedicated people we have, and they are dedicated to doing just as fine a job as they possibly can. So I think that sometimes we tend to overdo the criticism to the point where it adds to the problem we are trying to cure.

Having said that, there are problems, and there is no doubt about that. We have to look at the big picture sometimes. I think we get so bogged down into nits and gnats of what a particular advantage is this way to one party or that way to another party, that we sometimes need to stand back and look at the big picture of why some of us feel campaign finance reform is very, very important.

Let's drop back to the point where we see how our political system developed, why it developed the way it did. You know, we have the finest constitutional system of government in the world. We are the envy of much of the rest of the world for our political system. It represents all the people more perfectly than any system of government that has been devised. Winston Churchill put it well once when he said we have "the worst system of government, except for every other system of government ever tried."

We do more towards representing the individual and more towards making sure that every single person has a fair shake in our society than any other government that ever has been, even with the problems that we have. And we have to admit we do have a lot of problems. I see these problems as being mainly ones of danger signs up there to cure these little specks of rot that have crept into our system that could do major harm to our body politic in the future if we do not correct them now.

If we have such a great system of constitutional government, how about the people running that Government? The Constitution does not provide for how we are going to staff the Government. And mere words written on paper—be they the Constitution of the United States, and sacred though that it is—that does not guarantee that we will have a good running Government under that constitutional system unless we have good people in there to make that system work. That is the key, and that is fundamental, because that is what our political systems in this country are. Our political systems are basically the personnel departments to run that constitutional Government.

Those political parties that we have right now that wind up after an election staffing and giving direction to that constitutional system of government—those political parties are not provided for in the Constitution. We don't find anything in the Constitution that says there will be so many people in the Democratic Party, so many people in the Republican Party, and so on. No. In fact, our political parties have just sort of developed over a period of time under our constitutional system.

That is as it should be, I guess. They have evolved. They have changed through the years to better reflect the interests of the people of this country.

But there is one thing you have to have to make that constitutional system of Government work. And that is in any democracy to long endure we have to have in Government the confidence of the people—the confidence of the people. Unless you have that, a democracy may not long endure because people will want to experiment with trying the other systems of government, or they will want to go up and join splinter groups that reflect more their own little, narrow interests of what their parochial views are in their local community and where they think the country should go in the future to benefit them personally. We will see more and more of that, if the confidence of our people in Government goes down.

Look across the seas. We see Italy. I don't know how many it is now—50-some different Governments since World War II. I think they have averaged about one per year, or something like that. They only have a government by a coalition of different groups—disparate groups of people getting together and not making a permanent government for a lengthy period of time, and making temporary alliances for short-term advantage. That is not the hallmark of America. And to see us setting up any possibility of that kind of a situation would play a game of roulette for the future of this country.

Our country was founded on the basis not that we take this group, set it aside, and give it certain advantages. Not that there is a ruling class up here someplace, and they have certain advantages, and we set one class off against another. Our Government was set up on the basis of the importance of each individual—not groups, not special groups, but each single individual; and each individual was a king in this country, each individual was royalty in this country, if you will. Our Government was set up not to have a royalty that dictated their ideas, and everyone else had to live under that kind of rule. We have our constitutional system here where authority wells up from the people through their elected officials. It was that confidence in those elected officials that let us move ahead and become the kind of Nation we have become. We are a representative form of government. We are not a perfect town meeting government as we have seen in New England—the most pure form of democratic expression I guess that we have in our country. We cannot take a referendum on every single vote, in a national referendum—on every single issue—as they can at a town meeting. No. We say we will send people to work full time representing us, and we will trust those people. We will trust those people—that is the important word—to make those decisions on our behalf.

If we start having trust in those people eroded, and we see that trust going

downhill, then I see a big danger for our country. Our Nation was founded on this representative form of government that represents all the people all the time. And any time we depart from that kind of a feeling in this country of our Government representing all the people all the time, we engender less faith in our system, and we set up a potential of a slide downhill in our ability to cope with the future.

I don't think the United States of America is ever going to get taken over by the likes of Russia, China, and North Korea and Iraq, or anybody, or put together by any combination. Our country is going to be militarily secure, I believe, into the indefinite future as far as we can see because we are cognizant of the fact that we live in an uncertain world. We will have to protect ourselves. And we are so far ahead of anybody else in military technology and power that I don't see that as a hazard for the future of this country at all. But I do see a danger for our country if we have this increasing cynicism, this cynicism of our people that seems to be growing, and particularly among our young people. If that cynicism grows to the point where our young people in particular feel that politics is just too dirty, "I do not want to touch it, wash my hands if I shook hands with a politician, I just do not want to have anything to do with politics"—if they have that kind of view, then what happens? We will have less support for our political system; that is, the department of personnel for this constitutional system of Government; less support for those parties. We will have less trust of elected Government officials and our representative form of Government. We will have people tending more to split off into special interest groups instead of supporting mainstream parties that have served us well for all of the history of this country—when we get away from representing all the people all the time, we start down a slope that I think is a danger to the future of this country.

One person, one vote, one person, one influence—let's say. We are divided up into so many million little bits of influence in this country in our system of government, one person, one vote, one influence—that is what people think about. We tell our kids. "When they are growing up, when you get to be old enough, you register to vote because your vote is every bit as important as the vote of the President of the United States." And we mean it. And it is. That vote counts every bit as much when the tallies come out on election night—no matter what the rank of the person, be it some gutter bum who got registered and decided to vote, or be it the wealthiest person in this country, or be it the President of the United States. All the votes are equal in that tally. And it is a vote. It is representing those people who are elected to represent all the people and represent them all the time. And that is the basis on which they are elected.

That one influence from each person is supposed to be that person's influence, and influence is the future of this country. That, throughout our history, has given us the confidence to work together.

So, when I see a cynical attitude developing toward Government and politics and those in Government instead of confidence in elected officials, we see question marks all the time about whatever is going on in Government—automatic suspicions, automatic paranoia: "You better watch those people in Washington. They are out to get us," in a certain way or whatever. That to me is the beginning of a danger signal. It is the beginning of the potential of a slide downhill and confidence in Government that to me can lead to many other problems and leave us less able to take care of ourselves as a nation in the future than we have been in the past.

This is erosion of trust to the point where people want no part of politics. They just didn't want any part of it at all because of what they see. It is something that we don't want to see happen.

It is rather peculiar because we see some of this cynicism developing and expressing itself in polls. When people are polled, they let their cynicism all hang out. It is right there in the polling—repeated polling that shows that cynicism has been growing with regard to how people view their Government. And the confidence they have. That is really amazing because we have had rare times in our history when economic times and the general social pattern across the country has been any better. There the lowest unemployment rate, the lowest inflation rate, and Federal employment is coming down. We have a chance of balancing our budget. The times are good, and unemployment is low. We have no big foreign threat out there to us physically. You think people would be very, very happy about this whole thing. But instead of that there has been this gnawing, growing, rotten little specks of cynicism growing on our body politic that I see as a real danger for the long term.

I think we can come back to what I mentioned a little while ago. People no longer feel confident that their primary interests are our primary concern here in Washington. They feel, "Why vote? Why get out there and vote? Why participate in a political party?" Why try an exercise that one little bit of influence they have to put together with millions of other little bits of influence which will direct the future of this country? Why should they try to exercise that little bit of influence when they see that the real influence in Washington, the real influence in our political parties, the real influence in Presidential elections, in congressional elections, in Senate elections, is too often money? It buys access.

Why do we think of Roger Tamraz on the Democratic side who is willing to

put \$300,000 into a Presidential race because he wanted to get in and try to influence somebody. If he could get to the President, or to the Vice President, or get to somebody, and if he could get them to say, "I will approve your oil pipeline" in Southwest Asia, he was going to make billions out of it. He made no bones about it. He put in \$300,000, and he said the next time he would put \$600,000 in. Fortunately, it didn't work, to the credit of the people that were in charge—the President, and the other people around there.

But I will tell you. It raises a warning signal to us about what can happen.

I used that example on the Democratic side. How about on the Republican side? How about when you put out invitations to a group called "The Season Ticket Holders" for \$250,000 each. One hundred people can join this thing, and for that you are going to get a guaranteed dinner with the chairman of your choice in the Congress. It says it right in there. No problem. You are invited to all the policy matters. You are invited. If you are a businessman and you want to contribute \$250,000, or have your corporation give that kind of soft money—and soft money can be given in any amount—then you are guaranteed that you will be able to come in and represent your business interests with the committee chairman of your choice.

It is not in the executive branch. It is here where the laws are formed—right here in Congress. At the bottom of the invitation, it says "Benefit Upon Receipt."

We wonder why the people are a little bit suspicious out there about what is going on.

That was out of the hearings we had in the Governmental Affairs Committee. I could go on and on with a number of other examples. I just used those two to make sure that we all understand that this isn't something that is just one or two or very few people.

It is something that has become endemic in Government. It is something that is pervasive. It is something that is a rot on the body politic. It hasn't ruined it yet. Most of that apple, most of that body politic, most of whatever it is still is in good shape and the people are just as dedicated as they have ever been and the public servants are just as dedicated as they have ever been. But if we let this practice on either side of the aisle grow into the long-term future, we are creating a problem for the future of this country. And that we do not need and we do not want and we cannot afford.

Trust is down. Suspicions are up. People cynically question those of us in office, and we cannot blame them.

Now, some other things have caused some problems in this area, too. One is that campaign spending has gone up and up and up and up and up. A report from the Federal Election Commission—let's go back about 10 years. Let's go back to 1985 and 1986. That is just over 10 years. At that time, the total, all

congressional campaigns—just congressional not including the Presidential campaigns—in the 1985-86 cycle, the total spending for everything to do with Congress, Senate and the House of Representatives, was \$472 million. Ten years later it is \$790 million—\$790 million just for congressional races, House and Senate.

This is interesting. The number of candidates has gone up in that period. I guess more people are running in primaries and so on that are subject to Federal elections. Back in 1985-86, there were 1,873 people who ran for national office, congressional campaigns. That has gone up to 2,605. I guess that should be encouraging to us in that maybe more people are running for office. I wish I knew the quality of those people who are running for public office and whether we are getting the best and brightest out there in the system instead of more people deciding to take a whack at running for Congress. Why not? I do not know how you could judge that. Someone could do a political science doctoral thesis trying to analyze that, as to what is happening to the quality of people running for office.

When you go from \$472 million in 10 years to \$790 million, the money chase is on. The money chase is on, and 70 percent of it goes to TV. If you are not coming into people's homes via TV, you are not, in effect, knocking at the door, as we used to do and greet the people and have a handshake. TV has replaced all that. If you do not come into that person's living room and say hello to them via TV, you are not in the campaign anymore. That requires about 70 percent. So the importance of TV has gone up, and that has raised the cost of campaigning tremendously.

I point these out as a danger to the future as I see it. We had one cataclysmic event back a few years ago, and that is what we all know of by the general term "Watergate." The revelations of Watergate resulted in our saying enough is enough. Congress got to work. It passed some legislation, put some limits on, deciding we were going to regulate some of these things in the future, not let them run rampant like they were because the whole public psyche in this country had been jerked up short at that time. I tell you, everybody was disturbed about this, and we couldn't wait every day to hear what the new revelations were.

Watergate, for the first time, resulted in the resignation of a President of the United States, something that, growing up, we thought would have been absolutely impossible.

But out of those national concerns came reforms, and the reforms served us well, I believe. They worked. We had testimony yesterday from our former colleagues here, Senator Nancy Kassebaum Baker, and a former colleague here also and later Vice President, Walter Mondale, before our Governmental Affairs Committee. They talked about how the reforms put in

place following Watergate, they felt, really worked very well. There were some regulations put on. People had some questions about first amendment rights and all these different things that are brought up and discussed in the Chamber now also, but the reforms after Watergate seemed to have worked pretty well.

But then came a series of court and FEC decisions that undermined it and created some loopholes for those Watergate reforms. We started seeing the rise of soft money, and it rose and it rose, and then it really went out through the ceiling in the last election. And that was by far the biggest change that had occurred.

So we are now on a money chase, be it Presidential or be it here in the Congress. I have heard criticism on the floor, as well as in some of the press conferences of some of the Members here, being caustically critical of—and some of the press being caustically critical of—the President going out and fundraising when he says at the same time we need campaign finance reform. Isn't this being hypocritical? I say, no, I do not think so at all because we have not really changed the rules. As the President said, he is not interested in unilateral disarmament at this point.

As I said at our hearing yesterday, if both sides agree that this money chase should not go on the way it is and we agree to limit both sides, then certainly the President should not be out fundraising. If we agree to that, the other side could agree to it also. It would be a little bit like if I was over in England and I got used to driving on the left side of the road and I liked that, and I came back to this country and I put in legislation to say, let's have driving on the left-hand side of the highway become the norm in this country and we are going to pass a law that permits that to happen, but I say I believe in this so fervently I am going to go drive on the left-hand side of the road even before the law is changed, you know what the result would be. I guess we can say the same thing here. I think the President is right in going ahead with fundraising as long as the law is the way it is and the Republicans are doing exactly the same thing.

So I think some of our campaign practices need to be revised, and that is what we are talking about with campaign finance reform.

You know what all the current practices are. We see them every day right here on Capitol Hill. Some people can't go through more than, let's say, a two-pay period here without receiving an invitation here in Washington or someplace to a barbecue, to a coffee, to a reception, to a dinner. Are these all situations where you go and you say, I have to pay \$500 or I have to pay \$100 or I have to give \$1,000 or I can't go to this thing? No. A number of these things, quite a lot of them, as a matter of fact, mean just getting acquainted with people and doing the first stroking, if you

will, and setting up a situation where you can go back later and ask for some money, and, hopefully, they will see fit, once you become acquainted with them, to contribute to your campaign. That is the nature of politics. That is the way it is.

But then later on there are some people who creep into this whole process—even though I think the major part of the process is still legitimate and aboveboard—who do want special access. They are not looking to just support someone whose beliefs they believe in, whose statements of purpose, whose ideas of public office are something that they personally believe in—which would be the best of democracy, if we could guarantee that was the type of support being given to individuals.

No; they are people who come in and then want to do what I talked about a little while ago. They want either to buy a ticket to become a season ticket holder and have that guaranteed dinner with the committee chairman of their choice or they are a Tamraz who makes no bones about it; he wants to get his pipeline approved, and he is willing to give \$300,000 to get a shot at a few words with the President in hopes he can influence that person to come around to his way of thinking—which did not occur, I repeat.

Is that influence imaginary? Buying access; is that imaginary? No, it is not. When we had insurance legislation here a couple years ago, it came out in the paper that some of the big contributors and big lobbyists were called in—I believe it was on an insurance bill—and actually wrote part of that bill on the Hill here. They called in the lobbyists who made the huge contributions and let them write their own portion of the bill. That was even defended by one of the Members by saying, well, they knew more about it than anybody else. They certainly did, but that did not mean they were going to write it in a way that was for the benefit of all the people all the time. They had bought their way in with influence, and they were writing it for the benefit of some of the people and the benefit of their special interest, you can bet on that, or they would not have been in here doing that.

We saw recently the results of \$50 billion being inserted into a bill to benefit the tobacco companies, the biggest contributors. Their chief representative, who reportedly in a magazine makes about \$50,000 a month, former Republican National Committee chairman, was the one who apparently worked his way and got that in. That is what people are unhappy about.

I have given both Democratic and Republican examples here because I want to point out that this is not something which is just all on one side of the aisle.

Sometimes the States get out ahead of the Federal Government in these United States of ours. They get out ahead of us in that they can operate, they can act more swiftly to take on a

problem as they see it developing. Some of the States have seen their political systems be corrupted, or the danger of being corrupted, by political influence at the local level, and they have taken some action.

The State of Maine has recently passed legislation, the basic theme of which is they are going to try State funding for State races. They are saying, we are going to cure this thing; and rather than try to write more complex laws on top of already complex laws, we are going to say, no, we are not going to do that anymore. We are just going to say, in the best interests of the people in getting the government, getting our elected officials, to make sure they address the concerns of all the people all the time, once they get through the primary, then let's get them some financing here so they do not have to go out on this money chase and promise everything under the sun to get enough money to have a chance of winning an election.

There are 12 other States, as I understand it, that are looking at a similar program right now. Maybe that is the answer for the future. We have seen court rulings and FEC regulations and rulings create loopholes that let people have access to getting around our election laws. Perhaps Federal financing is a way to correct that. I personally think that is something we will come to eventually, whether we like it or not. We will be forced into it because it looks as if, unless something drastic changes in the Chamber here—we may get a bill through, but it appears that it is going to be watered down enough that it may not be the overall comprehensive campaign finance reform that some of us believe, sincerely believe, is necessary if we are going to correct this problem into the future.

I do not rule out the possibility that at some time in the future we are going to have Federal financing of Federal campaigns because I think the people of this country may demand that. I am one of the original cosponsors of a bill here in the Senate, the Kerry-Wellstone bill, to take a look at this, to see if we could not work out something that is satisfactory in that particular area.

So I think we need to watch this experience of the States as they try to take back their State governments and make their State governments representative of all the people all the time, not all the people part of the time and special interests the rest of the time. We need to watch this very, very closely.

Let me address one other area. We haven't had much discussion recently in the Governmental Affairs Committee hearings that we have been having, we have not had much emphasis on enforcement. There have been those who said we have all these laws on the books now. They are not working, so why add more laws on top of them and make more laws that won't work either? That is a pretty good argument,

as a matter of fact. But I don't believe that is the way we ought to go. What we should do, we should make a FEC that can enforce the legislation, enforce the laws of the land, enforce the regulations they have put out, and make sure that anyone who violates those regulations is brought up short and is penalized and do it immediately, not years and years later.

Instead of that, what have we seen? We have seen, through the years, the budget for the Federal Election Commission either remain about the same or actually be cut, from year to year. Instead of giving better enforcement, they are only able to give less enforcement. Maybe the people who have perpetrated those cuts on our system here had that in mind. Maybe they did not want to see the FEC be anything more than, what has been termed in the past, a toothless tiger. I think if we have laws they should be enforced. I think whatever is required to help the FEC do that, we should provide the money to do exactly that.

This year we have reached even a ridiculous example. They asked for an additional \$4.6 million over there in addition to their, I think it is, \$28-point-something million. They asked for an additional \$4.6 million to give them special investigative authority, investigative capability to go out and see what happened in the 1996 election. And the committees up here have not only not approved the additional money for them, they have sent word over there specifying they are not to hire more people. They are not to hire more people. That is the word that FEC is operating under from the committees on the Hill right now this very day. They are not to hire more people to look into these alleged violations of law that happened in the last election.

In other words, we are creating a Nation of political scowflaws out there, if you will. Because they know you are not likely to get caught if you do something wrong, because that is just the way the system is. It does not have the capability of picking up all the wrongs in the system. So you have a chance of getting away with all sorts of misdeeds if you want to try it.

So, we need a strong FEC. We had one estimate given to us the other day by one person who studies these things a lot of the time, that they thought the FEC budget should probably be doubled. It should be somewhere around the \$50 million mark, instead of hovering around the \$30 million or under mark. I would vote for that.

I think we also need to make some changes in the Federal Election Commission, in that I don't believe they are organized on the proper basis. When we say you have six commissioners over there, three will be Republican and three will be Democrat, that sets it up for political bickering right off the bat. It is organized for political disunity going in. It is not organized to get to election fraud and violations without fear or favor, no matter what

the politics of it are, Republican, Democrat, or independent. It is set up with three and three, which just breeds political gridlock. And that is exactly what they have had through the years, in many cases. Much of the time.

One of the suggestions that had been made in the past is that we, instead of having the commissioners appointed on a political basis the way they are now, we should have the commissioners appointed from former Federal judges: People who would be stable; they have been used to giving fair consideration of the law and cases, that has been their training, that has been their background; and to be appointed for their nonpolitics, for their apolitical views, if you will, because they would best be able to judge, then, when a Democratic or Republican transgression occurs, they would best be able to give it the proper attention and proper consideration. Rather than just saying I am a Democrat so I better protect my Democratic interests over here no matter what, or I am a Republican so I'll see that we forgive that violation or whatever it is on the Republican side—no. That is not in the best interests of the people of the United States. The best interests of the people of the United States is in having a Federal Election Commission that enforces the law without fear or favor, wherever the violation occurs. And that means, I think, that we have to reorganize at the top level over there.

Going into our committee investigations this year, we were faced with a tough choice.

Before I leave that, for just a moment let me give a few figures here on the FEC, what their budget problems have been. For fiscal 1995 they had over 10 percent of their budget rescinded halfway through the fiscal year, the largest percentage agency rescission of any Government agency. In fiscal 1996 they sought \$32 million but they received only \$26 million, with some of those funds fenced for other particular purposes. For fiscal 1997 they had their travel budget limited and fenced such that it was difficult to conduct depositions and court appearances, including those undertaken in connection with the Christian Coalition litigation. In fiscal 1998, being considered right now, they asked both the House and Senate for \$29 million, plus an additional \$4.9 million—I correct my figure I gave a moment ago at \$4.8 and \$28 million, I guess I said—but they asked both the House and Senate for \$29 million plus an additional \$4.9 million just to deal with cases arising from the 1996 Federal election. The actual budget is still in conference, but they have been told specifically not to hire more staff to look into those problems of the 1996 election.

Let me tell you one other thing, and this I think is rather amazing. I didn't know this until a few days ago myself. Their total enforcement cadre over there is 30 lawyers to oversee all these hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of

cases filed with the FEC. There are 30 lawyers. How many investigators would you think the FEC would have to go out in the field and investigate wrongdoing out there, get the information, go to boards of elections, bring that information back, really create these cases—how many investigators do we figure the FEC has? Do you know what the answer is right now, as of this day, the 1st of October, 1997? They have two, two investigators. And that is up from only one just a short time ago. I guess that is heartening. That is a 100 percent increase, isn't it? We have gone from one up to two.

Two investigators for the FEC. Their lawyers in the enforcement division go out but they don't do investigations. They will go out and do depositions. They will go out and do a court case someplace that has been developed here, but their work is basically paperwork handled at the Washington level. So the investigative capacity at the FEC is not much, two people for the whole agency.

I propose we somehow get some little cadre of FBI people who really know something about investigation and assign them, at least for a period here of a few years, to help out over there, doing real investigative work trying to clean up the problems of campaign finance where the laws have been broken. And there have been laws broken in a number of areas.

Where do they need to look? Starting out our hearings this year I suggested we, instead of just going with Republican investigations or Democratic investigations, I proposed that we pick some areas where we know there are difficulties with campaign finance and then we bring those up, one after the other, and have a series of hearings on each one of these subjects. Let the chips fall where they may, Democrat or Republican, and find out what is wrong with the system, get it out there, get it out in the open. If we need additional law, let's have additional law. If we just need to enforce existing law better, then let's do that, too. But let's find out what the problems are first and then enforce them and make a system that really is run on a tight basis.

What are some of these areas I want to look at? One is foreign money. There are all sorts of allegations about money coming in from wherever, whether it was the Chinese or Chinese Government, where it was being channeled, where it was coming through and who it was going to, and did it affect elections or did it not affect elections—we had all sorts of problems with foreign money potentially coming into the American system. We had one on one side looking at whether it is the Democrats are where the money is coming and John Huang and Charlie Trie, and did that money come from the Government of China? On the other hand, we had the spectacle of Haley Barbour and the Republican National Committee getting loans of money, \$2.1 million out of Hong Kong, funding it

through the National Policy Forum in this country and into the Republican coffers. So we had bipartisan foreign money problems, there isn't any doubt about it.

So we should be looking at that? That is one area. There are other areas, though, that we have only touched on briefly in the last few hearings that we have had, that I think we also have to look at if we are going to really do the right job, looking into campaign finance reform or campaign finance violations, No. 1; and things the FEC should be monitoring on a steady basis.

How about the second one, third-party transfer? If I have maxed out my contributions that I can give, I say, "I am maxed out." But I turn to somebody else and I say, "OK, look, I'll give you \$1,000 and you go over there and you give that in your name and that clears it and I'll just give you the money." That is illegal. We have lots of information about that being done. That whole thing is an area we have really not even explored much yet, yet it was violated time after time after time.

So, foreign money, do we have to look into that? Of course we do. The third party transfer of funds? Of course we do.

Another area was the area of misuse of tax exempt organizations, so-called 501(c)(3) and (c)(4) organizations, where they have organizations given certain tax-exempt status and, for having that status, they are prohibited from political activity. But in this last election that whole thing ran amok. Organizations were being put together with that kind of charter and they were deliberately channeling money through. We have example after example of that, and we have not really had a chance to bring those things out yet, either. So that is another area we ought to be looking at.

Another area the FEC ought to be following, if we gave them adequate resources to do so, is tax-exempt organizations.

Then we had the biggest increase of all and that is in the area of soft money, where you can give any amount you want to give, any amount you want to give. If you are a billionaire you can walk in and put \$1 billion down if you wanted to. Do you think that might buy some influence? I think it might buy some, yes. You can put down any amount you want. As I talked about a little while ago, we had the restricted membership of 100, if they would contribute \$250,000 to that season ticket holder group that I mentioned just a moment ago when I was lining up one on the Democratic side and one on the Republican side to give some balance to this. The soft money can come in in any amounts now, but it is supposed to be just for party building. It is supposed to be used for things like get-out-the-vote drives and general advertising on general views of the Republican Party or the Democratic Party. Was that misused? There is no

doubt whatsoever about the misuse of soft money and the pernicious influence that it had with this last election. The area of influence of soft money has just skyrocketed from election to election since the new FEC ruling just a few years ago.

Another area is the straight old quid pro quo. We could add that as a fifth. If I give you so much money as a public official, then I want you to pass a certain law for me; and you do it. There are examples of quid pro quo also. So, these are all areas that we cannot ignore from the past. There are many of those things, just in those areas that I mentioned, that are flat illegal. Soft money is not illegal. It is perfectly legal now, but we have to make it illegal with McCain-Feingold, which I support fully and I am a cosponsor of. This is probably the most runaway part of campaign financing that we have had in recent elections—certainly in this last election.

Now, along with soft money, that I make such a fuss about, there is one other part. If we are going to correct this, there is one other thing we have to do, too. We cannot just see the money that was formerly going to soft money, to the parties and being misused then, being put into State races or into congressional races. We can't just see that money then not go into soft money but go over into issue advocacy ads and independent expenditures for the so-called issue advocacy ads that can be put on in a particular campaign in the last few days and influence a campaign, quite apart from the person running in that campaign who doesn't even have control of who is coming in and putting on TV ads either for or against him or her.

So we can't just do away with soft money and hope that will solve the problem, because soft money is probably going to gravitate over to the area of issue advocacy or independent expenditures. If we are going to correct one, we have to correct the other; we have to deal with them together.

So the question is, how do we prevent soft money not only from going into issue advocacy ads or independent expenditures, but also we want to make sure that we don't create a loophole here where the soft money now will go by the many, many millions of dollars over to the States, which it would be legal to do right now, go to the States, and the State parties then would use it in particular campaigns within the State by putting on independent ads or issue advocacy ads in support of congressional candidates, even those that are not State races, but there is an interest in them. So you see how complex this whole thing becomes.

Mr. President, those are a few views on some of the things that I see with regard to campaign finance this year.

There are a couple of statements I would like to quote on the floor today. Will Rogers is looked at as one of our great political commentators, in a humorous way, from years past. He did it

in a way that got the attention of the people. He was pretty caustic in his comments sometimes. He made a statement once that might be applicable today, though. He said:

Wouldn't it be great if other countries started electing by the ballot instead of by bullet, and us electing by the ballot instead of by bullion?

I think he was right.

Another is a statement by Kin Hubbard, Frank McKinney Hubbard:

When a fellow says, "It ain't the money but the principle of the thing," it's the money.

And you can bet on that.

Jesse Unruh of California some years ago said:

Money is the mother's milk of politics.

And that's sure true. It is as true today as it has ever been before.

Let me finish up where I started off today with this. I am afraid by our talk here about what is the potential for the future that we talk about this in such terms to make our point on the floor that sometimes we emphasize them to the point that we are about to increase what we are trying to prevent, and that is cynicism in this country.

By talking about the difficulties of campaign finance and the transgressions against campaign finance law—which should never have occurred in the last election on both sides of the aisle, and they have to be corrected. I am not trying to say they are not important, but they are. My whole statement today has been along the theme that this is a beginning of a rot we have to correct. So I am not trying to minimize these things.

I hope most of the people of the country realize that most of the people who run for high office do so with very good purpose in mind. Most of the people here, I would say, are very talented people. Most of them could probably be making more in business or in some corporate position or outside of public office than they do here. Not all of them, but certainly many people could. We have people running for office who are very fine people.

But this is a danger when we see things like what happened in this last election—the potential with foreign money, although all the sums talked about or rumored, whatever came from foreign money is a tiny little pittance, just a tiny little nothing almost compared to what was spent. That \$790 million I indicated was spent in the last election just in congressional elections. Not even the Presidential election is included in that.

So a few million dollars that may have come from some foreign source is a fairly small amount, but it is a danger sign. We have to regulate that. We have to cut it off. We have to make our restrictions enforceable if we are not to see that grow into the future, and that is the danger; that is the danger. We have to make sure that with third-party transfer of money, we don't just find rampant disregard of our laws, and then people just saying, "I know my

limit is" so and so "under the law, I will give you" this, this, "and somebody else, and I will contribute a lot more than my Federal limit was ever supposed to be and I won't get caught anyway."

We have to make sure that doesn't occur. We have to make sure the misuse of tax exempts, which ran rampant this last time, as conduits from people who had special interest money to put in—and they put it in by the millions. We have evidence of where that went and how it went. I hope we are able to put that on in the hearings before our campaign finance investigation ends on the Governmental Affairs Committee.

All these areas—whether it is foreign money or third-party money or tax-exempt money or soft money or quid pro quo—all these areas must be enforced with existing law. Then we can go ahead with bringing soft money under better regulation than we have ever done in the past. In fact, there isn't any regulation on it to speak of now. Then we are making real progress.

I believe the McCain-Feingold bill, which I fully support, is a start. I don't view it as anything more than a start. I don't think Senator MCCAIN or Senator FEINGOLD feels it is anything but a start right now, but it is a start. It is a start in showing people that, yes, we can act here in Washington; yes, when we do see a danger for the future, when we see some rot beginning on this body politic, we can cut that out, we can correct it, we have the capability to do it and we can restore confidence.

Where we see cynicism and we see disregard for law, we see cynicism about what may be going on with our Government, we can replace that, once again, with real confidence, real faith in letting the people of this country know that we are concerned and are willing to do something about it.

That is the reason why I support the McCain-Feingold proposal so wholeheartedly. They are important, and I am hoping that we can really have a vote up or down eventually. I know the so-called legislative tree has been filled that will try to thwart the passage of this legislation, but I am hoping we will really see a vote possible on this legislation before we finish with it. I guess the schedule is we will finish with it sometime next week.

Mr. President, this was a rather lengthy statement. I will undoubtedly have more to say about this next week.

I ask unanimous consent that the full text of my prepared remarks be printed in the RECORD, and I yield the floor.

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

CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

(By Senator John Glenn)

"Wouldn't it be great if [other countries] started electing by the ballot instead of by bullet, and us electing by the ballot instead of by bullion?"—Will Rogers.

"When a fellow says, 'It ain't the money but the principle of the thing,' it's the

money,"—Frank McKinney Hubbard ("Kin Hubbard").

"Money is mother's milk of politics."—Jesse Unruh.

Well, Mr. President, I have often wondered if and when this day would come. I recognize that both the distinguished Majority Leader and the equally distinguished Minority Leader have worked long and hard to get this bill to the floor and I congratulate them on their efforts. I also want to express my appreciation of Senators McCain and Feingold as the authors of this legislation and for their leadership on an issue that truly goes to the heart of American values. Their bipartisan cooperation has pointed us in the right direction and I hope that we can follow their example. We now have an opportunity to restore faith in our American system and renew our commitment to government for all the people, all the time and not some of the people some of the time, special interests buying access too much of the time.

One thing is clear to me. Our current system is sick and must be healed. We must work together to find a way to bring that needed reform. Our nation is confronted by many concerns and we have spent much of this year addressing some of those problems through the budget, reconciliation, defense authorization, appropriations bills, and the Chemical and Biological Weapons Treaty. With this debate we turn our attention to a more fundamental question: the role of money in our electoral system. I believe that a simple principle should apply in our democracy. We should encourage the active participation of the greatest possible number of citizens and restrain the undue influence of narrow factions and special interests. Only by insuring that our electoral system is open and fair can the notion of "consent of the governed" have true meaning.

How we finance our election campaigns is a central feature of how American citizens judge the integrity of our democracy. Many Americans see our current campaign fund raising practices as a form of corruption and because they believe that some interests have an unfair advantage when it comes to governmental decision making. I believe that this contributes to a corrosive cynicism that undermines America. When voters continually witness the political money chase they conclude that our system is for sale, that politicians are bought, and that policy decisions are made to favor the highest bidder.

We have all noted the increasing numbers of people who lack confidence in government and do not trust the government to do the right thing. We have witnessed declining voting participation.

Some would have us believe that campaign finance reform isn't of any interest to the American public. Some say the public doesn't care, why should we care? I think that's flat wrong. I think the public does care.

Let's face it, the public continues to lose faith in their federal government. Recent polls have shown that 70% of Americans want campaign finance reform, but only 30% believe it will happen. And perhaps most disturbing of all, three out of four interviewed do not trust us in Washington to do what is right.

Let me read a quote about government leaders from one of those people interviewed: "I don't expect too much . . . They're all crooked. It's just a degree of crookedness."

That's chilling. And I'm afraid it's a sentiment that is all too common.

Campaign finance reform is a perfect example of why the public doesn't trust us.

Another recent poll (Center For Responsive Politics, conducted in early April) found that 60 percent of the people polled thought

campaign finance reform should be a high priority this year. And, late last year, (Mellman Group, October, 1996) showed that 59 percent supported the concept of public financing of elections to clean up this mess.

Yet, despite its desire to see solutions, the public simply hears out of Washington that no one cares about campaign finance reform. The public sees both Democrats and Republicans sling mud at each other over each party's excesses, but they don't hear a real desire to clean up the mud. They hear about attempts to block reform, that reform isn't the "American way."

Poll after poll shows the public wants campaign finance reform. I think we should listen.

At the same time we have seen spending in campaigns rise through the roof. According to the Federal Election Commission (FEC) the cost of all Congressional campaigns more than doubled from \$354.7 million in 1981-2 to \$765.3 million in 1995-96. Major political party efforts at the local, state and national level increased from \$254.1 million in 1981-2 to \$881 million in 1995-96.

Of course most of this money has been used to purchase more and more broadcast time at ever increasing costs to reach more and more voters over an ever longer campaign. One could conclude that the amount of money raised and spent has had a negative effect on voter attitudes and participation.

WATERGATE AND REFORM

We all remember the Watergate era that led to the campaign finance rules under which we currently operate. Reform at that time was long overdue. Important improvements were made at that time. Prior to the enactment of the Federal Election Campaign Act and its amendments, some campaigns conducted business through slush funds and hush money. Major reforms included the establishment of the Federal Election Commission, requiring reporting of contributions and expenditures by federal candidates, limits on individual contributions, and spending limits and partial public financing of presidential campaigns.

Unfortunately, those reforms have been eroded over the years by FEC rulings and Supreme Court decisions such as Buckley v. Valeo—overruling spending limits for Congressional candidates and equating money with free speech—and Colorado Campaign Republican Committee v. FEC—allowing political parties to make independent expenditures.

THE ROAD TO REFORM

With this debate we continue the long battle to reform our campaign finance system. The former Senator from Oklahoma, Senator Boren first brought the need for reform to the attention of the Senate in 1985. The battle having been joined, it was difficult to get it considered in the 99th Congress. Former Senator Goldwater of Arizona played an important role.

In the 100th Congress, the Senate conducted a historical record number of cloture votes. In 1988, we saw a scene right out of Frank Capra's "Mr. Smith Goes to Washington" with an all night filibuster and the Sgt. At Arms arresting absent Senators and bringing them to the Senate chamber. I believe that our inability to bring about reform has made things worse.

CURRENT PRACTICES

Let me be clear. I do not believe that raising money for campaigns is corrupt. I do not believe that our government is corrupt because public officials raise money for campaigns. I believe that fund raising and public policy decision making can be kept separate. I believe that those who choose public service have a high calling. This is an honorable

profession and I have always been proud to serve.

However, with the explosion of fund raising and the erosion of our laws, many citizens believe that the credibility of our electoral process has been impugned by the view that special interests have special access and therefore have undue influence.

We must reform our system to restore faith in our democracy.

We all are witnesses to the perception that money has a growing influence. Political parties and candidates are engaged in an endless pursuit of campaign funds made up of both hard and soft money. Not a day passes without a full schedule of events, receptions, coffees, meetings, dinners, lunches, discussions, and forums—many ultimately intended to establish the climate to eventually raise money.

Soft money, campaign contributions not directly used in behalf of federal candidates and not required to be reported has become the crack cocaine of politics and parties and candidates are addicted.

As the ranking member of the Senate Governmental Affairs Committee I have spent all year looking into campaign fund raising. It is clear to me that many contributors believe that they get what they are seeking. They pay for access in the legislative and executive branches, and they get it.

We have been examples of contributors who want to appear to have influence by being seen with important officials and to have their pictures taken as a way to impress others. We have also seen contributors who have a special interest or particular project that they want considered. Through their contributions they obtain access.

Many contributors do have interests that can be affected by government decisions. No one can underestimate the impact on the American people when headline after headline links governmental action and campaign contributions. The \$50 billion tax benefit for tobacco companies in this year's tax bill, inserted in secret and with no debate, only serves to make many citizens believe that the integrity of our electoral process has been compromised by special interests.

NEEDED REFORM

Eventually, Mr. President, I believe that the answer to our concern is to eliminate the role of private money in campaigns. We should allow campaigns to be fairly and equally underwritten by all Americans through a some form of publicly supported financing.

That is why I joined with my colleagues Senator Kerry of Massachusetts and Senator Wellstone of Minnesota in cosponsoring a bill, the Clean Money Clean Campaign Act, based upon the Maine plan to limit campaign spending, prohibit special interest contributions, eliminate fund raising efforts, provide equal funding and a level playing field for all candidates and end the loopholes that have wrecked our current system. Through a publicly funded system we can end the current abuse and establish a system that takes us back to our major responsibility, representing the interests of "all the people, all the time".

I recognize that the time has probably not yet come to move to federal financing, but I believe that the more the American people focus on the current system and its exploding abuses, the more likely it will be that the support will grow for such a change.

MCCAIN-FEINGOLD

The bill before us originally contained spending limits for Congressional candidates. In an effort to reach out for a consensus on this issue, those provisions have been eliminated. Nevertheless, we now consider a bill which I believe addresses many important concerns.

We must address the question of soft money contributions. We must find a way to require the disclosure of funds used for express advocacy and issue advocacy.

I believe we have to take a hard look at the FEC. We must have enforcement of election law—present or future—or we encourage scofflaw parties and candidates. The FEC cannot do an adequate job. Currently the FEC has 30 enforcement attorneys. Mr. President, that is fewer than the number of lawyers currently working on the Governmental Affairs investigation. The FEC has two—count them—two full time investigators. In order to insure better enforcement we must consider that the \$28 million FEC budget should be increased and if expected to do an adequate job it should be nearly doubled. Furthermore, while the FEC is being expanded I believe that investigative assistance should be provided by at least a small group of FBI agents.

SUMMARY OF FEC BUDGET WOES

Fiscal 1995: Had over 10% of budget rescinded half way through the fiscal year, the largest percentage agency rescission of any government agency

Fiscal 1996: Sought \$32 million but received only \$26 million with some funds "fenced" for particular purposes.

Fiscal 1997: Had travel budget limited and fenced such that it was difficult to conduct depositions and court appearances including those undertaken in connection with the Christian Coalition litigation

Fiscal 1998: Asked both the House and Senate for \$29 million plus an additional \$4.9 million just to deal with cases arising from the 1996 federal election. Actual budget is still in conference but have been told specifically not to hire more staff. Summary of FEC Provisions in Clean Money Clean Campaign Bill

Adds "independent" Commissioner selected by independent commission to the FEC

Limits Commissioners to one six year term
Prohibits contributions from individuals not qualified to vote (juveniles, felons and foreign nationals)

Permits the Commission to conduct random audits of PACs, candidate and party committees

Grants the Commission the authority to seek an injunction to halt illegal act PRIOR to the election

Lowers the threshold for opening an investigation from reason to believe a violation has occurred to reason to open an investigation

Mandatory requirement to file disclosure reports either electronically or by fax.

Through this debate I hope that we can work together and make needed improvements to our system of campaign finance. We must clean up campaigns and restore faith in our government.

Ms. COLLINS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the distinguished Senator from Maine.

HEALTH CONCERNS CAUSED BY INCREASING AMOUNT OF IMPORTED FOOD AND VEGETABLES

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, Americans have long been urged by our doctors, our teachers, and our parents to eat at least five servings every day of fruits and vegetables. When we follow this good advice, we assume that the fruits and vegetables that we are consuming are wholesome. Recent reports, however, have raised questions about

the safety of imported food products. Our markets are increasingly filled with imported food that may not meet U.S. food safety standards. Thus, American consumers seeking a healthy diet face the unappetizing risk of unknowingly subjecting themselves to tainted imported food.

As the chairman of the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, I am conducting an investigation into the safety of food imports. I have asked the General Accounting Office to examine whether or not the Federal Government adequately protects the American people from tainted imported food. We need to know how imports are currently being inspected, what resources are being devoted to food safety and whether the highest risks are being given the highest priority in the inspection process. We should make certain, Mr. President, that our food safety programs are effectively and efficiently managed to safeguard the public's health.

Recent news reports have shown several instances where tainted imported food has caused serious illnesses. Food safety programs and food safety problems are not limited to beef and poultry, and it is not just food coming from domestic facilities that can cause health problems.

Imported fruits and vegetables in increasing numbers are causing serious illnesses. In March, over 260 children and teachers from Michigan developed hepatitis after eating frozen strawberries that were imported from Mexico. Those berries were illegally provided to the School Lunch Program, which requires food used to be produced in the United States. Instead, the tainted Mexican berries had been shipped to over 1,500 locations across the country, including my home State of Maine. In another example, over 2,000 people were infected with cyclospora in the last 2 years from eating tainted raspberries from Guatemala, making it the largest outbreak of food-borne disease in recent years.

Mr. President, I believe Congress must thoroughly examine the safety of imported food products. Currently, the Food and Drug Administration and the Department of Agriculture's Food Safety and Inspection Service have shared responsibility for the regulation and inspection of imported food. Agriculture officials are responsible primarily for meat and poultry, while the Food and Drug Administration regulates and inspects other food products. Standards in enforcement are thus different, depending on the type of food. In addition, the significant increase in food imports has resulted in a system where consumers cannot be assured of the safety of the food they eat. A New York Times article on September 29 of this year, just this past week, indicates that food imports have doubled since the 1980s, straining the limits of our current inspection system.

Later this week, President Clinton is expected to announce several initiatives to increase and improve Federal