

\$98 million for the National Endowment of the Arts. The NEA was a marked agency, identified by the other body for elimination. In fact, the other body voted to zero out all funding and tried to extinguish the NEA. But together with my colleagues in the Senate, another round of efforts to dismantle or eliminate the NEA was stopped. When the bill came out of conference with the House, the NEA had been saved. As evidenced by a series of strong bipartisan votes in the Senate in favor of the NEA, my colleagues and I were able to save this national agency and preserve a Federal role for the arts.

During the Senate debate over NEA funding, I cosponsored with the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, Senator STEVENS from Alaska, a Sense-of-the-Senate resolution asking the Congress to examine alternative sources of funding for the NEA. I believe it is time to give the NEA a secure future and preserve a national cultural endowment for generations to come. My hope is that the Congress will address this issue in the future.

And so it is for these reasons that I support the Interior appropriations conference report. I commend the conferees on a job well done.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SPECTER] is necessarily absent due to a death in the family.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SPECTER] would vote "yea."

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] is necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 84, nays 14, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 283 Leg.]

YEAS—84

Abraham	Enzi	Lieberman
Akaka	Feinstein	Lott
Allard	Ford	Lugar
Baucus	Frist	Mack
Bennett	Glenn	McCain
Biden	Gorton	McConnell
Bingaman	Graham	Mikulski
Bond	Grams	Moynihan
Breaux	Grassley	Murkowski
Brownback	Gregg	Murray
Bumpers	Hagel	Nickles
Burns	Harkin	Reed
Byrd	Hatch	Reid
Campbell	Hollings	Robb
Chafee	Hutchinson	Roberts
Cleland	Hutchison	Rockefeller
Coats	Inhofe	Santorum
Cochran	Inouye	Sarbanes
Collins	Jeffords	Sessions
Conrad	Johnson	Shelby
Coverdell	Kempthorne	Smith (OR)
Craig	Kerrey	Snowe
D'Amato	Kerry	Stevens
Daschle	Kyl	Thomas
DeWine	Landrieu	Thompson
Dodd	Lautenberg	Thurmond
Domenici	Leahy	Torricelli
Dorgan	Levin	Warner

NAYS—14

Ashcroft	Durbin	Gramm
Boxer	Faircloth	Helms
Bryan	Feingold	

Kohl	Roth	Wellstone
Moseley-Braun	Smith (NH)	Wyden

NOT VOTING—2

Kennedy	Specter
---------	---------

The conference report was agreed to. Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the conference report was agreed to.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

RECESS UNTIL 2:15 P.M.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, at 12:57 p.m., the Senate recessed until 2:14 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. HAGEL).

Mr. LOTT addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished majority leader.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there now be a period for the transaction of morning business for the next 30 minutes with Senators permitted to speak for up to 5 minutes each.

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

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. LOTT. For the information of all Senators, we are now in the process of taking a look at D.C. appropriations bill papers on both sides of the aisle. We hope that within the next hour or so we will be able to go to the D.C. appropriations bill.

Also, it is our intent, as I have advised the Democratic leader, this afternoon to call up the DOD, Department of Defense, authorization conference report and begin the process on that bill.

So those two bills will consume the bulk of the time this afternoon. There is the possibility of recorded votes, and Senators should be aware of that.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. I further ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to speak as if in morning business.

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

CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. Mr. President, this morning the Senate was once

again blocked from considering campaign finance reform legislation. As a result, the ISTE reauthorization bill has been delayed.

What happened today was clear. Intense opposition to any consideration of campaign finance reform legislation has precluded consideration of one of the most important measures to come before the Senate this year, the ISTE reauthorization bill. ISTE has been derailed for the time being because the majority party has refused to agree to even schedule a debate on campaign finance reform. They have refused the will of a majority of the Senate to engage in a debate over an issue that goes to the very heart of our Government and our democratic process.

The 48 Senators who voted against cloture today did not vote to kill the ISTE reauthorization bill, as some have claimed. We did not cast our votes against cloture because we objected to this critically important highway and transit bill. Rather, we cast our votes against the obstructionist techniques that have been used to block debate on campaign finance reform legislation. We refused to cast our votes to end debate because there has, as of yet, not been debate over campaign finance reform.

Several weeks ago, the Senate engaged in a mock debate over the issue. It was not a real debate. Not a single amendment was offered. Not a single vote was taken. It is the business of the Senate to consider amendments and vote on issues and debate concerns of the American people. None of that has happened. It was as undemocratic a debate as I have yet seen in the Senate, and I know that the American people expect more from us.

They are frustrated and disillusioned with the current election process. We need to get Americans back into the system and get them involved in decisions that affect their lives. We need campaign finance reform to restore the American people's faith in the electoral process. Too many people believe that the current system cuts them off from their Government.

A League of Women Voters study found that one of the top three reasons people do not vote at all is the belief that their vote will not make a difference. We saw the result of that cynicism in 1994 when just 38 percent of all registered voters headed to the polls. We saw it again in 1996 when only 49 percent of the voting age population turned out to vote, the lowest percentage of Americans to go to the polls in 72 years.

According to a Gallup poll conducted early this month, 59 percent of Americans believe that elections are generally for sale to the candidate who can raise the most money. When you consider how much money it costs to finance a modern campaign, you can understand the frustration. According to recent Federal Election Commission figures, congressional candidates spent a total of \$765.3 million in the 1996 elections, which was up 5.5 percent from

the record-setting 1994 level of \$725.2 million.

That figure does not include the huge amounts of so-called soft money spent by the political parties. In the first 6 months of the 1997-98 election cycle, \$35.4 million in soft money contributions to political parties was raised, outpacing the same period in the 1995-96 cycle.

I would take a step further to remind my colleagues that there is even softer money than that with the independent expenditures and, of course, individual, wealthy people just write themselves a check and send themselves a thank you note, and that goes into the system. It is no wonder that Americans are clamoring for campaign finance reform. It is no wonder they believe their voices are overshadowed by special interests with the ability to fill campaign coffers. It is disheartening, Mr. President, that the majority has denied us the opportunity to debate this issue. It is more disheartening that they have denied us the chance to debate legislation to help keep the doors of democracy open for all Americans. They have refused to enter into a dialog with the American people about the contorted rules which govern campaigns, and about the urgent need to reform the system. They have refused a most reasonable request from a majority of Senators—an agreement that the Senate will take up consideration of campaign finance reform legislation, under normal procedures and normal rules, with amendments and votes and deliberations on the issues, sometime next year.

Mr. President, we did not cast our votes today against cloture because we are confident that the McCain-Feingold campaign finance reform legislation could be enacted into law, or because every one of us thinks it is the "end-all, be-all" of campaign finance reform legislation, but because we believe it is imperative that the Senate engage in a real debate over this issue. We believe the Senate has a responsibility to consider this issue. We believe that what has happened here over the last several weeks as parliamentary blockage after parliamentary blockade has been erected in front of efforts to debate campaign finance reform has been an abrogation of the democratic process.

It is the business of the Senate to debate measures, offer up amendments, and vote on issues, and the Senate has done none of the above with respect to campaign finance reform.

It appears that, for the moment, the majority has succeeded in blocking debate over campaign finance reform legislation. I have no doubt, however, that this issue will ultimately come up, if for no other reason than the American people are fed up and frustrated with the current system.

It also appears that, for the moment, the majority has derailed consideration of the ISTEA reauthorization bill. Let there be no illusions, however, that ISTEA is dead. It is not dead. This legis-

lation is too important to simply wither. It will be taken up for consideration and we will enact legislation to provide our States and communities with at least the \$180 billion in highway and transit funds that this legislation promises.

I must admit that I have mixed feelings about delaying consideration of ISTEA. For my State of Illinois, and indeed, for the Nation's transportation system, delay may give us an opportunity to rework some of the provisions of the current ISTEA reauthorization bill that inadequately treat those regions of the country that are essential to the movement of our Nation's commerce.

For the most part, I believe the authors of this ISTEA reauthorization bill have done an excellent job crafting a bill that strengthens many environmental provisions, allows States greater flexibility to support Amtrak, increases funding for a variety of safety initiatives, increases funding for intelligent transportation systems, and preserves the Department of Transportation's important DBE program. It is a bill that preserves many of the most important aspects of the original ISTEA, and that strengthens many other important provisions, and I commend them for their hard work and diligent efforts in this regard.

This ISTEA reauthorization bill, however, fails to allocate funds in a manner that adequately meets the needs of our Nation's intermodal transportation system. It does not recognize and provide sufficient funds to areas of the Nation that are responsible for the majority of our Nation's commercial traffic. It does not adequately address the relationship between transportation and our economy.

In 1991, when Congress enacted ISTEA, we stated:

It is the policy of the United States to develop and National Intermodal Transportation System that is economically efficient and environmentally sound, provides the foundation for the Nation to compete in the global economy, and will move people and goods in an energy efficient manner. . . . The National Intermodal Transportation System must be the centerpiece of a national investment commitment to create the new wealth of the Nation for the 21st century.

That is what the authors of the original legislation stated as a goal. If the next ISTEA does not follow this important declaration, if it does not provide adequate funding to maintain and improve the corridors and areas that are responsible for our Nation's commerce, the effects of our negligence will ripple throughout every sector of our economy.

My home State of Illinois serves as the transportation hub for our Nation's commerce. It is home to the world's busiest airport and two of the world's busiest rivers. It is where the Nation's freight railroads come together to move goods from one side of the country to the other. It is the center of the Nation's truck traffic. If you add up the value of all truck shipments in the

Nation, Illinois' has by far the largest share of any State. If you count the ton-miles of truck shipments that pass through States on their way to their final destinations, Illinois has by far the largest share of any State.

Illinois' roads, therefore, must bear the weight of the largest share of the Nation's commercial activity. The ISTEA reauthorization bill does not recognize the burden this responsibility places on our roads. According to a recent study from the Surface Transportation Policy Project, Illinois has the second worst urban roads in the country. The newspapers all report headlines like: "Illinois Roads in Shambles"; "Highways on road to ruin"; "Illinois' roads among the worst in the Nation"; "Roads in dismal shape."

These headlines are not surprising when you consider that Chicago is the Nation's largest intermodal hub. It is literally the transportation nexus of the Nation. It is only appropriate, therefore, that the national Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act recognize this fact and adequately provide for the enormous needs that go along with our status as the transportation hub of the Nation.

Mr. President, I am confident that when the Senate does take up the ISTEA reauthorization bill, we will be able to work together on a solution that provides funds to areas with the greatest needs. I am also confident that the Senate will ultimately take up, consider, and enact serious campaign finance reform legislation. These issues are simply too important for there to be any other outcome.

I yield the floor.

THE IRAN MISSILE PROLIFERATION SANCTIONS ACT OF 1997

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I am joining a large bipartisan group of Senators in cosponsoring S. 1311, the Iran Missile Proliferation Sanctions Act of 1997.

This bill addresses one of the most pressing national security problems we face—Iran's efforts to acquire technology that will enable it to build weapons of mass destruction. Certain Russian entities have engaged in some level of cooperation with Iran, and, while the Russian Government does not appear to be aware of these activities, the effect is the same—putting very dangerous technology in the hands of a regime that intends to destabilize.

Mr. President, all Americans share the goal of stopping these technology transfers, but there are clear differences on how to achieve it. The administration has launched an aggressive diplomatic onslaught, pressing the Russian Government to do all it can to halt these activities. Vice President Gore and Secretary of State Albright are fully engaged in this effort. In addition, the President has appointed top diplomat and former Ambassador