

many other Americans, he later changed his mind as to whether our continued military interest in Vietnam served the national interest. After leaving the Foreign Service, he supported, in 1971-72, the centrist presidential campaign of Edmund Muskie. Mr. Lake was not a member of the Center for National Security Studies, and did not "help found" it, as has recently been charged. Mr. Lake's connection with the Institute of Policy Studies was that at the invitation of an acquaintance he delivered a single lecture to an IPS seminar on Washington's government institutions.

We currently live in an extraordinarily complex world, in which our national security concerns are no longer focused on a single country and a single movement. In this world we need a director of central intelligence who is able to see the whole picture and can then identify the multiple concerns which require our special attention. We also need a director who can incisively analyze the material presented to him by his staff, can spot the flaws and insufficiencies and see to it that a superior, thoroughly reliable product emerges from the process. Finally, we need a director who combines professional integrity with personal decency. Having seen Tony Lake at work, I am confident that he meets all of these criteria.

Mr. GRAHAM. 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.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

WILLIAM RANDOLPH HEARST FOUNDATION SENATE YOUTH PROGRAM

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate immediately proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 60, which was reported by the Judiciary Committee today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 60) to commend students who have participated in the William Randolph Hearst Foundation Senate Youth Program between 1962 and 1997.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, before I begin my remarks on the sense-of-the-Senate resolution before us today, I would like to express my appreciation to my colleagues, Senator KAY BAILEY HUTCHISON of Texas and Senator WYDEN of Oregon, who joined me in introducing this measure earlier this week.

I am also very grateful for the fact that a number of Senators from both sides of the aisle have subsequently expressed their support for this effort by cosponsoring this resolution.

I would like to finally thank Senator HATCH and Senator LEAHY, the chair-

man and ranking minority members of the Senate Judiciary Committee, who have very graciously allowed us to bring this resolution to the Senate floor quickly while the 1997 U.S. Senate Youth Program delegates are still here in Washington visiting.

Senate Resolution 60 pays tribute to the 3,600 students who have participated in the U.S. Senate Youth Program over the last 35 years.

Under this program, which has been very successfully administered by the William Randolph Hearst Foundation, two students from every State of the Nation, the District of Columbia, and the Department of Defense schools abroad are selected to spend a week right here in Washington learning about their Federal Government.

Typically, each year the delegates meet with Senators, Representatives, Supreme Court Justices, Cabinet members, White House personnel, and other officials, and have the opportunity to ask them questions directly and to offer comments or concerns on current events.

Earlier this week, I had the pleasure of addressing the 1997 delegates. It was a very enjoyable and memorable event for me for two reasons. First, the questions and the comments raised by the delegates were both timely and insightful. Their knowledge was impressive and their enthusiasm contagious.

Second, I have the honor and the privilege of being the first Senate youth delegate who has gone on to actually serve in the Senate. I still remember vividly when I visited Washington, DC, in the spring of 1971, more than 25 years ago. We met with various Representatives and Senators, including my colleagues, Senator ROBERT BYRD and Senator STROM THURMOND, both of whom I am now privileged to serve with in this body. In fact, I brought out my journal and I read my notes on both Senators' speeches to us, and it was a wonderful experience to reread and relive that week.

The high point of my visit, however, was the time that I was fortunate to spend with Maine's Senator Margaret Chase Smith. She was very much an inspiration and a role model for me and countless other girls growing up in Maine and young women throughout the Nation who aspire to public service.

While I am the first Senate youth delegate to serve in the Senate, I fully expect that there will be other delegates who will serve one day in the House, the Senate, on the Supreme Court, in the Cabinet, and even as President of the United States.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this resolution, which recognizes the value of this program, salutes the individual students who have participated in it, and commends the William Randolph Hearst Foundation for its generous sponsorship over the years.

At this point, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution

be agreed to, that the preamble be agreed to, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating to the resolution appear at this point in the RECORD.

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

The resolution was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution (S. Res. 60), with its preamble, is as follows:

S. RES. 60

Whereas the continued success of our Nation's constitutional democracy is dependent upon our Nation's youth striving toward higher goals;

Whereas a student's intelligence, determination, perseverance and continued interest in the workings of our Nation's political processes must be nurtured and encouraged;

Whereas the pursuit of higher education, and participation and interest in the political processes, remain priorities of young citizens around our Nation; and

Whereas the United States Senate and the William Randolph Hearst Foundation Senate Youth Program have provided high school juniors and seniors who are leaders in education and student government, as well as in their communities, with the opportunity to travel to their Nation's capital and witness the political process, supported solely by private funds with no expense to the Federal Government since the program's inception in 1962: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate hereby congratulate, honor, and pay tribute to the 3,600 exemplary students who have been selected, on their merit, to participate in the William Randolph Hearst Foundation Senate Youth Program between 1962 and 1997.

Ms. COLLINS. I thank the Chair.

Mr. WELLSTONE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I might be able to speak for 10 minutes.

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

Mr. WELLSTONE. I thank the Chair.

CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, we have had a lot of focus in the media about money and politics, and we are involved in a debate here on the Rules Committee about the Government Operations Committee and the scope of the inquiry. I thought I would speak in this Chamber for a few moments about what I think is the most important issue in American politics. I guess I want to start out by saying to colleagues, Democrats and Republicans alike, and to people in the country, if what happens in the Congress is that you just have accusations going back and forth and the climate becomes really poisonous, I fear we will not do anything right.

I really do believe that this is the core issue of American politics. I think the ethical issue of our time is the way in which money has come to dominate politics. I do not think it is so much the wrongdoing of individual officeholders. As a matter of fact, Mr. President, I have said it in debates, I have

said it in interviews: The whole system is inappropriate. The whole system is inappropriate. It needs to be turned not upside down—it is upside down right now—but right side up.

If we are going to talk about any kind of corruption, it is not the wrongdoing of individual officeholders. We are talking about something far more serious. It is systemic corruption. By systemic corruption, I mean we now have reached the point where too few people have way too much wealth, power and say, too much access, too much say by virtue of their economic resources and their big contributions, and the vast majority of people feel left out of the loop.

That is the fundamental issue. To most people in the country, the vast majority of people in the country, it is really clear:

First, too much money is spent in these campaigns;

Second, there is too much special interest access and influence as a result of the money spent;

Third, too much time is spent by all of us—all of us—in what can be described as a money chase, trying to raise money because you are running for office; and

Fourth, regular people, ordinary citizens, which I do not use in a pejorative sense but in a positive way, do not feel they can run for office.

Mr. President, we are talking about nothing less than the question of whether or not we are going to have a real representative democracy. We have now really gotten to the point—and I am not going to use all the terms such as “independent expenditures” and “soft money” and “hard money.” Let me just make a more basic point. We are talking much more about auctions than elections. We are not even talking about authentic democracy anymore. It is a minidemocracy at best. If you believe that each person should count as one and no more than one, and you believe in equality and you believe in fair and open elections, people in the country know this is all trumped by big money.

It is time for reform. It is time for reform. It is time to get big money out of politics. There are a lot of proposals. Some of us really believe you ought not to have any private money in the system and that ultimately, absolutely is the way to go. Some focus on other legislation. Some focus on soft money.

I just want to make this clear, that we are going to be making a huge mistake, all of us are going to be making a huge mistake if we do not pass a major reform bill this Congress. We are going to make a huge mistake if the only thing this boils down to is just sort of piling acquisitions on accusations and people going after one another. If this becomes a kind of slash-and-burn politics, search-and-destroy politics, we are going to get absolutely nowhere.

I will say this. I am only speaking for myself. I do not know how the Chair

feels. Actually, I believe, even though the argument is made often that the problem is that those in office do not really want to change the system because the system is wired toward incumbents, because we are able to raise more money than our challengers—the statistics bear that out—I think it has come to the point where all of us should hate the system, because when you are raising money and you are running for office and you have to be on television and you are trying to figure out how you are going to go after your opponent and destroy your opponent—that is the way some people view politics; they should not but they do—or you are figuring out how to raise millions of dollars so you do not get ripped up into shreds, the fact is even if you are absolutely sure in your head and your heart that not one time has the compelling need to raise money ever affected any position you have ever taken on any issue, it certainly does not look that way to the public.

I am convinced that all the good things that could happen here are trumped by money in politics. I am convinced that one of the reasons we are not responding to the very real concerns of citizens across this country, which have to do with affordable education and good jobs and the standard of living and reducing violence in communities and all the rest of it, is because of this influence of money in politics.

This is the core issue. There is too much access for the big givers and the heavy hitters and the well connected, and the vast majority of people feel left out of the loop and they are right. What concerns me is I have heard some colleagues say, “But the fact of the matter is, the polls do not show this. The polls do not show that the people seem to consider this a burning issue.”

I think what is sad is that people's expectations are so low in the country right now that they are not at all sure there is anything we are going to do about this. But we better prove ourselves to the people we are asked to represent. We better pass a reform bill. We better make sure that we dramatically reduce the amount of money that is spent in these campaigns. We better make sure we try to lessen—if you cannot eliminate it, at least lessen—special-interest access. We better make sure we do something about this constant money chase. We better make sure our elections do look like elections and not like auctions. We better make sure that people in the country, whether they are Democrats or Republicans or independents, feel like they can run for office. We better do that, because this is all about democracy.

We keep spending more and more money every election cycle, and participation goes down, down, down. So I am hopeful, even though this is a tough time in the Senate. We have major divisions. People are drawing the line. It seems to be an all-out battle. By the way, I am all for good debate. I do not

like to hate but I like debate. But I am telling you, every single one of my colleagues, Democrats and Republicans alike, are making a big mistake if we do not line up behind major reform.

We should want to do this. If we want people to at least have more confidence in the political process than they have now, if we want people to begin to believe in us, if we want people to believe in the legislation that we pass, which is a product of this process, then people have to believe that politics in Washington, DC, is not dominated by big money. People have to believe the Congress belongs to them, that the Capitol belongs to them, that all of us, Democrats and Republicans, belong to them.

I know I may sound melodramatic on the floor of the Senate, especially since today there is no one to debate. But I came to the floor to speak because I am absolutely convinced that this is the priority. There is nothing that we could do that would be more important than to try to move forward on a reform agenda. I am hoping that, in this Congress, we will do that.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and 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. GRAMS. 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. GRAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak for up to 15 minutes as in morning business.

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

THE NOMINATION OF FEDERICO PEÑA TO SERVE AS U.S. SECRETARY OF ENERGY

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, I rise today on behalf of our Nation's taxpayers and ratepayers in seeking to reaffirm the promises made to them by the Federal Government well over a decade and a half ago. Given that the Energy and Natural Resources Committee this morning reported out the nomination of Federico Peña to be the new Secretary of Energy and that full consideration by the Senate on his nomination is likely to occur soon, I find it both necessary and timely to reignite today the debate on our Nation's nuclear waste storage problem.

Since 1982, our nuclear energy ratepayers have been required to pay over 12 billion of their hard-earned dollars to the Federal Government. And that was in exchange for the promise to transport and store commercially generated nuclear waste in a centralized Federal facility by January 31, 1998.

Unfortunately, this obligation has never been met by the DOE, which has already spent over 6 billion of those ratepayer dollars, yet has little to show in exchange for that massive investment. Today, our ratepayers continue to pay into the Nuclear Waste