

digit earnings growth it had come to regard as its due. Worse, I.B.M. was gaining on E.D.S. for total contracts won and would roar past in 1996.

It was in this atmosphere that E.D.S. prepared its \$162 million bid to issue and consolidate direct loans over a five-year period. The bid was at least 50 percent lower than the one submitted by the Maryland company that had been doing the job, the CDSI/Business Applications Solutions unit of Computer Data Systems Inc. E.D.S. soon won a second five-year contract, worth \$378 million, to service the loans.

Thomas A. Green, president of the CDSI unit, said that his company had already started to see a surge in interest in the direct-loan program—and the Education Department should have known that. "We were sending out applications all the time, so it was clear that the popularity of the program was growing," Mr. Green said. "They weren't blind-sided at what it was going to be when they took over," he said of E.D.S.

Mr. Green also said his company was never as backlogged as E.D.S. has been. He said CDSI consolidated 144,000 loans in the 22 months between January 1995 and November 1996, when it finished its work. The average consolidation took 65 to 70 days, he added.

That compares with an average of 142 for E.D.S., according to Mr. Smith, the Education Department official. E.D.S. has processed about 54,000 loans since taking over last September, he told the House panel.

One of those affected by the delays is Robyn Higbee, who says she went back and forth on the phone for six months to consolidate two of her husband's law school loans totaling \$18,500. Mrs. Higbee struggled with this as the family moved from Virginia to California, her husband studied for the bar exam and started a new job, the couple bought their first home and she gave birth to a baby who required heart surgery.

"It was just something that was totally unnecessary," Mrs. Higbee, 25, said of the loan complications.

Randolph Dove, a spokesman for the company in its Washington-area office, while not familiar with the details of Mrs. Higbee's and Mrs. Elmore's cases, said that E.D.S. regretted the difficulties any students have had. "We've been working very hard and have a lot of people dedicated to resolving this," he said.

Over all, E.D.S. has recovered from its dry spell in winning contracts. I.B.M. won \$27 billion in new business last year, compared with E.D.S.'s \$8.4 billion, according to Greg Gould, a computer services analyst at Goldman, Sachs, but this year E.D.S. has already won or is close to signing \$16.4 billion worth of contracts. Also, gross margins are up for the work E.D.S. managers are bringing in—25 percent rather than the 16 percent on contracts in 1994 and 1995, Mr. Gould said. And top management has increased its control of underlings who may have been tempted to bid too low to win a contract, he added. "There's that winner's curse," he said. "You want to win and you just lower your price until you win the contract."

The prognosis for direct student loans is murkier. E.D.S. expects to have the kinks out of its system and its backlog erased by Dec. 1, Mr. Dove said. Students can then start applying once more for consolidations, he said.

But the concern over the logjam is undercutting the Government's plans to expand the program. Representative McKeon, who introduced the legislation now before the education committee, concedes that there are not enough opponents of direct loans to kill the program outright. But his bill would at least end the Government's monopoly over consolidation that restricts all students who have any direct loans.

For E.D.S.'s part, Mrs. Vance said that the publicity would not have much impact on the company's prospects. "One contract is not going to set a trend or be a deterrent for new business," she said.

The Education Department, however, is considering whether to cancel the \$378 million contract with E.D.S. for servicing the loans. Such a move could come because applications for new loans are, oddly enough, now running below expectations. A cancellation would not be related to the problems with the consolidations, a department spokesman said, adding that another company's servicing contract is also in jeopardy.

But even some of the lawmakers who mostly blame the Education Department for the program's troubles are asking whether E.D.S. should be punished by being docked part of its pay. Representative Peter Hoekstra, Republican of Michigan, said he might favor doing that.

Even without that penalty, however, E.D.S. will feel some pain, Mr. Hoekstra said, adding, "I wouldn't want to be identified as the vendor that forced the Federal Government to shut down consolidations in the direct-loan program with a backlog of 84,000 kids."

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

#### ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS—S. 1319

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of Mr. LEVIN, Mr. JEFFORDS, and Mr. LEAHY be added as cosponsors to S. 1319, a bill to repeal the Line-Item Veto Act.

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

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

#### MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, in behalf of the leader, I ask unanimous consent that there now be a period for morning business with Senators permitted to speak for up to 5 minutes each until 3 p.m..

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

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

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as if in morning business with the understanding that if the distinguished floor leader is prepared to move forward, I am prepared to yield the floor back to him for purposes of conducting his business.

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

Mr. BRYAN. I thank the Chair again.

#### NUCLEAR WASTE POLICY ACT OF 1997

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, yesterday, in perhaps the most antienvironmental vote of the Congress, the House of Representatives passed the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1997. Like the Senate bill that passed earlier this year, the House bill unfairly targets Nevada, a State with no nuclear reactors, as the final destination for 80,000 metric tons of high-level nuclear waste produced by the U.S. commercial nuclear utilities, most of which are located in the East.

The central feature of the bill passed by the House yesterday, like the Senate bill, is the establishment of so-called interim storage of high-level commercial nuclear waste at the Nevada test site, about 80 miles north of the metropolitan Las Vegas area, an area that comprises some 1 million citizens.

Like its Senate counterpart, the House bill tramples on decades of environmental policy, ignores public health and safety and exposes the American taxpayer to billions of dollars in cost to solve the private industry's waste problem.

Fortunately, the President has indicated that he will veto either version of this misguided legislation. We have secured the votes in the Senate to sustain President Clinton's veto.

While yesterday's House vote falls slightly short of the number required to sustain a veto in the House, we are still within striking distance of the required number, and I believe that in the end this bill has little or no chance of becoming law.

As I have discussed many times here on the Senate floor, the nuclear power industry's legislation is nothing but corporate pork, plain and simple. It is a bailout for a dying industry at the expense of both the pocketbooks and the health and safety of the American public.

Nevada, as the industry's chosen destination for its waste, has obvious objections to this legislation. But, Mr. President, other regions are also rightfully concerned with the potential impact on their citizens. Under this legislation, in just a few short years, 16,000 shipments of toxic, high-level nuclear waste will be transported by rail and highway through 43 States. More than 50 million Americans live within 1 mile of the proposed rail and truck routes.

The bill requires the transportation of waste through many of our largest

metropolitan centers and provides no assurance that funds will be available to provide training and equipment for emergency responders.

Moreover, the bill makes a mockery of our Nation's environmental protection laws. It ignores the National Environmental Protection Act and would take precedence over nearly every local, State or Federal environmental statute or ordinance, including, among others, the Clean Air Act, the Clean Water Act, the Safe Drinking Water Act, and many more. It establishes radiation protection standards far lower than in any other Federal program and in complete contradiction to internationally accepted thresholds.

The bill provides little or no public input or comment by affected communities or individuals and establishes a whole new set of unreachable deadlines, repeating the very mistakes Congress made in 1982 with the original Nuclear Waste Policy Act.

All of this—the trampling of our environmental laws, the billions of dollars in subsidy to the nuclear power industry, and the grave threat to the health and safety of millions of Americans—is completely unnecessary. Nuclear utilities can and do store waste safely on site at reactors. In fact, the very same storage technology that the legislation contemplates using at the Nevada test site is currently used at reactor sites around the country, with many more sites soon to follow. No reactor in the United States has ever closed for lack of storage.

Despite the scare tactics of the nuclear power industry, there is no storage crisis. Objective scientific experts agree that there is no storage crisis. The Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board, an independent oversight board created by the Congress, found in March of 1996, and repeated again this year, that there is no compelling technical or safety reason to move spent fuel to a centralized interim facility for the next few years. Nevertheless, the nuclear power industry has been relentless in its efforts to move its waste to Nevada as soon as humanly possible, no matter what the consequences.

Mr. President, we will continue to do whatever we can to stop this legislation from passing. With a firm veto threat in place and without the votes to override the veto, I encourage the leadership of both the Senate and the House of Representatives to stop this exercise in futility. Stop wasting Congress' time on ill-founded legislation that stands little or no chance of being enacted.

The American people deserve more from us than wasting our time on billion-dollar subsidies for an industry that has spent too long already at the public trough.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

#### CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, I came over to speak on a beautiful, lazy Friday afternoon—that is one of the times you can get the floor without having to sit around too long—and talk about three or four items that I have just been reflecting on—nothing heavy.

But to take up campaign finance reform first, that issue has had the Senate tied in knots, now, for about 6 weeks, so tied in knots that we are not going to be able to finish the work that we ought to finish, particularly on the highway transportation bill, and that is a real tragedy. Nevertheless, I have felt very strongly about this issue for a long time, so strongly that earlier this year I introduced my own bill to provide for public financing of campaigns.

I think I could probably say without fear of contradiction—and at my age I am not likely to live long enough to see this country go to public financing—and yet in my opinion that is the only solution: If you take all private money out of financing of campaigns in this country then you know that any private money in a campaign is a violation.

Senator THOMPSON has just announced—essentially announced—the shutting down of the hearings on campaign finance reform. Nobody's fault—I thought Senator THOMPSON did a credible job. I thought all the members of the committee did. But there really was not very much there, except occasional abuses, cases of neglect, inattention, and heavy partisanship, but very little in a way that could remotely be construed as illegal. Yet, for all the abuses—and there were some—uncovered and testified to and about during those hearings, there is not any strong sentiment here to change the system under which those abuses occurred. If we do nothing this year, we do nothing next year, you can rest assured the abuses will continue.

I come from the Democratic Party. Of course, when it comes to raising money, we are a threatened species. But completely aside from the politics of the issue—and the fact is that the Republicans outraise us—I think our Democratic National Committee is in debt by \$15 million. I saw a big story in the paper this morning that the Democratic National Committee was going to raise \$2.5 million at a retreat in Florida this weekend, and the story acted as though there was something ominous and maybe certainly unethical about it. But it didn't seem that way to me at all, not under the existing system. There is nothing wrong with people giving \$50,000 a couple to attend a weekend retreat. That is a pretty steep price, but people do it every weekend in both parties. The price is just not normally that high.

But I also feel that as long as we allow that sort of thing to continue, we are effectively selling off the Government to the highest bidder. I said on the floor, and it bears repeating, you cannot expect a democracy to function as it is supposed to function when money plays the role it plays in our campaigns. So, I hope that, come next March or whenever they have agreed to, if there has been such an agreement, that we can address the McCain-Feingold bill. I am a cosponsor of the bill, but I must say it pales compared to what I think ought to be done, namely go to public financing and take private money out of it.

I saw a list in the Washington Post yesterday of all the incumbents and how much money they had in the bank and how much the challengers had. And the incumbents are all friends of mine. This is not to belittle them. They are simply taking advantage of the system as it is. But the incumbents have millions in the bank and the challengers had virtually nothing. As a country lawyer from a town of 1,200 people who jumped up from a private practice to run for Governor—which most people considered insane, trying to get me to submit to a saliva test—believe you me, I know the power of incumbency and I faced it.

In the first primary, I spent \$90,000. You couldn't get on the evening news for a week for that today.

I don't want to get too preachy about it. This is something you can get preachy about. But the fact is, I see campaign finance reform now in a different way than I saw it even as recently as 2 or 3 years ago. I see it now as a real threat to this Nation. It is no longer, at least it should not be, a partisan matter. It is, and it shouldn't be, because everybody's future is at stake.

I saw in the paper this morning where one of the candidates in Virginia is going to be given \$1 million by his party. I saw last week where one of the candidates for SUSAN MOLINARI's spot, I guess it is in New York, that one of the parties is dumping \$800,000 into that campaign and that person's opponent had \$35,000 in the bank. You don't have to be brilliant to know how those races are going to come out. Television does it all and you cannot get on television without money. That is what these massive contributions are all about.

Whoever has the most money 94 percent of the time wins. You can hardly call that a democracy because, as I say, it is threatening.

#### REDUCING THE DEFICIT

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, there is a lot of talk now since the President has announced that the deficit this year for 1997 is, I believe, \$22.6 billion. That is an incredible figure. In 1993, you are looking at a Senator who was genuinely concerned, really concerned, not just concerned, alarmed about where we were heading with these massive deficits of \$290 billion a year, and