

years to negotiate. So why not embrace the strong treaty we have now and make the best use of it?

Failure to ratify this treaty will have serious negative consequences for the United States. We would cede our longstanding international leadership on multilateral arms control issues and lose influence over the way the CWC is implemented. And, ironically, the U.S. chemical industry, which strongly supports the treaty and which participated in the negotiations leading up to it, would be subject to trade restrictions that could cost it up to \$600 million a year in sales.

However, the greatest consequence of failure to ratify the CWC would be that U.S. military forces would be placed at increased risk of poison gas attack.

In fiscal year 1997, the United States will spend over \$800 million on chemical and biological weapons defenses. This is money well spent. Our troops must be prepared to deal with this horrible threat. However, it would be folly to spend these funds without doing something concrete to reduce the long-term threat posed by chemical weapons.

Mr. President, veterans groups and military associations have spoken with a clear voice. They want the scourge of chemical weapons eliminated and agree that the Chemical Weapons Convention advances this goal. Let's not ignore their pleas. Let's ratify the Chemical Weapons Convention as soon as possible so that we can get down to the business of rolling back chemical arms programs worldwide.

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 Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. COLLINS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is now closed.

#### AUTHORIZING EXPENDITURES BY THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 39, which the clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 39) authorizing expenditures by the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with an amendment to strike all

after the resolving clause and insert the following:

That (a) Senate Resolution 54, agreed to February 13, 1997, is amended by adding at the end the following:

#### "AUTHORIZATION OF ADDITIONAL FUNDS

"SEC. 24. (a) IN GENERAL.—A sum equal to not more than \$4,350,000, for the period beginning on the date of adoption of this section and ending on December 31, 1997, shall be made available from the contingent fund of the Senate out of the Account for Expenses for Inquiries and Investigations for payment of salaries and other expenses of the Committee on Governmental Affairs under this resolution, of which amount not to exceed \$375,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended). The expenditures by the Committee on Governmental Affairs authorized by this section supplement those authorized in section 13 and may be expended solely for the purpose stated in this section.

"(b) PURPOSE OF ADDITIONAL FUNDS.—The additional funds authorized by this section are for the sole purpose of conducting an investigation of illegal activities in connection with 1996 Federal election campaigns.

"(c) REFERRAL TO SELECT COMMITTEE ON ETHICS.—The Committee on Governmental Affairs shall refer any evidence of illegal activities involving any Member of the Senate revealed pursuant to the investigation authorized by subsection (b) to the Select Committee on Ethics.

"(d) FINAL REPORT.—The Committee on Governmental Affairs shall submit a final public report to the Senate no later than January 31, 1998, of the results of the investigation, study, and hearings conducted by the Committee pursuant to this section."

(b) Section 16(b) of Senate Resolution 54, agreed to February 13, 1997, is amended by—

(1) striking "\$1,339,109" and inserting "\$1,789,109"; and

(2) striking "\$200,000" and inserting "\$300,000".

(c) The Committee on Rules and Administration shall continue to conduct hearings on campaign reform.

Mr. WARNER. Madam President, on Thursday of last week, the Rules Committee reported out an amendment to Senate Resolution 39, and it is my understanding that the present business is that pending amendment, which does amend, if decided by the Senate, rule 39.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WARNER. Madam President, I thank the Chair. We will now proceed to discuss the amendment as passed by the Rules Committee on Thursday of last week, the 6th of March.

Madam President, the responsibility of the Rules Committee is to entertain, from all committees of the U.S. Senate, their requests for funding. We have, in Senate Resolution 54, which has been adopted by the Senate, the budgets for all of the committees of the Senate for their fiscal year, which runs from March 1 through February 28.

The Committee on Governmental Affairs, in Senate Resolution 39, submitted their request for funding. In the initial consideration of Senate Resolution 39 by the Rules Committee, the committee determined that they would

grant a portion of the funding request, and that is reflected in Senate Resolution 54.

The Governmental Affairs Committee still had, under Senate Resolution 39, the balance of their request, which was considered on the 6th of March by the Rules Committee. After a full debate—and certainly in the judgment of the chairman, myself, and actively participated in by Senators on both sides, as we had nearly 100 percent attendance at the committee hearing on both sides—the committee voted to provide \$4.35 million for the Committee on Governmental Affairs as a supplemental to the request as reported in Senate Resolution 54.

Now, how did we arrive at that figure? You can look at the request of the distinguished Senator from Ohio—indeed, a request that, by and large, was supported by most on that side of the aisle—that there be a definitive date for cutoff, and that date by the senior Senator from Ohio was December 31 of this calendar year, 1997.

If I took that and viewed it as a reduced period of time; namely, that the Governmental Affairs Committee could begin its work using the supplemental funds, March 15, from a practical standpoint, through December 31, 1997, it would appear to this Senator that we would have, by and large, given that committee the funding profile in dollars in proportion to the timing from which those funds may be expended.

The next question was the scope. I worked with other colleagues, primarily those on the Rules Committee, and I devised a formula, in consultation with the distinguished majority leader and others, whereby looking at the original Watergate resolution, we took from that the concept that we would allow the Governmental Affairs Committee to expend the supplemental budget for such investigations that they felt were illegal in connection with the 1996 Presidential election and congressional elections—not delineating between the House and Senate, but simply all Federal elections in calendar year 1996.

So it seems to me that the Rules Committee, in a fair manner, recognized the dollars that we needed, gave the Governmental Affairs Committee a scope of the investigation and illegal—illegal is a very broad scope. It goes beyond. And I will at a later time today put into the RECORD the definitions of illegal. But it goes beyond just criminal assertions of allegations of criminal violations. It goes beyond that. So it is a broad scope. Then the Rules Committee took from the proposal, which the senior Senator from Ohio will address momentarily, a termination date of December 31, 1997.

In addition to the Rules Committee, I think very importantly recognizing the essential need for the Senate of the United States to actively participate in determining what happened, certainly in 1996 in connection with the ever-increasing number of allegations—most

of them regrettably could border on or do, in fact, constitute illegal—it was essential that the other committees of the Senate take on their responsibilities, which is traditional under the allocation in the Senate of the responsibilities among the several committees. Therefore, we charged the Rules Committee, of which I am privileged to be the chairman, the duty to continue its hearings on campaign finance reform, gave it a sum of \$450,000 to be used by that committee in enlarging and broadening the scope of their operations in the overall context of campaign reform and campaign financing. So the Rules Committee will take on an added role.

In addition, if there is that development by the Governmental Affairs Committee or the Rules Committee of facts which should be examined by the Ethics Committee of the U.S. Senate as those facts relate to a Member of this body, it will be incumbent upon the Ethics Committee to review any allegations we feel merit the judgment of that committee as it relates to an individual in the U.S. Senate.

So, Madam President, I feel that the Rules Committee unanimously, regrettably—bipartisan, yet unanimous among the Republicans—has addressed this tough issue, and we are here today for the purpose of amending Senate Resolution 39 such that they can have the additional funds and under a very carefully crafted and proscribed scope of activities within a time limit of December 31, 1997.

Madam President, I yield the floor so that my distinguished colleague from Ohio can present his views.

Mr. GLENN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. GLENN. Madam President, we are now into the second week in March. The Senate has been operating for approximately 2 months. I don't know that we have had much in the way of accomplishment during that time period. Certainly, there are national problems that should be addressed.

For example, we ought to be working on balancing the budget instead of just trying to pass amendments, which we tried to do, and it failed. We also have a series of problems with our health care system. Managed care may be saving money, but there is increasing evidence that it is happening at the expense of lower quality of health care. So, for uninsured Americans, that continues to be a major problem. As far as health care goes, we are going to have a debate, I guess, about partial-birth abortion.

In other areas, the stock market has gone through the roof. Unemployment is at a 25-year low. But there is concern about the future, and about Social Security and Medicare. But there are no serious proposals by the Republican majority to deal with these issues. Well, today we have an opportunity. We have an opportunity to have the possibility of beginning a serious dis-

cussion about a serious issue: the campaign finance system used by both political parties in the United States.

The American people are disgusted by what they see in campaign finance. And they should be. Along with the steady drumbeat of antigovernment ideologues, it is a major factor in America's loss of faith in our institutions of government. It is that serious. All you have to do is look at the polling data and such things as decreased participation in voting. If this trend continues, if America goes downhill because of the lack of confidence in our Federal Government, I say that we face a crisis that could literally threaten the foundation of democracy in the United States.

There is a remedy to avert this crisis, as I see it, and to begin the restoration of public support for this system of government. The remedy requires that we reform the campaign finance system. It is a wonderful place to start because it certainly needs reforming.

Will this get a serious examination by Congress, or will we get sidetracked by a partisan political circus? The jury is definitely out on that at this time. We have before us a resolution to fund a Senate investigation which, if the scope were made broader than it currently is, has enormous potential as a tool to stimulate public pressure on Congress to enact meaningful campaign finance reform, honest campaign finance reform.

Recent revelations about fundraising involving 1996 Federal races are disturbing. They involve both parties in both congressional and Presidential campaigns. The truth is that the current fundraising system, both Presidential and congressional, is scandalous. Having said that, in my opinion, most Members of Congress are honest elected officials, both over in the House and here in the Senate. They are honest elected officials trying to do a good job, albeit from different political philosophies. But that is our system. But the general public perception that money gets its way in determining policy is, indeed, true for too many.

There is a public perception that access follows money, and anybody who has been around Capitol Hill very long knows that sometimes it does. Access can alter the balance of arguments weighed by a Member and his or her staff when deciding a course of action, be it a vote on the floor or in committee, a colloquy on the Senate floor, introduction or cosponsorship of a piece of legislation, floor speech, insertion of language in a committee report, or a communication with an executive branch agency requesting an action, or the withholding of an action. But even when there is no connection whatsoever between a donation by a person to a politician and the latter's specific action as a legislator favoring that person, the perception of a payoff, even the possibility of a perception of a payoff, is corrosive to public trust in our Government. We must dispel this grow-

ing perception that Congress or parts of Congress are for sale if we are to reverse electoral apathy and restore faith in our Government. Gift bans have not done it. Honoraria bans have not done it. Only deep changes in the campaign finance system will do the job, and it will not be easy.

The question is what should be the relationship of the Governmental Affairs Committee investigation to the drive for effective bipartisan campaign finance reform? The resolution before us, S. 39, as amended by the Rules Committee, states that the supplemental funds to be given to the Governmental Affairs Committee for this investigation are for the sole purpose of an investigation into illegal activities in the 1996 Federal election campaign.

There are two things wrong with this statement of scope for the investigation. The first thing is that it is a bald-faced attempt by the Republican majority of the Rules Committee to undo a unanimous bipartisan agreement among the members of the Governmental Affairs Committee to have a broad investigation that would examine improper as well as illegal activities along with previous campaigns. Contrary to the claims of the Rules Committee chairman that his language tracks the Watergate resolution, the fact is that the Watergate resolution called for an investigation of improper and unethical activities as well as illegal ones.

I am looking at a copy of the Watergate resolution that was passed in the Senate back in 1973. It was submitted by Senator Ervin, Sam Ervin and Mike Mansfield. In part 15 on page 8, it says they are "to look into any other activities, circumstances, materials or transactions having a tendency to prove or disprove that persons, acting either individually or in combination with others, engaged in any illegal, improper, or unethical activities in connection with the Presidential election of 1972, or any campaign, canvas, or activity related to such election."

That is the language of one of the parts of what the Watergate Committee was to look into—any illegal, improper, or unethical activities in connection with the Presidential election of 1972.

The narrowing of the scope of the Governmental Affairs investigation by the Rules Committee is nothing more than a blatant pander to those elements in the Republican Party that do not wish to reform the campaign finance system and who are quite willing to scuttle the Governmental Affairs investigation if necessary to avoid creating public pressure to pass a decent bill.

How does narrowing the scope to illegal activities avoid this problem for the Republicans? The first thing to understand is that the problem with the campaign finance system is not just what politicians do that is illegal. It is what politicians do that is legal that is

an equal scandal, and it happens every single day on Capitol Hill and with both political parties.

Let me give you an example. Let us talk about soft money. That is the best example. One of the most pernicious influences in politics these days is soft money. Let me give you an example of that. Let us say Senator X, whoever it might be, solicits \$50,000 or \$500,000 in soft money from a potential donor to his or her party, ostensibly for party-building purposes, get-out-the-vote drives or the like. But the party can then turn around and use the money on an issue ad during the Senator's reelection campaign that helps him or her and hurts the opponent.

According to the Department of Justice, Senator X can even do the solicitation for that \$500,000 from his or her office because the solicitation is not for his or her campaign specifically but, rather, for the Senator's party.

This practice should be illegal, but it is not. Suppose Senator X wants a direct contribution to his or her campaign from a potential donor, direct to his personal campaign. In that case, Federal election law prohibits the donor from contributing more than \$1,000 per person, and it must be in the donor's own name.

But that same donor can go out and collect checks of \$1,000 for Senator X from everyone he knows, bundle them together, and send them to the Senator's campaign. Let us say Senator X calls from the Senator's office for those donations. If Senator X calls, he is committing an illegal act. But if Senator X calls from outside, it is OK.

Suppose Senator X is so grateful, wherever the call came from, for the donor's willingness to help that the next time the donor is in town and wants to talk to Senator X about a legislative matter he has an interest in, Senator X not only lets him into his office but he welcomes him and listens to his pitch. And suppose that Senator X is sufficiently concerned about maintaining the donor's political help that the Senator does what the donor wants on the issue and there was no discussion linking the donation to the donor's request or to the Senator's action.

In that case, there has been no bribe. But it is certainly the case that Senator X made his decision on the issue as a result of the donor having had access to the Senator, access that was based at least in part on the donation the Senator was given.

Now, suppose Senator X made the original call to the donor from the Senator's office phone instead of from an outside phone. That would be a violation of law. You cannot do that.

Let me pose the question. Which is the worst ethical lapse, making the phone call from a legally prohibited place or letting the money influence the Senator's vote? I submit that the answer is not even close. Senator X's constituents and the people generally will have been ill served if he lets

money influence his decision, and that overshadows the question of whether the phone he used was a private phone or a Government phone.

What is the point of this fictitious example? Well, the resolution before us, which limits the scope of the investigation only to illegal activities, would allow an investigation of whether Senator X committed an illegal act by using a Government phone for the direct solicitation if there was an allegation that he had done so but would allow no investigation of the contribution, and if a soft money contribution was involved, whether Senator X's party had spent that money on certain ads helpful to the Senator's campaign, a legal practice but one that should be illegal.

It is not just the independent expenditures by the major parties that is the problem. There are also the independent expenditures by outside private groups including tax-exempt organizations that should be investigated for possible collusion with party organizations. The Washington Post had an article yesterday concerning nonprofits. To quote them: "Mysterious organizations that funded a flurry of attack ads at the end of the 1996 election," that were targeted mainly against Democratic candidates. No one apparently knows who supports them. One group, the Coalition for Our Children's Future, spent \$700,000 on ads, mailings, phone banks, to help Republican candidates from Louisiana to California.

Another group, Citizens for Reform, spent \$2 million on ads, including a mailing labeling a Democratic candidate for Congress as sexist and anticonsumer. And this organization is tax exempt. They are not supposed to deal in political matters. In the case of tax-exempt organizations, collusion with a political party would be illegal but would not involve criminal penalties. In the case of a so-called 501(c)(3) tax-exempt organization, which is prohibited from engaging in political activity, there is the question of whether the placing of certain issue ads should be considered political activity under certain circumstances.

Will this be investigated by the Governmental Affairs Committee under the funding resolutions' current scope statement? That will depend on how the word "illegal" is interpreted. I must say, at several points along the way we have had different interpretations of that word.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Washington Post article be printed in the RECORD at the end of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. GLENN. That is only the beginning of the problems with this resolution. It also requires that if any evidence of illegality is discovered in the 1996 campaign activities of a Member of Congress by a Member of Congress, then such evidence is to be referred to the Ethics Committee.

Does that mean the committee's investigation is to be terminated at that point? And, if the evidence comes to the attention of the committee before an investigation has even been initiated, does that mean the committee is to defer to the Ethics Committee for the investigation of the Member? Does referral to the Ethics Committee mean that Governmental Affairs will defer to the Ethics Committee on any possible criminal referral to the Department of Justice? We need answers to all of those things, obviously.

What if we are into an investigation and there is something that pops up that looks as though it might be an ethical matter and might be illegal, which this committee would be permitted to deal with? Since there is this special provision with regard to ethics in the Senate, in referring it to the Ethics Committee, do we have to stop any investigation before anything comes out beyond a point where there has been just an allegation of illegality?

So, let me return to the question of the meaning of the word "illegal" in the resolution. What is the standard to be used by the Governmental Affairs Committee to determine that an activity involves an illegality and is therefore subject to an investigation? Is illegality meant to be equivalent to criminality? Or is it broader and includes activities that are in violation of law but subject to only civil penalties or no penalties at all? The answer to this question will determine whether the activities of tax-exempt organizations engaged in political activity will be investigated.

I believe the questions I am raising need to be answered during this debate so Members will know precisely what they are voting on when the time comes. These questions also need to be answered in order to examine whether the 54 subpoenas issued thus far by the chairman of the Governmental Affairs Committee are within the new scope of the investigation.

Let me turn to some other deficiencies in the resolution. These are also deficiencies of omission. My remarks stem once again from my belief that a balanced investigation of fundraising by both parties, highlighting legal transgressions as well as their legal but ethically dubious fundraising activities, could be effective in pointing the way toward real reform. Conversely, an unbalanced, partisan investigation suggesting that the problems lie solely or even mainly with one party would be destructive to forging a consensus and would lead to political games, possibly including an attempt to pass reform legislation crafted not so much to fix the system as to give one party a fundraising advantage over the other.

As the ranking Democrat on Governmental Affairs, I have urged the chairman of the Governmental Affairs Committee to follow standard Senate practices and enter into a written agreement that the investigation will be

carried out in a bipartisan manner with an agreed-upon agenda and with fairness. That involves ensuring that both the majority and minority: have contemporaneous access to all documentary evidence received by the committee; have the right to be given adequate advance notice of, to be present at, and to participate equally in all depositions and investigatory interviews; have equal opportunity to obtain and present relevant evidence on the subjects of the committee's inquiry; and, are treated equally and without discrimination in the discharge of the committee's administrative responsibilities.

I regret to say that no agreement on these matters has been reached thus far. This has most egregiously shown up in the way subpoenas have been handled thus far.

I am hopeful that passage of a funding resolution for the committee's investigation will be the occasion to put this investigation back on a bipartisan track. I believe that failure to do so will redound to the credit of no one and mark the first major stain on this committee's record of bipartisan cooperation during my 22-year tenure on it.

Finally, I must comment on that part of the resolution that provides for authorization of some \$450,000 in additional funds for the Rules Committee to examine those aspects of campaign fundraising that are outside the scope of the Governmental Affairs Committee's investigation under the terms of this resolution as currently written. It is certainly true that the Rules Committee has legislative jurisdiction over campaign finance reform and, therefore, can look into soft money and independent expenditures, among other things, as policy matters.

But the Rules Committee is not basically an investigative committee. I could not recall the last time it ever issued a subpoena. We made some inquiry into this and found that no subpoenas have been issued by the committee since at least 1980. We do not know whether any were before that time or not. They may do hearings, but that is not the same as an investigation as conceived under this resolution.

Let us not deceive the public about this. Recent press reports clearly indicated that at least two members of the Rules Committee, Republican members of the Rules Committee, would not vote for the funding resolution for the investigation that originally came out of the Governmental Affairs Committee because the scope of the investigation would have included legal as well as illegal congressional fundraising practices. Those Members were concerned that the result of such an investigation might be to raise public pressure on Congress to pass campaign finance reform legislation.

The fact is, there is little support for campaign reform among my Republican colleagues. The McCain-Feingold bill has only one other Republican cosponsor, and that is Senator THOMPSON,

to his credit. So we know what game is being played with the Rules Committee rewrite of the previously-agreed-to scope of the Governmental Affairs Committee's investigation. It is a game in which legal but improper congressional fundraising is kept off the table while a parade of Presidential fundraisers for the Democratic Party and the Clinton-Gore campaign are brought before the cameras at televised hearings, to give the impression that all the problems are with the Democratic Party and there is no need to change the laws.

I do not believe it will work. I do not believe the American people are that naive. I believe they will see through such a strategy were it to unfold. Chairman THOMPSON has said congressional fundraising should be on the table. I agree with him. That is one of the reasons I was disappointed when none of his first 65 subpoenas were directed toward congressional fundraising. I and my Democratic colleagues will attempt to broaden the scope to include legal activities that are improper, which is where many of the major campaign finance problems are, and which should be thoroughly investigated by the Governmental Affairs Committee. So, I hope—in fact I invite Chairman THOMPSON to join me in co-sponsoring an amendment I plan to offer to broaden the scope, and I invite him to join me in voting against tabling any such amendment.

I also invite all Members of the Senate, Democratic and Republican, who truly want to change our system to join us.

Let us look at it from your children's perspective of 20 years from now. Whichever party is in the majority—and that may have changed in that time, maybe before that—but look at your children as adults out there, taking part in the political system at that time. Whichever party is in the majority at that time, I am sure we can all hope that political fundraising will not be the mess that it is today. One way to gain that end is to assure that investigations are carried out now without fear or favor and spotlighting the dark corners, whether illegal or legal, but in either event, wrong, improper, and unethical.

The resolution before us does not take us in that direction, and that is why I also urge Senator THOMPSON, even if we fail to pass such an amendment, to seek every opportunity at our committee level to examine and thoroughly investigate any alleged illegal fundraising activities by Members of Congress, in the House or Senate. That will at least be a start, and I pledge my full support to such efforts.

So I await with interest his proposed agenda and subpoenas in this area.

At the appropriate time today, before we finish this debate, I will have an amendment to submit. I would like to lay it down this evening. I doubt all the people on either side of the aisle who wish to speak on the amendment

will return before we go out of session, but I would like to have time later on to submit the amendment before we go out of session this evening.

I yield the floor.

#### EXHIBIT 1

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 9, 1997]  
FOR THEIR TARGETS, MYSTERY GROUPS' ADS  
HIT LIKE ATTACKS FROM NOWHERE

(By Charles R. Babcock and Ruth Marcus)

Campaign watchdog groups and government regulators are concerned about the emergence of mysterious organizations that funded a flurry of attack ads at the end of the 1996 election and could play an even larger role in coming campaigns.

The groups, with bland names such as Citizens for Reform and the Republic Education Fund, spent millions of dollars on television advertising, mailings and telephone banks in the closing weeks of the campaign, mostly on the side of the Republicans. None of their activities was reported to the Federal Election Commission (FEC).

"The public has no idea who these people are or where they're coming from or who funds them," said Charles Lewis, executive director of the Center for Public Integrity, which monitors political ethics. "They are trying to influence the political process and the public is in the dark."

For example, a group called the Coalition for Our Children's Future spent more than \$700,000 on television and radio ads, mailings, and telephone banks to bolster GOP candidates in key races from Louisiana to California.

The last-minute onslaught, financed in part by a donor who demanded a written confidentiality agreement, was conducted without the knowledge or approval of the group's directors. Two of the directors resigned in protest after The Washington Post informed them of the late ads, saying they never approved the expenditures. They said they still do not know exactly what was done or the source of funding.

Former director Deborah Steelman, a GOP lobbyist, said she thought the group had been inactive since spending more than \$4 million on advertising backing the GOP's legislative agenda in 1995. "Clearly, the organization created another mission of which we were not a part," she said.

Like the more identifiable AFL-CIO and environmental groups that also ran advertising, leaders of organizations such as the coalition say their television commercials were not political because they did not explicitly endorse a candidate. Since they were engaging in "issue advocacy," they said, they were not required to report to the FEC the source of their funds or how much they spent.

One group created last spring and calling itself Citizens for Reform spent \$2 million in the closing days, according to its president, conservative activist Peter Flaherty. In California, it sent mailings into the district of Democratic Rep. George Brown accusing him of being sexist and anti-consumer. The Consumer Federation of America, cited as the source in one flier although it endorsed Brown, denounced the mailing as "extremely misleading and grossly unfair." In Montana, the group bought television time calling Democratic congressional candidate Bill Yellowtail a convicted criminal who "preaches family values . . . but took a swing at his wife."

Another new group called Citizens for the Republic Education Fund obtained at least \$1 million in late ads, according to director Lyn Nofziger, longtime political aide to Ronald Reagan. In Texas, it bought television ads against Democratic congressional candidate Nick Lampson that said he had been

accused of Medicare fraud. In Erie, Pa., another television ad denounced "big labor bosses" for trying to buy "a Congress they can control."

Some ads were so inflammatory that the Republican candidates they were designed to help denounced them. And some stations would not run some ads or pulled them off the air after complaints by Democratic candidates. Leaders of the groups targeting Democrats say they operated independently and they and GOP officials said the groups were not fronts for the party.

Nofziger called it, "outrageous" that advocacy groups like his are allowed to "go and run political ads and call them education." He added, "We wouldn't have had to do it if it had not been for labor" and its attacks on GOP candidates.

The Flaherty and Nofziger groups were run by a Washington-based firm, Triad Management, that advertises itself as sort of an underground version of the Republican Party. A Triad marketing video includes testimonials from Sen. Don Nickles (R-Okla.) and several House members aimed at recruiting donors for what the video labels a "privatized Republican national coalition."

Triad's Carolyn Malenick, a former fundraiser for Oliver L. North, says on the video that labor has always been the "rapid fire" of the Democratic Party. "If the Republican Party needs that quote 'rapid fire' where're we going to find it?" she said. "If we need to move or have \$100,000 put into a congressional race tomorrow where're we going to find it?" Malenick declined to be interviewed.

Mark Braden, Triad's attorney, said the group was not a front for the GOP or a particular special interest, like the tobacco industry. Malenick's donors are mostly individuals from "ideologically driven networks," he said.

While most of the late negative issue ads with mysterious sponsors targeted Democratic races, a labor-funded group, the '96 Project, paid for voter guides mailed in the name of other groups in 14 races. The project paid \$50,000 for mailings in six House districts where the fliers said they were "sponsored" by local or state affiliates of the National Council of Senior Citizens, a group made up predominantly of retired union members. There was no mention of the '96 Project in the mailings.

Scott Wolf, director of the project, said there was no intent to deceive the public on who was behind the mailings, which made GOP candidates look unfavorable on key issues.

His group also paid for mailings in eight races "sponsored" by the Interfaith Alliance, a group of ministers formed as an alternative to the Christian Coalition, according to the alliance's Greg Lebel. Lebel said "it never occurred to us" voters might be misled because the eight mailings said only that the '96 Project "prepared" the voter guides.

Most of the late money from obscure groups was spent on television. And Federal Communications Commission officials who monitor political advertising say their authority over broadcasters is limited. Charles Kelley, chief of enforcement for the FCC's mass media bureau, said the agency wants to know "who is the attempted persuader" in such ads. The question, he said, is "what legal authority we have, if any, to obligate the true sponsor to step forward."

The FCC managed to do that in a case in Oregon last fall, when it discovered that a group calling itself Fairness Matters to Oregonians was being financed by the Tobacco Institute. The FCC ruled the group's ads, which opposed an increase in the state cigarette tax, could be aired but the tobacco Institute had to be identified as the sponsor.

Various campaign reform proposals in Congress attempt to address the late attacks by saying the name or image of candidates cannot be mentioned in ads in the last 60 days before the general election. But many lawmakers and interest groups say such proposals would put unconstitutional limits on their First Amendment rights.

Flaherty, who also heads the Conservative Campaign Fund PAC, said concerns about sponsorship are misplaced. "Most people when they see an ad don't focus on who put it on, but focus on the message," he said. "If the message has strength and credibility it will persuade people. If it doesn't, it won't." In applying for tax-exempt status, which allowed it to avoid paying taxes on investment income, Citizens for Reform told the IRS it had no plans to spend money "attempting to influence" elections. But asked whether the groups' advertising had been effective, Flaherty said, "I think we made a big difference. It was an absolute onslaught in some of these areas by labor and liberal groups and I think we helped stanch the bleeding artery."

Perhaps the most peculiar of the late ad campaigns was the one run in the name of the Coalition for our Children's Future, which spent money in six House districts, the Louisiana Senate race and 12 Minnesota legislative races, according to Executive Director Barry Bennett.

Two directors, Dirk Van Dongen, president of the National Association of Wholesaler-Distributors, and Donald L. Fierce, a GOP consultant and former Republican National Committee aide, resigned in protest; two others, Steelman and Gary Andres, had left the board earlier.

How the unauthorized advertising campaign was launched and how races were targeted remains murky. Bennett, working in Ohio at the time of the election as chief of staff to then-Rep. Frank A. Cremeans (R), at first said he did not know of any extensive late advertising. Then he acknowledged he had signed the secrecy agreement with the donor and signed blank checks to pay a Houston political consultant who ran the advertising campaign. Bennett said he did so without telling board members.

Bennett and the group's fund-raising consultant, John Simms, said the consultant, Denis Calabrese, approached them last summer and helped connect them with some donors, who they declined to identify. Calabrese, who has worked on industry's side to make it harder to win large damage awards in lawsuits, did not return numerous phone calls.

Bennett said he had tried without success, after the Post inquiries, to obtain copies of the television scripts from Simms' firm. He said he had no idea what the coalition, organized to address federal issues, was doing in Minnesota statehouse races.

"Am I embarrassed by this?" Bennett said before he stopped returning phone calls. "Yes . . . I understand we've created a huge mystery here and that's our fault."

Mr. WARNER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. AL-LARD). The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, there are others anxious to speak to this. I see Senator HATCH is here, and I want to, just in reply to my distinguished friend and colleague, say a few words here, and then Senator HATCH, hopefully, will take the floor momentarily.

First, I want to make it very clear, I am not going to personalize this debate in any way or use the word "pandering." Nobody is pandering anybody around here. What we are trying to do

is how to get as quickly as possible to the point where the U.S. Senate, in several committees, can start looking into this very important issue, hopefully in a fair and objective manner, for the best interests of this institution and our country.

I have been in politics—I am almost hesitant to mention how many years—but it is a good 40-plus, and I have never in my lifetime ever seen a situation engulfing this great Nation, casting more doubt in the minds of the voters with regard to how we, those who serve in the Congress and those who serve in the executive branch as the President and Vice President, go about the process of elections, and we have to get at the bottom of this thing as quickly as possible.

I have indicated my support for Chairman FRED THOMPSON as a man I have absolute faith in, who can deal with this matter fairly and objectively, and I have said that for weeks. Never once have I deviated, and I do not think there will ever be a basis that I shall deviate. I said from the beginning that I want to support him as an individual. I want to support the work of his committee. But there is a very careful delineation of responsibilities here among the several committees, and there is clearly, within the jurisdiction of the Rules Committee, which I am privileged to chair, the right to superimpose our own judgment on the scope and activities of the other committees of the Senate as it relates to those funds under our jurisdiction.

This is in no way any bald-faced effort by myself or other members of the Rules Committee, particularly the distinguished majority leader, who was just on the floor consulting with me minutes ago, no way to try to do other than what I have just said, which is to get the Senate on the track as quickly as possible. We just have to get beyond all of this procedure business and get on with the business.

I said that I drew this scope language, drawing from the Watergate. I never said I used it. I have read it now probably 25 times and studied the history of it. I know all the words that are in it. It is interesting. In the Watergate resolution, I ask my friend, if he wants to debate it later on, whether or not you find any authority in there to investigate the Congress. I do not find it in the Watergate resolution, but it is very clearly expressed in this resolution as adopted by the Rules Committee. We in no way tried to obfuscate that issue.

This volume is the "Authority and Rules of Senate Committees" for the last fiscal year, but it is applicable to this. I would like to just read the question of jurisdiction of the Rules Committee, and it is found on page 155 of that book. It states we have the authority to investigate "corrupt practices."

Now that is about as broad as any charter can be—as broad as any charter can be. Then go to section 5:

Federal elections generally, including the election of the President, Vice President, and Members of the Congress.

There it is. That is the jurisdiction of the Rules Committee.

Now go over to the jurisdiction of the Governmental Affairs Committee—and I urge my colleague from Ohio to take a moment or two to look through this book so that he can reply—found on page 101, and in detail on page 102, where it says, the committee is duly authorized, or a subcommittee thereof is authorized to study and investigate.

You do not find—at least I haven't thus far in studying it—that precise language as it relates to the Rules Committee concerning jurisdiction over precisely what it is that the U.S. Senate must investigate. If anything, this volume gives clearly the authority to the Rules Committee, and I find less specificity as it relates to the Governmental Affairs Committee.

Lastly, as to campaign finance reform, the generic subject, the Rules Committee held a number of hearings last year. We already commenced our series of hearings this year. The distinguished majority leader designated the majority whip, Mr. NICKLES, and a group of us, including the Senator from Virginia speaking, and it is our responsibility to try to come up with a grouping of proposals which we have reason to believe will effect the greatest possible reform in this generic subject of campaign finance reform.

You bet there are areas which I would like to see changed. In my last campaign, I experienced spending by my opponent—and I do not castigate him in any way at this point in time, nor did I ever—but clearly he had the authority under the Supreme Court decision to spend all the money of his personal funds he wished. He set a record in the history of the U.S. Senate races from the first day this body was constituted through and including today for the greatest amount of money spent for a State per capita in the United States.

I think we should enact some legislation that would curtail, in some manner, the limit of an individual to expend millions and millions and millions of dollars. In the case of my race, it is presumably in excess, it was reported, \$10 million out of personal spending. Maybe subsequent records will show an additional amount, but that is not here to argue. The point being, the only way that can be done is by a constitutional amendment. I would not want to see this body rest its entire package of reforms that a constitutional amendment is going to be adopted in this area of campaign finance reform.

My own personal opinion, it is highly unlikely that such an amendment, even though I would favor certain types of constitutional amendments on campaign reform, that that can be achieved; essentially, the first amendment, which, again, would require a constitutional amendment. There are

many areas of campaign finance reform that would be solely predicated on the ability to get a constitutional amendment in order to achieve those goals.

I would not want to see this body pass a package of campaign finance reform proposals knowing full well in our hearts that the Federal court is going to strike down in large measure a number of those provisions.

So I look forward to continuing to work with the distinguished majority leader and the majority whip in seeing what we can come up with in a package of campaign finance reform proposals which can be adopted by this body and, Mr. President, can withstand the essential scrutiny that will come about by the third branch of Government, namely, the Federal court system.

Mr. President, I now yield the floor. Mr. HATCH addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, it befalls me to make a few comments here today concerning why this investigation is so important. Before I do, I want to compliment the Rules Committee and the people on the Rules Committee who have handled this very difficult subject matter and have done it in a credible and responsible way.

I also personally believe that no two people could handle this matter better than the chairman and ranking member of the Governmental Affairs Committee. Senator THOMPSON has had extensive experience in these matters and Senator GLENN is known as an eminently fair and worthy person here in this body. I have total confidence in both of them that they will be fair, they will be thorough, they will be tough, and they will do what is right.

We simply have to get to the bottom of this. The American people are concerned about it. Certainly the media has written extensively about these matters. It is incumbent upon the Senate in its oversight capacity to investigate these matters fairly and thoroughly.

As we take up Senate Resolution 39 today, I would like to just take a few minutes to emphasize one major point: That there is a serious number of very, very troubling matters to investigate, simply at the very core of Senators THOMPSON's and GLENN's inquiry.

Merely in recent press reports—if that is all you had—there are very substantial and troubling questions that must be answered regarding whether foreign money and foreign influence has infiltrated the American political process. While numerous other allegations of improper fundraising at the White House and by the White House have surfaced in the media in the past week or so, that is not what I want to talk about today.

Even putting aside all of those allegations, the fact is that we have before us very serious allegations that China funneled funds into American elections in an attempt to influence American policy and policymakers. The gravity

of these allegations should not and must not be underestimated. Were our national interests sold out? I hope they were not. But this matter must be pursued, and it must be done in a thorough, fair, and honest manner.

Later this week the Judiciary Committee will forward a letter to the Attorney General requesting that she apply for an independent counsel. To date, she has refused to do so in this matter. I do not read anything sinister into that—I believe that the Attorney General is an honorable, ethical person of integrity. She has applied for the appointment of no less than four independent counsels since she has been Attorney General. I think she has shown that she is a person who can act. But to date she has refused to act on this matter.

Accordingly, Congress must be all the more vigilant. And given the apparent conflict of interest, the public will be relying on Congress to ascertain the facts and get to the bottom of this whole affair.

The Governmental Affairs Committee inquiry into fundraising improprieties is, in my opinion, one of the most important congressional investigations in history and involves some of the most serious allegations we have seen to date about our electoral system and our Government. The press and congressional committees have uncovered material facts that prompt numerous questions:

First, did a foreign government try to influence our national elections and our domestic and/or foreign policy?

No. 2, were millions of dollars of foreign money laundered through various groups to the Democratic National Committee, particularly by three individuals—Charlie Trie, Johnny Chung, and John Huang, all of whom have some ties to China.

No. 3, were there violations of any of our existing laws, such as the Hatch Act, the Ethics in Government Act, and our current Federal elections laws?

The breadth of this particular investigation is immense. We cannot allow ourselves, in an attempt to satisfy the tendentious cause for a broad inquiry into congressional campaigns, to interfere with what is a serious matter.

Investigating the 1996 Presidential campaign alone will require a very substantial budget and a substantial amount of time—I presume even more time than the Rules Committee has allowed in this instance, which is only until the end of this year or approximately 8 months. I suspect this will go on beyond that and will have to go on beyond that because of what will be brought out. Let us focus for a moment, however, in terms of the breadth of this investigation, on one individual—Mr. John Huang. He was born in China. He worked for the Lippo Group, a huge conglomerate based in Indonesia with large business interests in China. Lippo is owned and controlled by the Riady family—Mochtar, James, and Stephen. These are also Chinese natives.



By 1994, Huang was the top Lippo executive in the United States.

Huang was appointed Deputy Assistant Secretary for International Economic Policy in our Department of Commerce in September 1994.

Let me just go down through what John Huang did while employed at Commerce—just a quick glance. He was, according to reports, given a top security clearance without the usual background check, which is all but unheard of; 78-plus visits to the White House; 70-plus calls to Lippo during this period of time; 39 classified top secret briefings dwelling on China and other countries in Asia; 30-plus phone conversations with Mark Middleton or associates; 9 phone messages from or calls to Webster Hubbell; 9 phone messages from the Chinese Embassy officials; 5 months of top secret clearance before joining the Commerce Department. In other words, even before he got in this very important position in Government, he had 5 months of top secret clearance. Why? That is a question that is going to be a big question in this matter.

Huang enjoyed a top secret clearance for 5 months of top secret clearance before joining Commerce and nearly a year after leaving Commerce to join the Democratic National Committee. Why? Why would those security clearances go with him outside of Government? Why would he be permitted this kind of access to very sensitive information? These are questions that are very important. Taken with the \$780,000 severance pay Huang received from Lippo prior to joining the Commerce Department, these facts naturally raise questions.

This next chart involves a meeting at the White House to discuss the Huang transfer from the White House to the Democratic National Committee on September 13, 1995. It was an Oval Office meeting. The President was there. James Riady, the Lippo executive was there. Bruce Lindsey, the Deputy White House Counsel, was there. Joseph Giroir, who is, I believe, the former top partner in the Rose Law Firm, the Lippo joint venture partner/adviser, former Rose Law Firm partner, and, if I recall correctly, was the managing partner of that firm, and none other than John Huang, former Lippo executive, Principal Deputy Assistant, Secretary of Commerce.

At this meeting, it was decided that John Huang would move from the Commerce Department to the Democratic National Committee as vice chairman of finance.

We do not know what happened at this meeting, although some extremely troubling explanations have been reported by the media. Each one of these people, it seems to me, with the possible exception of the President, will have to be questioned regarding just what went on at that meeting, why Huang left Commerce, and why he was immediately transferred to the Democratic National Committee as the fi-

nance vice chairman, why James Riady, was even at this meeting. That is a very important meeting.

Let me put another chart up here.

This is John Huang at the Democratic National Committee. These are examples of illegal funds raised by Huang. The Wiriadinatas raised \$450,000, all of which was returned by the DNC. Pauline Kanchanalak, \$250,000. She has since left the country. She is now in Thailand. All funds returned by the DNC. Wogesh Gandhi, \$250,000. He testified he had no assets. All funds returned by the DNC, the Democratic National Committee.

Cheong Am America—or John H.K. Lee—\$250,000. Like Kanchanalak and others, Cheong Am America—or John H.K. Lee—has disappeared. All of these funds were returned by the Democratic National Committee. Hsi Lai Buddhist Temple, \$166,750: This comes from a temple where the residents take a vow of poverty; \$74,000 of the \$166,750 was returned by the DNC. All together, that we know of, John Huang raised \$3.4 million, \$1.6 million of which has been returned by the Democratic National Committee.

These are just a few of some of the problems that I think the Governmental Affairs Committee is going to have to go into. I do not see how they can avoid doing it. To give a picture of some of the people who seem to be involved in this, let me just highlight some of the other individuals involved in this affair.

We start with John Huang, former top Lippo executive in the United States, who had a \$780,000 severance package when he went to Congress. He had multiple contacts while there with Lippo.

The former Democratic National Committee vice chairman raised more than \$3.4 million, \$1.6 million was returned, and he visited the White House during this period more than 75 times. C.J. Giroir, in the Lippo joint ventures, former Rose Law Firm attorney, met with James Riady, President Clinton, and Lindsey on the Huang move to DNC, and donated \$25,000 to the DNC. Mark Middleton, former White House aide from Little Rock, met with James Riady and President Clinton on that occasion. Far East business interests, had unlimited access to the White House after his departure.

Charles Trie, Little Rock restaurateur, received a \$60,000 loan from Lippo, and he arranged with the former Lippo executive Antonio Pan to get a Hong Kong dinner for Ron Brown. Trie also attempted to give \$600,000 to the Clinton legal trust fund, and he visited the White House at least 37 times.

Mark Grobmyer, Little Rock attorney, close friend of President Clinton, consultant to Lippo, Far East business interests, met with James Riady, Huang and President Clinton. Soraya Wiriadinata, daughter of Hashin Ning, former Lippo executive, contributed \$450,000 to the DNC, and it was all returned, according to the committee. Soraya has gone back to Indonesia.

S. Wang Jun, Lippo joint ventures, Chinese arms merchant, senior executive at CITIC and COSTIND, Chinese Government entities, and attended a White House conference. Webster Hubbell, former Associate Attorney General, received a \$250,000 consulting fee from Lippo—would not say why he got that.

Charles DeQueljo is the president of Lippo Securities in Jakarta, gave \$70,000 to the Democratic National Committee and was appointed to the USTR office. Pauline Kanchanalak, a Thai lobbyist who worked with Huang when he was at Lippo, contributed \$253,000 to the DNC, and it was all returned. She had frequent contacts with Huang. She visited the White House at least 26 times. And then we come back to John Huang himself.

Now, all of these people are going to have to be interviewed. We are going to have to find out what the facts are here. What was going on? Were there illegalities?

In that regard, these are key players who have taken the fifth amendment: John Huang, Charlie Trie, Pauline Kanchanalak, Mark Middleton, and Webster Hubbell. I do not see how anybody on the other side of the floor can argue that this set of hearings should not go on, or that this would not take almost every second of any committee's time, and I am only talking about one aspect of it. There are many other aspects to this.

The key players who have left the country—and we have not been given reasons why they left the country—are John H.K. Lee—gone. If he is going to be interviewed, it is overseas. Charlie Trie, gone, after taking the fifth. Pauline Kanchanalak, gone—as far as I know, back in Thailand, after having taken the fifth amendment. Arief and Soraya Wiriadinata, gone. Charles DeQueljo, gone. And James and Mochtar Riady, gone. They left the country.

All this is a brief discussion of one aspect of this. There are other aspects of this, but this is a brief glimpse into some of the serious allegations the Government Oversight Committee will have to look into. I emphasize the point with which I opened, just that at the core of this investigation is a vast series of matters which must be looked into. This will be one of the most important congressional investigations in history. I hope it is not obstructed by partisan tactics and politics. I hope with all my heart it is not. I think the American people expect as much.

When I found out over the weekend that the FBI—and I did not know this before—had notified seven Members of Congress that they might be receiving laundered funds from a foreign country, mainly China, I was kind of shocked at that, because if they informed those seven Members of Congress, surely the FBI informed the White House. I have been led to believe by the FBI they informed the National Security Council. That being the case,

why are all these people having such access to our White House under those circumstances? As chairman of the Judiciary Committee, as chairman of the committee that oversees the Justice Department and the FBI, naturally, I have to be concerned about it.

Now, in addition to all of this, there are newer revelations coming out every day. I challenge the Government Affairs Committee to substantiate these allegations, to look into them.

Let me just list some of the new revelations about the campaign finance scandals that were first reported after the Governmental Affairs Committee made a request of \$6.5 million to investigate the scandal.

First, Deputy Chief of Staff Harold Ickes made a telephone call from Air Force One to warn of the wiring of the money to the Democratic National Committee and additional funds to nonprofit organizations. There is some indication they used Air Force One for the purpose of raising funds. I hope that is not the case.

Second, questions have been raised concerning whether the White House database was created for official—as opposed to political—purposes, since it contained individuals' Social Security numbers, nicknames, relations to the First Family, pet political issues, and sometimes a photograph.

Third, China may have sought to influence U.S. policy through the direction of foreign campaign contributions to the Democratic National Committee and actions taken at the Chinese embassy. It has been disclosed that Huang had contacts with the embassy while he worked at Commerce.

Fourth, the NSC, National Security Council, at the White House provided the White House with warnings about Johnny Chung, who has ties to the Chinese Government, who was nonetheless subsequently granted access to the White House on numerous occasions, even though they knew about those ties.

Fifth, Huang approached two business associates and offered to pay them \$45,000 if they would take \$250,000 from him and donate it in their own names to the Democratic National Committee. That is illegal.

Sixth, the White House fired four staff members whose salaries were being paid by the Democratic National Committee while they were working at the White House. I don't know whether that has ever been done before, but it should not be done.

There are other allegations, but let me just mention a couple of other things. The Democratic National Committee returned another \$1.5 million in illegal or questionable campaign funds that have to be looked into. The FBI warned, as I have said, seven Members of Congress that the Chinese Government was laundering money into the United States' election process. The FBI warned the National Security Council as well. We checked that today. And I have to tell you, just this

one set of allegations could take more than a year or two just to get into them. It's going to take overseas travel; it's going to be very difficult with people taking the fifth amendment, with people possibly hiding documents and withholding them, and with just this one problem burgeoning and getting bigger every day.

So I commend the Rules Committee and the majority leader for getting this thing off dead center and providing the money so the Governmental Affairs Committee can look into these matters and resolve them one way or the other.

I wish some of these things were not true. I certainly don't wish anyone any harm. But, unfortunately, if you look at the facts that I have just given to you today, I think it's very unlikely that these matters are going to be disproven. But I hope they can be.

It is going to be up to this Governmental Affairs Committee to look into it. I think that committee is very capable of doing this. The two leaders are among the best in the Senate. I expect them to do a terrific job. Senator THOMPSON, in particular, has had extensive experience because of his experience in the Watergate investigation and other investigations since then. He is an excellent lawyer, one of the best who has ever served in the Congress of the United States. I don't know anybody who will be more fair and more decent to the people who are being investigated. I think the same goes for the distinguished Senator from Ohio, Senator GLENN, for whom I have great friendship and fondness, and who I know will do an honest and decent job here.

I don't think we should get so caught up in this context, in some of the issues that are being raised collaterally. I know the distinguished Senator from Ohio is not raising campaign finance reform to take the edge off of these issues.

I don't want to get into that today, because I think that is irrelevant to what needs to be looked into by the Governmental Affairs Committee. Now they are going to have a charter to proceed and, I think, a fair amount of money to at least begin these investigations. Hopefully, these investigations can be completed within the time allotted. But, if not, I think the Senate is going to have to look at it and extend the time if this burgeons into what many think it will.

With that, I thought some of these matters were important to bring out today in the beginning of this debate, so people realize this isn't just some little erstwhile decision by the Rules Committee; this is a very important, well-thought-out resolution of what has been a very difficult set of problems, which had a tendency to be greatly politicized over the last few weeks.

I commend the chairman of the Rules Committee, the majority leader, and the others who have worked so hard on this important matter for the work they have done.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I thank my distinguished friend and colleague, the senior Senator from Utah. Indeed, he points out, really, the tip of the iceberg here, in terms of the scope of the problem of all the issues that befall the Senate of the United States. There is plenty of work for everyone. I urge that it be done in accordance with the established rules and precedence of the U.S. Senate as to the allocation and responsibilities among the several committees.

I certainly join in the Senator's observation about the chairman of Governmental Affairs, Senator THOMPSON, and my good friend, the senior Senator from Ohio. A note of irony here. The two of us used to do a lot of the investigation for the Senate Armed Services Committee a decade or so ago, and I thought we did it rather well. By the way, Mr. President, we didn't have any charter or much money, but we got the job done and did it quite well, for the wonderful men who preceded us on the Armed Services Committee, Senators Stennis, Tower, and Jackson. They gave us special tasks and we followed through.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. WELLSTONE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, with all due respect to my colleagues—and I have a lot of respect for my colleagues on the other side—I think the decision of the Rules Committee doesn't represent a step forward, it represents a great leap sideways.

The Governmental Affairs Committee had voted unanimously to have a full inquiry. The inquiry certainly was going to focus on illegalities, but also on improprieties. That's the way we should proceed. The Rules Committee has stripped down the scope. And for people in the country who care fiercely about our getting away from auctions and back to elections, for people in the country who care about our getting away from what we have right now, which is pseudo-democracy, with big money dominating, back to authentic democracy, what the Rules Committee has done represents not a step forward, but a great leap sideways. It is a great leap sideways from an investigation that has to take place.

Mr. President, I know that sometimes we don't know what we don't want to know. But, quite frankly, I don't believe that this Congress is going to be able to step sideways from a full investigation into all of the ways in which money has come to dominate politics today in the United States of America.

Mr. President, my colleague Senator GLENN, at some point in his prepared remarks, said something like: Even what is legal quite often can be scandalous when you are looking at all the ways which money and politics interact today, and it really undercuts the whole idea of representative democracy. He is absolutely correct. We all



know that there are all sorts of examples of, No. 1, too much money being spent in these campaigns; No. 2, too much special interest access; we all know all about that; No. 3, too much of a money chase with Senators spending way too much time, more than any of us want to, raising money; No. 4, therefore, a system where regular people, ordinary citizens, which I do not use in a pejorative sense but in a positive way, don't even think they can play the game. That is what we are facing—money determining who gets to run, money determining who is considered a viable candidate, money determining the outcome of an election, money determining what issues are on the agenda, money determining which people are here lobbying every day and which are left out, and money determining the outcome. This really represents a corruption. But I am not talking about corruption as in the wrongdoing of individual officeholders. I am not here to bash any colleague on either side of the aisle. I am talking about a corruption which is systemwide. It is systemic. It is systemic corruption in the following sense: Too few people with this system we have right now, this rotten system we have right now, have far too much wealth, power, say, and access to decisionmakers, and the vast majority of people are left out of the loop. That is what is going on in the country.

My colleagues want to narrow the scope of inquiry. The Rules Committee basically has made an end run around the Governmental Affairs Committee. The Governmental Affairs Committee at one point in time had a unanimous vote. What happened? What happened? At one time the Governmental Affairs Committee said we are going to be a reform committee, and we are going to look at illegal behavior—by the way, we should; I am not defending any of it—and, in addition, we are going to look at improper behavior, what is inappropriate, and if people have special-color stamps for big contributors, maybe that is not appropriate, and if people take folks on trips and give them access to Republicans and Democrats based on their being big contributors, maybe that is not right. If people have special meetings, special dinners with special access to Senators because they are big givers or heavy hitters or well connected, maybe that is not right. Or if there is evidence of people being invited to help write legislation because they are big givers, maybe that is not right. Or if there is a meeting with a business community or labor community and one party or the other says, "We noticed you have made contributions to Members of the other party, and you had better not do that or you're not going to have access to us," that is not right. The list goes on and on.

What is legal is scandalous. This whole system needs to be turned not upside down—it is upside down right now—but right side up. We need to get the big money out of politics. We need

to get the big money out of politics. Anybody who believes in free and open elections, anybody who believes in political equality, anybody who believes that each person in the United States of America should count as one and no more than one, should be genuinely horrified with this system that we now have.

Mr. President, I think—I hope I am proven wrong—but I think the action of the Rules Committee represents not a step forward but a great leap sideways. I have my doubts as to whether or not we are going to pass the reform that gets the big money out of politics. Given the scope now at least of Governmental Affairs, they are not going to be looking at soft money, they are not going to be looking at independent expenditure, they are not going to be looking at what the New York Times yesterday in their editorial called systematized influence peddling, which by the way is a bipartisan invention. And when we narrow the scope and don't look at all of the abuses—we can have abuses; they may not be illegal but they are abuses—it is arrogance. It is what people in the country hate. It is what destroys confidence on the part of people in our political process. When we don't look at any of that, how convenient it will be. Because, if we do not have a full inquiry into all of these abuses, into all of this improper behavior, into all of the ways in which legally big money has come to dominate politics, guess what? We don't make the case for reform.

My concern is as follows: I think if we are not careful—on this point, even though I am in sharp policy disagreement with him, I think Senator WARNER is the best when it comes to civility. I do not have any question about him at all when it comes to civility. But my concern is that we have to really be careful so that what doesn't happen here—is that you have just got people going after each other with accusations, throwing bombs at each other, and all of the rest—is that we don't get down to what should be the real business, which is when push comes to shove there is plenty of blame on all sides. I include myself as being a part of the problem. I want to be part of the solution. I have said, in my not so humble opinion, that everybody in public office should hate this system and want to change it because when you run for office you have to raise money. I just finished running for office, and I raised money. You call people. You call people to ask them to support you. We do that. You may believe—and I did believe and I do believe—that the compelling necessity to raise money in these campaigns, given the current system, that it has never once influenced any position you have taken on any issue. You may believe that. But I tell you something. It doesn't look that way to people. Even if you are very honest—and I think my colleagues are—it doesn't look that way to people. We have to change this system.

My real concern—and we will have an amendment or several amendments on the floor of the Senate starting tomorrow—is that what the Rules Committee has done is not moving us forward, but, as I say, it is a great step sideways. It is a great step sideways from full inquiry. It is a great step sideways so the Governmental Affairs Committee is not really looking at all of the abuses. It is a great step sideways in not looking at the full range of problems and not looking at all of the ways in which money dominates politics. Therefore, is it a great step sideways from reform.

I mean, ultimately here is the litmus test for all of us. Speeches can be made. I am making this speech right now on the floor. Words can be uttered. But really the litmus test is, are you or are you not, regardless of political party, interested in change? Are you interested in getting this big money out of politics? Are you interested in having these Senate races with less money being spent? Are you interested in elections as opposed to auctions? Are you interested in reducing special interests access to decisionmaking? Are you interested in a system where there is a level playing field for challengers? Yes, challengers who can challenge all of us who are incumbents whether we are Democrats or Republicans. I will tell you. I do not think most people in the country think we are interested in that. I do not think most people in the country think we are going to pass any significant reform. I think most people in the country think that this is as much of a debate between ins and outs as Democrats versus Republicans, and the ins don't want to change a system that is really a great benefit to the ins; that is to say, people who hold office.

I am telling you that I think all of us are under a lot of scrutiny. And I think we had better figure out a way that we push through some significant reform, and it had better not be cosmetic, it had better not be one of these pieces of legislation that has a great acronym, a kind of made-for-Congress look; you know, sounds great, but as a matter of fact very little substance by way of really changing this system. I do not think we are heading in that direction. I think the Rules Committee decision takes us not forward, but again I think it represents, if not a retreat, the best I can say is it is a step sideways. That is why we will have an amendment or amendments on the floor demanding a full inquiry.

By the way, Mr. President, in the debates that I have been in, the argument I usually have to do deal with is, "Well, this is just some kind of convenient strategy because you don't want to focus on the illegalities." Of course, we do. But there is nothing mutually exclusive about saying get the facts about illegalities, then there is a full investigation and people are held accountable, but also look at the abuses, also look at the improprieties, also

look at the reform issue, also go down the path of changing the system for the better.

Mr. President, that, I think, is the missing piece. That will be our challenge on the floor of the Senate, and that is the direction that we have to go in.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WELLSTONE. I am pleased to.

Mr. WARNER. I listened very carefully to the Senator's remarks—indeed, I thank him for his comments about the Senator from Virginia. I have also found the Senator from Minnesota to have the same characteristics although I disagree with him on a number of issues.

As I listen to the Senator, it seems to me the Senator has pretty well made up his mind. The Senator has in mind already a framework of ideas and concepts that should be legislated by this body, am I not correct?

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, the Senator is correct that I can see a number of pieces of legislation, and I am going to outline some of them in a few moments, that I think would make sense, but I also am interested in the give-and-take with colleagues and fashioning compromise if I think it represents a step forward.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I understand that. But I think the Senator is pretty well of a mind to let us get on with the business. The Senator knows what has to be done in exchange with colleagues. Yet, the charter given by the Rules Committee for the additional funding, that sum of money on top of the normal budget for Government Affairs, goes to December 31. You are not going to wait until December 31 to hopefully get the legislation that you have resolved to have one way or another put on the floor, am I not correct? As a matter of fact, do I have reason to believe that you would like to see that legislation enacted before July 4 of this year?

Mr. WELLSTONE. The Senator from Virginia is absolutely correct. I do think—if I could finish.

Mr. WARNER. Go ahead.

Mr. WELLSTONE. There is an A and a B part. A, I do not think people in the United States of America need to be convinced that there are huge problems, and I do not think they believe we do not already know what many of those problems are. It is not like all of a sudden we have to get all sorts of more and more investigation to know what we can do. But I think the investigation can be helpful if you have a full scope of inquiry. I think now where we have gone with the Government Affairs Committee is a step sideways, and I think we should take action.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, on this issue I wish to engage my colleague. Clearly, in this resolution we have added additional money for the Rules Committee. If the Senator will examine the document which I referred to

earlier, the authority and rules of the Senate, you see in here the clearest of jurisdiction given by the Senate over decades to the Rules Committee to do precisely this, the broadest type of authority. You do not find in here, incidentally, the same authority for Government Affairs. Why? Because they are charged with investigating violations of law. They are not a committee that originates legislation in this area. That is for the Rules Committee.

So it is very clear to this Senator, and I think other Senators will soon recognize, that we are not sidestepping any issue, I say to my friend and colleague. We are simply adhering to the traditional guidelines, precedents and the written prescription for the committees of the Senate to perform their duties. I would urge the Senator to think about whether or not this is sidestepping, or, rather, using the rules and precedents of the Senate set forth in this volume and elsewhere with great clarity.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, to respond to the question—and I believe my colleague has asked a question—I do not know any other way to say this but to be straightforward and honest. The proof will be in the pudding. But I think once upon a time the Governmental Affairs Committee under the leadership of Senator THOMPSON was going to look at illegalities; it was going to look at improprieties; it was going to be a full scope of inquiry, and I think we were looking in the proper direction.

With all due respect to my colleague, whom I respect, I think the majority of the Rules Committee is not interested in reform. I think the Rules Committee could very well be a burial ground for reform. Now, if I am wrong, I am pleased to be wrong. But right now, as I think about some of the people who are most active on the Rules Committee and some of the people I have heard speak on this, certainly some of them have made it crystal clear that they are not interested in any reform at all.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I can certainly answer just for this Senator.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Yes. And I am not talking about the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. I am in favor of reform, although I have not supported McCain-Feingold because I find there are serious questions as to whether the majority of that bill can be upheld in the Federal court system. That is my concern. And my concern is it totally ignores the very serious problem in this Senator's mind whereby labor unions compel their membership to donate by taking it out of their paycheck before it even gets to the union family.

But anyway, I am not here to try to raise all the red hot irons. I want to keep, hopefully, this debate focused on this volume which lays out the authority of the several committees and the fairness of the resolution in this Senator's mind. I take umbrage, personal and otherwise, at the Senator's com-

ment—he wants to generalize—that the Rules Committee is the burial ground for campaign finance reform. Other Senators can speak to their thoughts on this. But certainly for this Senator, I am very anxious to participate in reform. As I said earlier, I am working with the distinguished majority whip in trying to bring together a series of concepts which will withstand Federal court scrutiny, in our judgment, and which will move forward in substantial reform.

So I say to my friend, I have listened very carefully to his comments, but I do urge him to look at this volume, which prescribes the duties of several committees, and to reflect once again on the fairness of the proposed resolution. We can move forward, Mr. President, with campaign finance reform irrespective of the timetable that is given, whether it is to the Rules Committee or the Governmental Affairs Committee. We can move forward. And that is a judgment call of the 100 Senators to work on collectively under their respective leaders.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Virginia yield?

Mr. WELLSTONE. I think I have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I thank the Chair, and I thank my colleague from Virginia. I say that I felt I was just expressing my honest opinion about what I think is going to happen in the Rules Committee. And my comment was not aimed at my friend from Virginia.

Mr. President, I will say one more time—and I will finish up because I see my colleague from Mississippi is here and I know my colleague from Mississippi is going to agree with everything I am saying so I am anxious for him to get the floor. But let me just finish up. Two points.

One, I think it is problematical, I think it is suspect, I think it is weaving and bobbing and dancing around and a big step sideways to have moved the Government Affairs Committee away from what should have been the scope of the inquiry. We are going to come out here to the floor with language which is going to make it clear that we are serious about reform. And we know that what is key to reform is an investigation not only of illegalities—and you get into a definitional battle over that—but also what is improper, what is not appropriate. You name it. And also all of the ways in which money and politics have now interacted in such a way as to severely undercut the very idea of representative democracy and really undercut the trust people have in our political process. That is No. 1.

No. 2. I just think people in the country are scratching their heads and saying, these folks in the Senate, they are saying that they actually need a lot of time to study all of these problems and they do not want to make a commitment to any date to bring up any piece

of campaign reform legislation; permit us to be a little skeptical. We have this idea that politicians are pretty good at delay, and they are pretty good at sidestepping issues, and they are pretty good at not getting down to the work; permit us to be a little skeptical.

How much more do people need to know about abuses, improprieties or illegalities in order to make some change? Many of us, my colleague is right, are pushing for some action. Now, I am not arrogant enough to say that one person has all the ideas about what should be done, but I do get very concerned about sidestepping here, narrowing the scope of inquiry here, delaying here and maybe, just maybe, at the very end laboring mightily and producing a mouse—hardly any kind of reform. I want to tell you, if we do that, people in the country should hold us accountable.

I think that my colleagues, some colleagues, fail to make a distinction. I could be wrong about this. But I am coming to believe that every day there is a headline about something new. I think people read it and they just quickly go on to other stories. I think part of the reason is, unfortunately, people's expectations are not very high, and that should trouble all of us. But at the very core, what is inside of people in this country, is we do not like this system at all. We do not feel as though we are well represented. We feel ripped off and we want you to change it.

I would say to my colleagues—yes, we talked about McCain-Feingold. I support McCain-Feingold. I worked with both Senators from the word go. I think it is an important, significant reform effort.

If I had my way I would go the "Maine option," legislation which really gets the interested money and private money out; a major overhaul of the system. If not, Senator COCHRAN and I had an opportunity to be at a show last night and I said, "Look, I will come to the floor with an amendment just to prohibit soft money." We are going to take action. There are a variety of different approaches and there are other things that can be done that represent reform. But I say to my colleagues, ultimately it gets down to this. We have to dramatically reduce the amount of money that is spent. We have to dramatically reduce the influence of interested dollars and special interest access to decisionmakers. We have to dramatically reduce this money chase. And we have to move toward something that approximates, more or less, a level playing field so we have competitive elections and so challengers have a chance against incumbents.

If we do not do that, we have not done the job. I think people are going to hold us to that standard. So we might be debating kind of the process we are going through to get to the end. But we need to get there together at the end.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. WARNER. Will the Senator yield for just one moment?

Mr. COCHRAN. I am happy to yield to my distinguished chairman.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I think the record should reflect our distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Kentucky, has just made a statement with regard to his future. Otherwise he would be here today, participating in this debate. Senator FORD returned home to make a very important statement regarding his future. I know my colleague from Ohio has looked over that statement in which he has indicated that he no longer is going to pursue a career in the U.S. Senate, but is to return to greener fields. I just thought we should put that in the RECORD, as to his absence here today.

Mr. GLENN. Will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. Yes. I want to praise Senator FORD, too. But we set aside this time for debate on the resolution. We had 2 hours in morning business and we will have additional morning business time, I am sure, later. I hope we could debate the resolution, but I will be happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Ohio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. GLENN. I thank my friend from Mississippi. I just want to reinforce what the Senator from Virginia just said. Senator FORD, as ranking minority member on the Rules Committee, would normally be on the floor, managing this bill. Since I had been ranking minority member over at Governmental Affairs, which is involved with this very deeply, he asked me to take his place here today. I should have noted that at the beginning of the session today, before I made my speech.

But he will be missed. I was sorry to see my good friend, WENDELL FORD, who came here the same time I did, make a decision to not run again. I know some of the pangs of going through that decision, having gone through those pangs myself just a short time ago. And I am sure I will want to say more tomorrow, but that is the reason he is not here floor-managing the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I think we should make it clear at the outset that those of us who are supporting this resolution as reported by the Rules Committee favor looking very carefully at our current campaign laws. The Federal Election Campaign Act sets out some very strict rules and guidelines and laws with respect to how our Federal election campaigns ought to be conducted. Some of us agree that those laws can be improved and are in favor of making changes. For example, I think one of the clear deficiencies in current law is the fail-

ure to require disclosure from all of those who spend money in the Federal election campaign process. There is no law against participating. We like to have full participation by all American citizens, by all of those who are eligible to vote in our country, and we need to continue to examine the process to see if we are doing a good enough job of trying to get everybody's involvement in the process. So there are a lot of things that we can do to improve the system.

But I hope that our friends who are urging immediate vote on a single proposal, certainly ought to allow a full debate to occur and a free exchange of ideas. This Committee on Rules has had a number of hearings under the leadership of the distinguished Senator from Virginia on this subject. And in this resolution there is a provision that further campaign reform issues will be examined by the Rules Committee, in the context of this resolution on this investigation.

Having said that, I think we do need to support, though, the passage of this resolution now so investigation can move forward. The Governmental Affairs Committee is charged under this resolution with responsibility of conducting an investigation into illegal activities surrounding the 1996 election campaigns. We do not single out the President's reelection campaign. We say the campaigns that were conducted in 1996, the challenge of the Republican candidate, the campaigns of all Members of Congress, the campaigns of those Senators who were up in the last cycle—all are to be the subject of the investigation by the Governmental Affairs Committee into illegal activities.

Further, if any Senator is found to have engaged in illegal activity, that is to be directly referred to the Ethics Committee for prompt attention and review.

What are these facts that support and are the basis for the resolution? I think it is important for us to look at what the facts are, to look at what the allegations are, some of the charges that have been made. One of the individuals who was mentioned by the Senator from Utah is John Huang. It is said by reports that he raised more than \$3.4 million for the Democratic National Committee. Where did this money come from? That is a fair question. That is a very legitimate question, and it ought to be answered by this investigation.

John Huang was given a security clearance while he was still working for a private enterprise, the Lippo Group, and before he started to work at the Department of Commerce. A legitimate inquiry by this investigation committee is: Why did he get a security clearance before starting a job with the Department of Commerce? And he kept his security clearance, even after he left the Department of Commerce and went to work for the Democratic National Committee. Another legitimate inquiry is: Why did

someone who is a full-time fundraiser for the Democratic National Committee need a security clearance? Or why was he permitted to have a security clearance?

During his tenure with the Commerce Department and at the Democratic National Committee, he had several visits with officials of the Embassy of the People's Republic of China. A legitimate inquiry: What were the purposes of these visits? Which Chinese officials at the Embassy did he visit and why?

Another person who was mentioned by Senator HATCH, as involved in the reports and who was involved actively in the election campaign of 1996, is Johnny Chung. Johnny Chung is said to have donated a total of \$366,000 to the Democratic National Committee. A legitimate inquiry: Where did Chung get this money? Another reported fact: Johnny Chung visited the White House more than 50 times, despite the fact that the National Security Council staff had issued a memo describing him as a hustler, and warning officials at the White House of that. Why did Johnny Chung have such free access to the White House? That is a legitimate inquiry. Who did he see when he went to the White House on these occasions, and for what purpose? One day, during a radio address by the President of the United States, Johnny Chung brought six Chinese officials with him to be spectators, and to witness the President's radio address, 2 days after giving a \$50,000 check to a senior White House official to pass on to the Democratic National Committee.

Charlie Trie is another person who has been mentioned today. Charlie Trie was a fundraiser for the Democratic National Committee and the Clinton's legal defense fund. He is said to have raised more than \$600,000. What were the sources of these donations? What did he expect in return, if anything? Charlie Trie visited the White House more than 23 times. Who did he see when he was there? What were the purposes of his visits? Charlie Trie arranged to have Wang Jun, a Chinese arms dealer, attend a White House event with the President.

These are legitimate subjects of inquiry into an investigation into possible illegal conduct in connection with the 1996 Presidential election campaign. It seems to me that these are not only questionable activities that raise questions about purposes of fundraising, but connections with a foreign government which was very actively involved in developing new trade relations with our country, in testing our relationship with other countries in that region of the world, and just this past weekend there were new revelations in connection with the fact that the Chinese Government was said, by our own Federal Bureau of Investigation, to be targeting Members of Congress, to influence for the purpose of enhancing China's position with respect to legislation and national policy here in the United States.

The question that is legitimate for us to undertake to answer in this investigation is what connection do these associates of the Democratic National Committee or the President—John Huang, Charlie Trie, Johnny Chung, and others—have with this effort by the Chinese, if any? These are legitimate inquiries.

Has there been a revelation or a discussion or a briefing at the White House by the FBI on these same subjects? And when did those briefings occur? Before these people were given free access to the White House? Or later? Or when?

Did these activities on the part of the Chinese Government become common knowledge at the White House? If they did, who knew about it? Somebody is bound to have known about it. You don't have this kind of seemingly unlimited access with high-level officials in our administration without somebody knowing why they were there.

What were their interests? One, of course, was a Department of Commerce official interested in trade, organizing trade missions all around the country. But not only that, Mr. President, let me show you a chart, for the purpose of information for Senators, reflecting information that may be close as a circle of interest.

Here we have the three persons I was talking about where there is clear evidence of a lot of fundraising activity, a lot of access with the White House and with top officials in the administration, one working at the Department of Commerce. This is John Huang, who was former top U.S. Lippo executive. Lippo is the Indonesian conglomerate already described by Senator HATCH and others. He was a top Democratic National Committee fundraiser. He had a top-secret security clearance at Commerce—even before, we have now learned—and had almost unlimited White House access.

Johnny Chung visited the White House at least 50 times, brought several Communist Party officials, Chinese Government officials, to the White House, and maintains business relationships in China.

Charlie Trie, Little Rock restaurateur, has visited the White House from 20 to 30 times; owns a home and restaurant in Beijing.

All three participated in very productive fundraising activities for the Democratic National Committee or the President's legal expense fund. Approximately \$4.5 million was raised by these three individuals for the Democratic National Committee. The Democratic National Committee said it is returning \$2.2 million of those contributions. For the President's legal expense fund, Charlie Trie raised \$639,000, all now ruled by the lawyers as returnable and should be returned.

Then look at this. These are interesting connections as well. Does this form a link, the link to China that gets the foreign government involved in our election process? It seems to me clear-

ly to indicate a reason to go forward immediately with the passage of this resolution and to go forward with this investigation to find out what the facts are. But here are what some of the allegations are in the reported facts that we can verify with an investigation.

Wang Jun, the foreign arms dealer who was brought to the White House, chairman of Poly Technologies, a Chinese arms manufacturer. He is also chairman of CITIC, which is the largest state-run business in China. He visited the White House on February 6, 1996, as a guest of Charlie Trie.

Ng Lap Seng, a member of CPPCC. This is the Chinese Government's national advisory board. He has multiple business interests in China, Hong Kong, and Macao. He is partners with Charlie Trie in San Kin Yip International Trading Co.

And the Lippo Group, which was discussed in some detail by Senator HATCH. Mochtar and James Riady are the family members who have large interests, if not controlling interests, in the Lippo Group. Lippo has vast business interests in China, business partners with China Resources, a Chinese Government-owned entity.

The CP Group, this is the largest foreign investor in China, \$2 billion investment, 130 joint ventures. Chairman Dhanin serves as economic adviser to the Chinese Government. Dhanin visited with President Clinton in the White House on June 18, 1996, arranged by Pauline Kanchanalak through John Huang.

The connections are with Huang, Chung, and Trie with investors, leading industrialists in China, in Indonesia, all with Chinese ties, all with very big stakes in the outcome of Government policies here in the United States and legislation here in the United States, and, apparently, Members of Congress were selected to be supported or encouraged or lobbied, or whatever happened, and we don't know what happened. We don't know if anything happened, but we need to find out what steps were taken to try to influence decisions in this Government by the foreign government.

The question about whether passing a bill to reform campaign finance law cures all that, of course, begs the question. That is not the question, and it is certainly not the answer. The question is, What are the illegal activities that are involved in these transactions, if any? That is not only an appropriate area for inquiry by this U.S. Senate, it is mandatory, it is a duty, it is a mandatory responsibility, it is a duty we have.

So I urge my colleagues to adopt this resolution. It is a product of an effort to try to resolve differences that some on the other side of the aisle have had with the effort that we initiated in the Governmental Affairs Committee to put together a resolution to define scope and a budget and a process.

But I have confidence, Mr. President, in the chairman and the ranking

Democratic member, Senator THOMPSON and Senator GLENN, who are totally dedicated, in my view, to a fair but full inquiry of the allegations that are apparent and are begging to be investigated so that we can find out what the facts are.

If laws need to be changed, we can recommend changes in the law. If we simply need to disclose whether people are innocent of the charges that have been made against them, that is an important part of the responsibility, too. To clear those whose names may have been tarnished by published reports that we have seen in the newspapers and heard in the broadcast media, that is part of the obligation of this committee as well, which I think will be taken very, very seriously.

So I am hopeful that the Senate will approve the resolution, Mr. President. I congratulate the chairman for his leadership in this.

Mr. WARNER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. I thank my distinguished colleague.

We are particularly fortunate on the Rules Committee to have a very significant number of senior colleagues, of which my good friend, the senior Senator from Mississippi, is one. And three members of the Rules Committee, three who voted for this resolution, are also members of the Governmental Affairs Committee. That, in my judgment, is a very, very important aspect of this debate. They looked at it from both perspectives. They have counseled this chairman as well as others on the committee. I think that goes a long way to say that this was a resolution carefully crafted and thoughtfully arrived at. I thank my dear friend.

Mr. GLENN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, I rise not for a lengthy statement here, but just to say that most of the remarks on the other side of the aisle this afternoon have been involved with "The China Link," as it is called on the diagram I see on the other side right now, and with the China connection, with Mr. Huang, Mr. Chung, Mr. Trie, and what may have happened.

I am not quite sure what relevance all these things have to do with S. 39 that is before us on the floor now and which we are debating. Because everyone is agreed, everyone I know on the Rules Committee, the Governmental Affairs Committee, the White House, the President, everybody is agreed that some things went awry in this area. And even the President has said, yes, he wants to see this brought out. Let us find out what happened. Let us correct it. Let us cure it and let us get on with it.

I do not know whether our debate here on the floor is going to take up time pushing this idea that somehow, or implying at least, that we are trying to avoid some sort of discussion or the

President is trying to avoid some kind of discussion on Huang, Trie, and others, because I do not think that is the case. I know the Justice Department, as I understand it—and this is just from news reports; I have not talked to the people over there—but as I understand it, they have 25 FBI agents assigned to investigate exactly this matter that we are talking about on the floor this afternoon. So if we need to, on the Governmental Affairs Committee, get into those areas because they involve, obviously, allegations of illegality, we will do so.

So I just want to make that comment that we are united, I think, in the Senate on both sides of the aisle and down to Pennsylvania Avenue to the White House on finding out what happened with Mr. Huang, Mr. Chung, and Mr. Trie, and bring that information out so we can correct whatever the situation was or get new legislation if that is needed to correct it. So we are all committed to that. I yield the floor.

Mr. LEVIN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, it is imperative that the public have a full picture of the questionable campaign fundraising practices which have risen to the surface in such quantity. These practices are not the sole domain of one party. Both parties raise money in comparable ways. Republican practices as well as Democratic practices must be investigated and made public. Otherwise, there is going to be no confidence and no credibility in this investigation. Unless we have an investigation into fundraising abuses by both parties, the committee's investigation—and here I am talking about the Governmental Affairs Committee's investigation—will turn into a partisan squabble.

Both Democratic and Republican activities at both ends of Pennsylvania Avenue must be investigated, and then let the chips fall where they may. There must be a full and thorough investigation into the campaign finance practices of the last election, and to the extent practices of earlier elections shed light on current practices or set the context for our consideration of current practices, the Governmental Affairs Committee should include and voted to include those election cycles in our investigation as well. Whatever we do in this investigation will also hopefully contribute to the enactment of campaign finance reform.

With those goals in mind, the members of the Governmental Affairs Committee met and together unanimously decided on language relative to the scope of this investigation. Members on both sides of the aisle were satisfied with the result and with the sense of accomplishment that we felt. Senator GLENN said just before the vote on the scope resolution:

I think we have made really a lot of progress in this regard. . . . I think this sets

down in language what we had talked about, what you, Senator Thompson had indicated you were for, what we were for.

And Senator LIEBERMAN described it as "an extraordinarily positive piece of work."

That agreed-upon scope in the Governmental Affairs Committee was not an expansion of Chairman THOMPSON's statement of scope which he made on the Senate floor on January 28 when he announced his plans for the committee's investigation. It was the embodiment, for all practical purposes, of what Senator THOMPSON had described in his floor statement. Senator THOMPSON said at that time:

The investigation that we are now undertaking is neither a criminal investigation nor a seminar on campaign finance reform, although it involves elements of both.

And continuing, Senator THOMPSON said:

Based on the information before us at this time, it is an inquiry into illegal and improper campaign finance activity in the 1996 Presidential campaign and related activities. . . . Now certainly our work will include any improper activities by Republicans, Democrats or other political partisans. . . . We are investigating activities here, not political parties.

We had a disagreement over how much the investigation would cost, but we did not have a disagreement over what the scope should be. We had a disagreement over the length of the investigation. Democrats on the committee thought we should have a goal for an end date so that we could responsibly, and in a reasonable amount of time, report to the Senate on our findings and conclusions. We thought, looking back at previous investigations, that a year would be appropriate. The congressional investigation into Watergate lasted just over a year. And we thought an end date as well as the funding could always be adjusted if the public interest warranted an extension depending upon the state of the evidence at the time the agreed-upon end date was reached.

We had also hoped for, and actually expected, progress on working out bipartisan procedures for the conduct of the investigation. The committee directed the staff to work on an agreement on procedures to ensure that there was bipartisan access to witnesses, documents and depositions.

So that's where we were after the last Governmental Affairs Committee meeting. We had a unanimously agreed-upon scope resolution, progress on bipartisan procedures, and differences over money and length of time. How did we get to where we are today? Well, this whole thing took a dramatic detour to, and then a dramatic detour in, the Rules Committee.

Republican members of the Rules Committee decided to narrow the unanimously adopted scope of the committee investigation. Initially, some of the Rules Committee wanted to leave Congress out of the investigation altogether. But they soon realized that that would not pass muster with the

media or with the American people. So they concocted a formulation, something that made them look like they were covering Congress but, in effect, leaving out the most sensitive areas to Members: soft money and independent expenditures. Republicans raised much more soft money than Democrats, and outspent Democrats 10 to 1 in independent expenditures.

The Rules Committee majority no doubt thought that if they could get the Senate to strike the word "improper" from the Governmental Affairs Committee jurisdiction and leave the scope covering only illegal activity, then they could deflect or avoid the possible resulting pressure to pass campaign finance reform. I have no doubt that that was the goal of many members of the Rules Committee—to deflect or avoid pressure to pass campaign finance reform.

That pressure would come from the bipartisan investigation in the Governmental Affairs Committee not only into what is illegal but into what should be illegal, what is improper, to what has an odor about it, to what is excessive. That is what the Governmental Affairs Committee, on a bipartisan basis, wanted to look at. Not just as to what was illegal technically but as to what we should consider as a legislative body to make illegal.

Now, the Rules Committee decided to put in language about referring allegations of illegal conduct against Members to the Ethics Committee and referred the issue of soft money and independent expenditures, and those are the 800-pound gorillas of campaign finance in the 1990's. Soft money, independent expenditures currently—the legal portion of those activities—were referred to the Rules Committee. But it is the Rules Committee whose majority does not want the Governmental Affairs Committee to have a full-blown investigation in the first place.

Now, that is where we are. The Rules Committee is proposing to this Senate that a unanimously agreed upon resolution of a standing committee of this body to investigate improper activity should not be permitted. Now, I do not know whether this has been done before in the history of this body where you have a committee with jurisdiction which votes unanimously on an investigation, which is then denied that investigation by the Rules Committee. Perhaps it has happened before, I do not know. I have asked the Democratic staff on the Rules Committee if they know of any precedent for this. They do not know of any.

We are not talking about reducing the funding. Here we are talking about limiting the scope of an investigation within the jurisdiction of a standing committee of this body, unanimously voted upon by that standing committee. Now, anybody who has been following this sad story will see through it because I do not think, again—and I will make this challenge to my dear friend from Virginia, Senator WARNER,

and he is my dear friend; I will make this challenge to him, because we should know whether or not the Rules Committee has ever in this way limited the scope of an investigation unanimously voted on by a standing committee of this body.

We are not talking about limiting the money. We are talking about saying you may not investigate improper activity. That is clearly within the jurisdiction of the Governmental Affairs Committee. There is no doubt that the Governmental Affairs Committee has jurisdiction to look into improper activities of the kind laid out in our full-scope resolution.

By the way, I have no doubt that the Rules Committee has jurisdiction to do what it has decided it wants to do, as well, that that jurisdiction is not exclusive. The Governmental Affairs Committee has the jurisdiction. There is nothing improper about its jurisdiction. For the Rules Committee to tell a standing committee of this body you may not look into improper activity within your jurisdiction, I believe, is unprecedented. If it has a precedent, then it seems to me this body ought to hear about it from the Rules Committee.

Again, to make clear what we are not talking about, we are not talking about reducing the funding, and we are not talking about the question of whether the Rules Committee has jurisdiction, as well, because clearly they have both jurisdiction to reduce the funds and to take up an issue themselves. What we are talking about is something that is clearly within the jurisdiction of the Governmental Affairs Committee and unanimously adopted by the Governmental Affairs Committee.

Now, in setting aside the Governmental Affairs Committee resolution, the Rules Committee and the resolution before the Senate struck the very key word "improper." Here is what the unanimously passed resolution of the Governmental Affairs Committee said:

The [committee] shall conduct a Special Investigation into illegal or improper fundraising and spending practices in the 1996 Federal election campaigns. . . .

Here is what the Rules Committee substitute says:

The additional funds authorized by this section are for the sole purpose of conducting an investigation of illegal activities in connection with 1996 Federal election campaigns."

The key word missing from the Rules Committee substitute is the word "improper."

What they are restricting us to investigate on the Governmental Affairs Committee is illegal activities. We are barred from using these special funds—and I emphasize it is these special funds which are at issue—from investigating improper activities. If the Rules Committee version of this resolution passes, and I hope it will not, the Senate would go on record as affirmatively denying an investigative

committee of the Senate from investigating improper campaign activities. I think that is a precedent which this body should reject on a bipartisan basis because it puts us in the exact wrong direction in terms of what this Nation wants us to do, which is to both look at illegal as well as improper practices.

Now, some people say, what about the illegal practices which have been alleged. My answer to that is we ought to look at it even though that is usually left to prosecutorial bodies and courts. We ought to look at illegal activities. We should not shy away from that—illegal activities by whomever. But we surely should look as well at improper activities, which activities, at least arguably, should be made illegal.

We are also doing something else in addition to restricting us from looking at the soft underbelly of campaign financing, which is soft money, we are also risking the very investigation of the Governmental Affairs Committee, because the legislative purpose, which is to change the laws, is being put into question by the restriction of the Rules Committee. If we could only look at illegal activity, things already illegal, and we cannot look at things which arguably should be made illegal, then the question of legislative purpose arises. That is what the courts have ruled must exist before subpoenas can be enforced.

A Federal district court in the Icardi case said that:

The court does hold that if the committee is not pursuing a bona fide legislative purpose when it secures the testimony of any witness, it is not acting as a "competent tribunal" even though that very testimony be relevant to a matter which could be the subject of a valid legislative investigation. . . .

So the resolution that is proposed by the Rules Committee substitute not only strikes the key word "improper" that would give the Governmental Affairs Committee the direct authority to investigate practices that are now legal but should be made illegal—because that is what the word improper allows us to do. What the substitute resolution of the Rules Committee does is fails to include any reference whatever to a legislative purpose. In this case, campaign finance reform. The silence on this point is deafening, and I am afraid the silence on this point, the removal of the word "improper" is also going to jeopardize the investigation which is left into the jurisdiction of the Governmental Affairs Committee.

Finally, I want to read one portion of the committee report of the Governmental Affairs Committee that supports the broader scope resolution which had been unanimously adopted by the Governmental Affairs Committee. This is what we said, Democrats, Republicans, unanimously. Or this is what the committee report, more accurately, the Governmental Affairs Committee, says about the broad scope resolution:

The allegations that have been made are very serious and go to the fundamental



workings of our democratic government. The faith of the people in their government and in their system of government is at risk. Our Constitution is premised on the fallibility of human enterprises, including governments. The founders of this Republic did not believe that the errors of Government were self-correcting. They knew that only constant examination of our shortcomings, and learning from them, would enable representative government to survive. They believed, correctly, that this process makes America stronger, not weaker. We must have the same faith.

And then the committee report of the Governmental Affairs Committee says the following:

These allegations of improper activities must be investigated. The committee intends to investigate allegations of improper activities by all, Republicans, Democrats, or other political partisans. It will investigate specific activities, not on the political party against which the allegations are made.

The Senate, if it adopts the Rules Committee resolution, will undermine the solid, bipartisan work of the Governmental Affairs Committee. A unanimously adopted resolution of that committee that has jurisdiction to investigate improper activities will be undermined by, instead, a partisan resolution of the Rules Committee, adopted on a partisan vote, which narrows the scope of the Governmental Affairs Committee on the use of these special funds.

So, again, while my friend from the Rules Committee, the chairman, is here, let me repeat one point. There is no doubt that the Rules Committee has jurisdiction to entertain the kind of hearings that it is going to have. There is no doubt that the Rules Committee can reduce the funding that has been provided. But I don't know of—and I welcome my friend correcting me if I am wrong—a precedent where the Rules Committee has told a committee of jurisdiction in this body which unanimously adopts a resolution to investigate an activity that it may not do so with the funds that are appropriate or allocated. I know that we can use other funds for that purpose. But we are talking here about a special funding resolution and a unanimously adopted, bipartisan resolution of the Governmental Affairs Committee to investigate something within its jurisdiction. For the Rules Committee to remove the word "improper," it seems to me is unprecedented and unwise, given the tremendous necessity to change the way campaign financing is done in this country.

I yield the floor and would be happy to respond if my friend from Virginia, the chairman of the Rules Committee, desires.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. I thank my distinguished colleague. Since he came to the Senate, I have valued his views greatly and his friendship a good deal more. Although we differ from time to time, let us see if we can't come to some fundamental understanding here. Has the Senator had an opportunity to review the document, which I referred

to today, the "Authority of the Rules of the Senate on Committees?" If not, I urge that the Senator take a little time to look through it. I read it as saying very clearly, that the broadest jurisdiction possible is in the Rules Committee to look into the subject before us—namely, campaign finance reform, campaign finance violations, the whole generic subject. It is silent with respect to the Governmental Affairs Committee. Most respectfully, it is silent on that subject.

The distinguished Governmental Affairs Committee is not a legislative committee in the context of this subject. I wonder if the colleague will take the microphone and we can have a colloquy. The first question is—you have not had a chance, but you will look at this?

Mr. LEVIN. That is correct, and we would be happy to.

Mr. WARNER. Second, you agree that Governmental Affairs is not a legislative committee.

Mr. LEVIN. The investigative jurisdiction of the Governmental Affairs Committee was the question I directed to my friend.

Mr. WARNER. I want to take it step by step. But as far as legislation, to the extent that the Senate hopefully will adopt legislation on campaign finance reform and campaign finance violations, this Senator is going to—and has and will continue to—work vigorously toward that goal. At the current time, the distinguished majority leader has designated the majority whip to head a task force on this side of the aisle, and I am a part of that. I can assure we are working diligently. So that's the legislative action.

The second point I wish to make is, I don't know of anything done by the Rules Committee in this particular resolution, or in any other thing the Rules Committee has done, which would deter the Senate or forestall the Senate from taking up campaign finance reform whenever the concurrence as to the timing comes with the distinguished majority leader and the minority leader. That is traditionally the function of those two leaders. That is a subject that is being actively discussed between the leaders. So nothing we have done deters that. That is a separate timing, a separate subject.

But we see when we pick up the papers, there is something new on this subject every day. It is the most distressing period I have ever seen.

Mr. GLENN. Will my friend yield?

Mr. WARNER. Yes. This is a colloquy. Go ahead.

Mr. GLENN. I thank my friend. I reply that the Governmental Affairs Committee has more broad jurisdiction on investigations than any committee here. It doesn't mean that we do those things legislatively then, but we are a committee that does investigations. We have done broad investigations in drug matters, for instance, and investigations and hearings regarding that. Yet, we turn that legislation over, we

turn our information over to other people to form the legislative background they need to bring it here to the Senate.

We have conducted hearings on espionage in the past, and we certainly don't have authority in those areas. But we are given broad investigative powers and staff and money to look into these things as part of our regular jurisdiction.

This committee was known through the years as a committee that took on organized crime. It was known back in those days, originally, as the Truman committee, PSI subcommittee that we have, and the McClellan subcommittee. We took on organized crime. But we didn't do the legislative matters, the legislating that had to be done. We turned the results over to other committees.

More recently, we have looked at fraudulent health programs involving the District of Columbia here and West Virginia and, I believe, part of Virginia, also. We didn't propose to do the legislation in those areas. For many years, I have personally been as involved as anybody in the Senate on matters regarding nuclear non-proliferation. Yet, primarily, that was not something we had to go ahead and put legislation in on, although I did use that to put legislation in many years ago. We have had investigations on terrorism, and it fell to other people to have the legislation.

Mr. WARNER. I readily accede to all this history, which is important. Indeed the Senator has been on the committee for 22 years, has he not?

Mr. GLENN. I have indeed.

Mr. WARNER. I am just pointing out that this resolution goes to the authority to investigate until December 31. Is the Senator suggesting that we are going to wait in the Senate until December 31 to review a final proposal on campaign finance reform? I hope not.

Mr. GLENN. I respond to my friend, no.

Mr. WARNER. There is a clear separation between the two trains that are moving—your investigation, which is important, and campaign finance reform, which, in my judgment, is equally as important. They are on different tracks.

Mr. LEVIN. Can I ask a factual question?

Mr. WARNER. The previous speaker said this Rules Committee resolution sidetracked campaign finance reform. I took serious question with him on that.

Mr. LEVIN. I think that is the likely outcome. We will know that. Is my friend from Virginia suggesting that the Governmental Affairs Committee does not have jurisdiction to investigate improper campaign activities?

Mr. WARNER. I didn't say that, Mr. President. The authority is very clear with respect to the Rules Committee, but it is less clear with Governmental Affairs. If the Senator sees a passage which I have missed—it is rather

lengthy—but it is less clear, in my judgment.

Mr. LEVIN. Just to clarify the colloquy, I heard my friend say the committee can use regular funding to look into improper activity.

Mr. WARNER. That was my next point.

Mr. LEVIN. Is there any doubt that the committee has jurisdiction to look into improper activities under its broad jurisdiction—quoting the Governmental Affairs Committee jurisdiction—“to have the duty to study the efficiency, economy, and effectiveness of all agencies and departments of Government, which would include the Federal Elections Committee.”

My question of the Rules Committee chair is, is there any question about the jurisdiction of the Governmental Affairs Committee to investigate the propriety of campaign financing and fundraising? Is there some doubt about that?

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, we are coming to a very important point, and I was going to raise that because I had this in my hand at the time I yielded for the colloquy with the Senator from Ohio. Senate Resolution 54, the omnibus resolution of the Rules Committee for all committees, under which \$4.533 million was allocated to the Governmental Affairs Committee—there is nothing in here respecting exactly how it will go about it. That is a matter that is up to the collective wisdom of the members of the committee under the leadership of the very fine chairman, and, indeed, equally fine ranking member. What the Rules Committee decided is, if you wish to have additional funds, that is within the province of the Rules Committee to say that those funds will be for a specific purpose, and that purpose being—we know exactly what it is. But it would seem to me that that action by the Rules Committee, subject to whatever the Senate does in working its will on this resolution—however this resolution emerges—hopefully, in my judgment, will emerge intact. There may be a technical change here or there. That should certainly be a precedent to the members of the Governmental Affairs Committee—a sort of guidepost as to how collectively, exercising the majority vote in this, the members should expend all the funds, in my judgment.

Mr. LEVIN. The collective wisdom of the Governmental Affairs Committee, unanimously adopted, is that we should look at both illegal and improper activities. I do not think there is a slightest doubt that both of those are within the investigative jurisdiction of the Governmental Affairs Committee. And nothing my friend from Virginia here today says anything to the contrary. Both illegal and improper activities are within the investigative jurisdiction of the Governmental Affairs Committee. And here we have a Rules Committee on a partisan vote saying to a committee of jurisdiction that has jurisdiction to investigate

both illegal and improper activity: “Sorry. This additional funding can only be used on what is already illegal. You may not investigate activities which maybe should be made illegal.” I believe that is unprecedented. I am not saying the Rules Committee cannot do that. I am saying it is unprecedented. I believe it is unwise for the Rules Committee to do that institutionally. More importantly, I believe that the Nation requires an investigation of both illegal and improper, and that is what with the bipartisan unanimous vote of the Governmental Affairs Committee was.

It is to me just the wrong message to send to the country that we are not going to let the investigative body look into improper activities, particularly involving soft money; independent expenditures which are now for the most part legal, not totally because there are some questions of illegality. But there are some. Most of the soft money is probably legal. Most of the independent expenditures are probably legal. But much of it deserves scrutiny and investigation.

What the Rules Committee has done is to deny—in a unanimous vote by the Governmental Affairs Committee—use of these additional funds to both look at improper and illegal activity. And I just hope the Senate as a whole will not set this precedent.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, with that I await the will of the Senate to work on it. But I point out that there is \$4.53 million. There is no proscription in there. But I would think that however this resolution emerges it should be a guidepost for the conduct of the investigation of this committee.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. NICKLES addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I want to compliment my colleague from Virginia, and echo some of the comments that he has made. I happen to have the distinction, as a couple of us do, to serve on both committees. I serve on the Rules Committee, and I serve on the Governmental Affairs Committee. I think the resolution that the Senator from Virginia brought to the floor—and I compliment him for it—says that we should abide by the jurisdiction of the committees. The Rules Committee has jurisdiction over campaign finance reform. It has had that jurisdiction for years. One of the reasons I became involved in the Rules Committee, one of the reasons I participated in the committee, and one of the reasons I requested time for participating, was because I am interested in campaign finance reform legislation, not just oversight on illegal activities. That is what the Governmental Affairs Committee investigates. That committee will be investigating a lot of things that have been discussed on the floor today and tomorrow and probably will be investigating these matters for some time this year, and rightfully so.

I believe I even heard the President of the United States say that we should investigate some of the alleged laundering of foreign money to the Democratic National Committee. We should investigate whether foreign nationals have tried to influence American elections. I do think, however, that the Rules Committee can work on campaign reform and simultaneously have hearings on legal activities dealing with soft money and with independent expenditures. I do not think that it is appropriate that those hearings should be mixed up with the hearings on illegal activity.

Think about it. We are talking about having people testify under oath and perhaps, by subpoena. I know from some of the subpoenas submitted by the minority that appear to focus on money spent by these groups—groups such as the Christian Coalition, Right to Life, the Sierra Club, the unions, and so on. A lot of organizations raise money and use that money to “educate their voters.” Maybe they do a lot more. Maybe they want to educate every voter in America. Organized labor put in millions of dollars in this last election. I am on the Rules Committee and I hope that we have hearings. I would say to the chairman of the Rules Committee, have hearings on soft money. What influence did it have on independent expenditures?

I think it is perfectly proper for the Rules Committee to investigate campaign finance reform. We put in an extra \$450,000 in this resolution for the Rules Committee to investigate “legal but improper” activities. If somebody deems a legal act to be improper, well that is the eyes of the beholder. But the Rules Committee, the committee of jurisdiction, the committee that will be charged with writing campaign finance reform, should be the committee that is going to be trying to figure out how you handle soft money.

For those who have not really looked into campaign finance reform before, I will tell you: There is not an easy answer on soft money. Some people just say ban it. Well, if you just automatically say ban it, you probably have not thought about it very much. You probably have not thought, “Wait a minute. Are we going to tell an organization they can’t communicate their views to members on legislation pending or on a Member’s vote on whether they are for their side or against this side?” I do not think we want to do that. I think that can become an infringement on the people’s rights of free speech. I think it may very well be declared unconstitutional. I really do not have any interest in us passing legislation just to have it to be declared unconstitutional by the courts.

So my point is that issues concerning independent expenditures and soft money are not easily dealt with. I will tell my colleagues on the other side of the aisle that I would be happy to work with others that have ideas. I think there is a real imbalance in today’s

electoral system. Under today's laws, individuals are limited donations of \$1,000. But you have unlimited expenditures on soft money. So an individual can only put in \$1,000. But you might have a wealthy person put in \$10 million to try to educate the populace on a particular issue. Another example, as the Senator from Virginia found out, you might run against a very wealthy candidate that might put in \$12 million or \$15 million and just swamp the airwaves. Yet, a Senator or another individual, if they don't have a lot of resources, would be limited to \$1,000 per election, and \$2,000 for a primary and general election. There are some real imbalances here and I would like to see us work to correct those.

I think that is properly done in the Rules Committee, not the Governmental Affairs Committee. The Governmental Affairs Committee is not going to be marking up the legislation on this issue. When you are dealing with the oversight on independent expenditures, on soft money, on legal campaign activity and the investigations, the Rules Committee should lead. The investigations under the Governmental Affairs Committee is where we have the subpoena power. That is where we are talking about trying to uncover what has happened. We have constitutional responsibilities within this committee to exercise oversight and find out if the laws have been broken. That is one of our responsibilities on Government Affairs and we need to do it.

I don't think it would be fair to be calling on people who have allegedly broken the law, having them sworn in, giving depositions under oath, making statements before the Governmental Affairs Committee, and then the next week be calling in groups under the same circumstances that were acting legally under the current system. I think they would be unfairly tainted with the same broad brush of illegal activity. I do not think that is right. I think it would be a mistake.

So I compliment my colleague from Virginia. I think he has designed a good resolution, a resolution that we can pass. It is a resolution that protects the jurisdictions of each committee. We actually have three committees involved. We have the Governmental Affairs Committee, which has very broad jurisdiction.

My colleague from Michigan asked if they can not investigate everything else. The Governmental Affairs Committee basically has the authority under its legislative authority to investigate almost anything related to Government. And so some people say, why even bother trying to delineate what they can investigate? They can investigate anything. However, I think what we have come up with a solution to let the Governmental Affairs Committee investigate the illegalities of the last election, whether it be congressional or presidential. Let the Rules Committee conduct hearings on campaign finance

reform and soft money and include hearings on improper activities, if there truly were improper activities. Maybe we can come to a consensus on how to handle soft money or independent expenditures. And if we find Members who have violated the rules or the laws, have those be referred to the Ethics Committee.

Some people say that the Ethics Committee is a chamber that no one hears from. I have been in the Senate now 17 years, and I can think of at least 5 Senators who are not here primarily as a result of the Ethics Committee. They do made a difference and they changed people's careers. They caused people to retire. They caused people not to run for reelection or they caused expulsion from the Senate. So the Ethics Committee does exercise its responsibility.

I compliment my colleague from Virginia. I think the delineation and protection is important. Frankly, if I was chairman of the Rules Committee, I would guarantee you I would be down here fighting for my committee's jurisdiction. We do it all the time. The Rules Committee does have jurisdiction over campaign finance reform and it should fight to protect that. It should have any hearings on independent expenditures. And my colleagues, if they want to get into it, I am all for it. Have the hearings. But to me it is in the right scenario. It is not putting people under oath and subpoenaing documents and making them submit to the same procedures as when illegal activities before a committee are under consideration.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. NICKLES. I would be happy to yield.

Mr. WARNER. First, I as chairman wish to give assurance of the Senator, who is a member of the committee, and other members, it has been the intention of the Rules Committee to continue as we did last year with extensive hearings—six in total. We will continue this year, and we will deal with those issues relating to soft money and independent expenditures. Somebody thinks you can take a hand and remove soft money but it is just all driven into the independent expenditure. And then you come straight to the first amendment and an individual's right to speak and to spend, which the Supreme Court of the United States has basically equated under their interpretation of the Constitution. Am I not right on that?

Mr. NICKLES. I think the Senator is correct. We may well have the debate on this this week, just to answer my colleague. We may well have the debate on whether or not we will have a constitutional amendment to limit the first amendment as it pertains to speech in campaigns. Some people advocate that. I do not happen to be one. But again that is a fair debate and one that we will probably have in the Chamber.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, if I could continue with the question, and I recognize two other Senators are seeking recognition so I will be brief, but several of our colleagues, and I respect their views, have come during the course of this very good debate this afternoon on this issue and tried to indicate in their judgment that this action by the Rules Committee is a deterrent, stalling or in another way impeding the progress of the Senate on the generic subject of campaign finance reform, which we have been working on now for some 2 years, and I do not think this is in any way a deterrent. As a matter of fact, the Governmental Affairs committee is to go on until next December.

It would be my hope and expectation that the distinguished majority leader and the Senator from Oklahoma in consultation with the minority leader would work on a schedule that is mutually agreeable. And I also wish to commend the Senator for taking the leadership in consultation with the majority leader to have a specific task force within our group that is now assessing what can be done and what will withstand constitutional scrutiny of the Federal courts to put a package together. It would be wrong to put a package through here if we all knew, many of us being lawyers, that it was going to be struck down by the Federal courts. But it is an easy thing to go out amidst this public concern, rightful concern about campaign finance reform, shovel the legislation out knowing that in a year's time it will be struck down by the courts. And that is wrong.

So I wonder if the Senator would just take a minute to describe the work of the task force. We have now had three meetings. In my judgment, we are making progress and I hope that the Senator shares that judgment.

Mr. NICKLES. I thank my colleague. Let me just make a couple of comments, Mr. President. One, we do have a group that is currently working on campaign finance reform. And to those who are saying that this effort of having the Rules Committee have jurisdiction over campaign reform is a stall—I think it is quite the opposite. I think having the Rules Committee retain its historical, legitimate jurisdiction over campaign reform is the right thing to do. I also think it is the best thing to do if you want to have real campaign reform, if you want to get something passed.

Now, we can work simultaneously. I believe the Governmental Affairs Committee is going to be swamped. It has numerous allegations to review. Allegations have been made almost on a daily basis for weeks and weeks now. The list is very long. If you tack on to that, an additional general oversight on campaign reform, I think that bogs down the process for, one, getting the original investigation resolved and, two, it bogs down campaign reform.

Now, I think by separating the two oversight responsibilities by having

hearings on campaign reform in the Rules Committee, it will allow the Rules Committee to consider those issues and to go ahead and work on legislation. We may have to do the legislation in a couple of pieces. Some people are very adamant on passing campaign reform legislation this year and they think we can only do it in one piece. I would urge my colleagues—and I see my friend from Wisconsin here—who are really interested in campaign reform to think of possibly what we can do. What can we put together now that has bipartisan support that we can pass?

I can think of several things. Full and immediate disclosure for soft money, for independent expenditures and for all hard money. There is a lot of money under the table right now. We do not have any idea, for example, how much total money that organized labor put into the campaigns. We do not have any idea how much different groups have put in. We could require immediate disclosure, and I bet we could get an overwhelming vote, even a unanimous vote, for immediate disclosure.

I think we can do some other things. There are a lot of other good ideas but I do not know that I should throw all of them out because I am starting to negotiate on these with my Democrat colleagues who want to make some real reform. Maybe we could come up with a consensus package now that includes reform on individual and special interest money. Some people advocate confining money to being raised in their State or district. I am for looking into that. Let us negotiate and see if we cannot put together a package by having oversight in the Rules Committee to include issues of independent expenditures and soft money. Let us see if we can come up with an agreement on that. Maybe the hearings will evolve to where we can come to a consensus on these issues. Also, maybe at the conclusion of the Governmental Affairs Committee, we may find other statutes that need to be changed.

Most of the things that we are looking at investigating right now concern statutes that are fairly clear. In some cases, they have been ambiguous. I noticed the statute in section 607, where it says it shall be unlawful for any person to solicit in a Government building. And the Vice President said he is exempt from the law. I find that to be a stretch. I do not see an exemption there for the Vice President. But if he is correct, maybe we need to change the law.

And so maybe these hearings will evolve and we will learn a little bit more about what should be included in our laws. I am happy to do that. But I do not think the Rules Committee has to wait on the Governmental Affairs Committee to act. I am willing to act earlier. I am very, very serious about trying to work to see if we cannot come up with bipartisan consensus legislation. Once we have passed that, to see if we can come up with those ele-

ments that we can agree upon such as making sure, for example, that all contributions for political campaigns are voluntary. To me that is a fundamental right. We should have that in a package.

So let us put together a package, pass it and then if we determine because of the Governmental Affairs Committee hearings or the Rules Committee hearings that we need to do further work, we can address it and pass that possibly later.

So again, I compliment my friend from Virginia for his resolution. I am hopeful that we will be able to pass it soon. I am hopeful—I see my colleague from Ohio—that we will be able to work together in the Governmental Affairs Committee in a bipartisan fashion to get the facts out and to conclude. I will tell my colleague I was one that said let us try to wrap this up this year. I do not want this thing going on forever. So we will work towards that end. I thank my colleagues, and I yield the floor.

Mr. WARNER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, that was a very interesting dissertation as part of this debate by the distinguished majority whip.

I would like to also note that the former chairman of the Governmental Affairs Committee, the senior Senator from Alaska, participated throughout the debate in the Rules Committee on this issue. He, as well as anyone, understands that committee, the scope of its jurisdiction, the wisdom of preserving the jurisdiction, and he voted solidly with us on this matter. So we have three members, the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma, the distinguished Senator from Alaska, and the distinguished Senator from Mississippi, who spoke today in strong support of this resolution.

So we are particularly fortunate that we have three members of the other committee that served on the Rules Committee and who gave their unqualified support for this resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, I will not make prolonged remarks this evening, but I must reply to some of the things that have been said here because the implication, at least, has been that somehow Governmental Affairs was usurping jurisdiction or something, and that Rules are protecting their turf in making sure this jurisdiction was not taken over by Governmental Affairs. I think we need to briefly review the bidding and how we got where we are.

When all this matter of campaign finance reform first came up, there were a number of committees in the Senate that thought they had a piece of this and wanted to have hearings or were quoted in the paper as saying they might look into it. We had Commerce, Judiciary, Foreign Relations, the Rules

Committee, and Governmental Affairs—all were involved. What was decided in centering this in Governmental Affairs was not a decision made on the Democratic side at all. To concentrate this in the Governmental Affairs Committee was a decision of the Republican leadership, that they did not want this strung out all over the lot. And with Governmental Affairs having the preeminent investigative authority in the Senate, they would concentrate everything there. The newspaper reports, at least, indicated that the leadership got the other committee chairmen to sign off with that approach, and it was announced that the Governmental Affairs Committee was going to take the lead in this.

That was not a decision made on the minority side. That was a decision made and carried out on the majority side. So there was no effort whatsoever by anybody to take some jurisdiction away from another committee.

Now, let us follow this through just very briefly as to what happened. When did the Rules Committee finally get interested in this and decide it was in their jurisdiction? Only after the funding request came from the Governmental Affairs Committee and the members on the Rules Committee, who really do not want campaign finance reform, blocked the funding, period, not in an official committee meeting, but in a meeting just of the Republicans on that committee.

Why did they object to the funding rules? Because they have an objection to campaign finance reform. This got into a real impasse, a real impasse with Republican leadership. So, then it became a deal cut to say we will water down what Governmental Affairs is going to do and we will let the Rules Committee handle this, because we have members opposed to campaign finance reform on the Rules Committee.

It has been pointed out that we have members now on the Rules Committee that are also on the Governmental Affairs Committee, three crossovers, three people with dual membership on both committees, who voted on the Rules Committee to do what this Senate Resolution 39 that we are debating is supposed to do. But I would point out, those are the same three members who voted unanimously on the Governmental Affairs Committee, unanimously on the scope, unanimously on what was to be looked into, unanimously there would be no-holds-barred, unanimously we would look into soft money, unanimously we would look into legal, illegal, improper, whatever—wherever the track led us. That is what they voted for on the Governmental Affairs Committee, and that is the reason it went to the Rules Committee that way.

It was only after members of the Rules Committee put this whole thing into a quagmire of dissent and were going to block any funding that this so-called compromise arrangement—or capitulation, I would term it—was

worked out. And that is just exactly how this thing developed.

So, all the talk here about how the Rules Committee members voted this so it must be right because they are also on Governmental Affairs ignores that they are the ones who voted unanimously on Governmental Affairs for the scope, for everything we wanted to look into. We hoped we could work out a goal. All of these things that were voted out of committee only got objections after it got over to the Rules Committee where any funding was stopped by the people who basically do not want any campaign finance reform.

I hate to be so blunt, but that is exactly—

Mr. WARNER. Will my colleague yield for a second?

Mr. GLENN. I will yield the floor.

Mr. WARNER. I think, if you are going to have that rendition of facts, you should also include that those same members asked for \$11-plus million and no time limitation, which, if I may with respect, you and your colleagues objected to. So that changed the entire formula for those three members.

Mr. GLENN. How did that change the formula, changing the money?

Mr. WARNER. When you denied them the fact they could go on without a time limitation, and the amount of money. My recollection is that you were only going to grant \$1.8 million.

Mr. GLENN. No, let me correct that, because what happened on this was that was a proposal from the Democratic side. It was voted down on Republican side. And the \$6.5 million was voted out of committee to the Rules Committee and the Democrats, who had thought we could get by with a much lower figure because every other committee had, going into this investigation with the idea that you always could come back and ask for money—which was done in the case of Watergate, with five different allocations of money. They voted out of committee \$6.5 million. That is what went to the Rules Committee. So we had gotten past that hurdle there. We were going with \$6.5 million over at Rules, and that is when Republican members on the Rules Committee objected to going forward. That was not the Democratic side. That is how we got to where we are right now.

So I am sure we are going to have more debate on this tomorrow, but I just thought I better indicate here, this was not Governmental Affairs trying to usurp jurisdiction. That jurisdiction was given to us by the Republican leadership in trying to combine all of the different committees that wanted this investigation into one investigation, under the prime investigative committee in the Senate, which is the Governmental Affairs Committee. That was a decision of the Republican leadership. We had nothing to do with that on our side of the aisle. It only came apart, even after it was voted out of the Gov-

ernmental Affairs Committee unanimously, by all Republican members, and got over to the Rules Committee and ran into trouble with some who want no campaign finance reform and objected so strenuously that a deal had to be cut to let them have some jurisdiction back on the Rules Committee in the areas of soft money that they are so afraid will be changed, and brought it back over there where they would have more of a chance to control it.

We, then, on the Governmental Affairs Committee, were charged with looking into only illegalities. That is a far narrower standard, when you get to investigating matters. We had hoped to have, and what the Republican members on the Governmental Affairs Committee had all voted for, was a broad investigation, no-holds-barred, let's set the basis for campaign finance reform for the future. That is basically what is being denied now.

I yield the floor.

Mr. WARNER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I shall yield momentarily to my distinguished colleague after just one further fact. The Rules Committee—we went back and checked it again—noted that concerning the request for funding from the Governmental Affairs Committee, which in the tradition of the Senate both the chairman and the ranking would sign, the distinguished ranking member of the Governmental Affairs did not sign the financial request for \$11-plus million that came to our committee.

So I think there are a few other facts that should be brought to bear as we look at this situation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, it was not too long ago, just last June, when I joined the senior Senator from Arizona and the senior Senator from Tennessee, as well as the senior Senator from Minnesota and other Senators, in offering in this body the first bipartisan campaign finance proposal in over a decade. Although the legislation had received unprecedented bipartisan support, including the backing of President Clinton and Ross Perot and Common Cause, 161 different editorial boards nationwide and some 60 congressional Democrats and Republicans, we in this body did fail to invoke cloture on that measure by 6 votes.

We have heard some interesting arguments during the past summer about this in the public debate, when we did finally debate campaign finance reform for just 2 days under a series of rules that would not allow us to amend the bill but would only allow us to have a debate for 2 days and then vote immediately on cloture.

That was the deal we had to accept, just to have this issue heard in this body and before the American people.

But we did so because we wanted a chance to be heard.

We were told on that occasion by our opponents, led by the junior Senator from Kentucky, very clearly that he believed there really wasn't much of a problem with our current campaign finance system. We were told that the explosion in campaign spending that we had seen in 1992 and, again, in the 1994 elections was not only not a cause for alarm; we were told by some, led by the senior Senator from Kentucky, that this onslaught of campaign cash was healthy for democracy. That is what we were told, and it carried the day, although a majority of this body did vote to go forward. The status quo, we were told, was democracy at its finest, and more spending, more big spending, would only make it better.

Of course, we heard the other side of this debate from those of us who adamantly are opposed to the status quo, and at one point during the public debate over this issue, I recall very clearly hearing both the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCCAIN], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. THOMPSON], predict that the 1996 elections would produce a large-scale scandal. They predicted a scandal. I also remember their stern warnings that it would be a scandal of grand magnitude that would eventually compel the Congress to pass meaningful campaign finance reform.

Mr. President, based on what has happened in the months that followed that debate, what was right? Who was right? Those who were proclaiming that money in politics was a match made in Heaven, or those who suggested that money in politics was closer to gasoline and matches?

I believe the debate we are having today, and the endless headlines and media reports of abuses by both sides of the aisle in the last election, provide a clear answer to that question. In fact, the Senator from Kentucky and others who opposed our effort last June on the grounds that we needed more campaign spending, not less, got exactly what they wanted in the last election. They got more spending all right.

The 1996 elections set an all-time record for campaign spending at \$2.7 billion—\$2.7 billion, Mr. President. Now, was democracy strengthened, as the Senator from Kentucky suggested it would be? I don't think so. Considering that the fewest percentage of Americans went to the ballot in 72 years in that election, I would say that we can lay to rest the theory that more campaign spending increases participation in our political system and is somehow good for democracy.

The resolution before us today provides about \$4.3 million for the Governmental Affairs Committee to conduct an investigation into reported illegalities stemming from just the 1996 elections. This includes abuses both in the Presidential and congressional elections. The investigation, as we have laid out here today, must conclude by

December 31, and a report must be issued by the committee within 1 month after that date.

Ultimately, I certainly will support this resolution, because I strongly believe these activities must be investigated on a bipartisan basis. That is why I have also supported an appointment of an independent counsel to investigate both Republican and Democratic abuses in the 1996 elections. I am aware that several of my colleagues originally held to the position, as the senior Senator from Ohio is pointing out, that the committee should only examine abuses in the Presidential election, but in light of the recent revelations about potential congressional campaign finance abuses in the last election, I commend the authors of this resolution for their willingness to investigate wrongdoing at both ends of Pennsylvania Avenue.

I am concerned, however, that this resolution is confined to the 1996 elections. Just in the past few days, allegations have come to light about the 1992 elections and potential wrongdoing by the current Speaker of the other body, as well as a former Vice President of the United States. These 1992 allegations are as serious, in my mind, as the 1996 allegations, and they warrant a full investigation by the oversight committees. The use of the White House and the office of the Vice President for activities related to fundraising I don't think was invented in 1996. That is just my guess, but I am pretty sure it was not invented in 1996.

Although it is imperfect, I will ultimately support the underlying resolution to allow this investigation to go forward and hope that the committee, under the strong leadership of the Senators from Tennessee and Ohio, will conduct a balanced and bipartisan investigation process.

But we have to recognize that these investigations are only one small step forward. We have to understand that these abuses, on both sides of the aisle, were an almost inevitable byproduct of a campaign finance system that has virtually no restraints on candidate or party spending and no restraints whatsoever on the so-called soft money contributions that seem to be at the focal point of so many of these abuses.

These abuses, as the Senators from Arizona and Tennessee predicted last June, were simply inevitable. Yes, it is illegal to raise campaign funds from the White House or from a Senate office. Yes, it is illegal to accept campaign contributions from nonresident foreign nationals. Now, that is clear. But let us talk about fundraising practices where the lines between what is legal and illegal and what is ethical and unethical become far more blurred. This is very, very difficult to determine whether something is simply illegal or legal.

For example, under current law, it is viewed as legal for a corporation, a labor union or a wealthy individual to hand the President of the United

States or a U.S. Senator acting on behalf of their political parties a check for \$400,000. As long as the check is made out to the party and not the person accepting or even soliciting the check, it is widely viewed as legal. It is called soft money, which is unlimited campaign contributions from sources which are normally restricted in their contributing, based on the reforms that were enacted some 20 years ago.

For example, corporations and labor unions, which are strictly forbidden from contributing directly to Federal candidates, can contribute unlimited sums of money to the national parties, which then funnel these funds into various House and Senate races. Mr. President, I don't think anyone in this body is going to be able to fool the American people on this. What this system is is a giant money laundering operation, and it is done openly. That is what it is. It is a giant money laundering operation, known as soft money.

It is also considered legal, apparently, for elected officials to trade access for huge campaign contributions. That is probably on the legal side of the ledger. Let me give you a couple of examples.

In 1995, the Republican National Committee promised \$15,000 donors four meetings a year with House and Senate Republican leaders, as well as participation in international trade missions. That same year, the Democratic National Committee offered \$10,000 donors the opportunity to participate in trade missions to Budapest, Vienna, and Paris.

This system of exchanging access to elected officials for large campaign contributions was recently referred to by a Member of this body as "the American way," that it is simply the American way to do things this way. Mr. President, if that is true, it is an awfully sad day for America.

The abuses that have been uncovered in recent elections are the symptoms, not the disease. The disease is our failed campaign finance system. Nowhere is this more visible than with the virtual explosion of so-called soft money. In the 1992 elections, about \$86 million was raised by the two national parties in these so-called soft money contributions. In 1994, that figure jumped to over \$100 million. And then in the 1996 elections, soft money exploded, and the two parties accumulated over \$263 million in soft money contributions. That, Mr. President, is more than a 150 percent increase in just 2 years.

When is this body going to stand up and say that it should be illegal, clearly illegal, for anyone, whether you are from Jakarta or Janesville, WI, to make a \$400,000 contribution?

When is this body going to stand up and say that we should reform a system that reelects incumbents well over 90 percent of the time?

When is this body going to stand up and say there is simply too much money flowing through our campaign

system? And, yes, we do need—soon—comprehensive bipartisan reform.

I just got here a little while ago, got to the floor, and heard the arguments of, yes, we are going to have the investigation and, yes, we are going to have a vote on the constitutional amendment on campaign finance reform. I am hopeful no one will be fooled. That combination of limited hearings that have to do with only illegal conduct and a vote on a constitutional amendment that will lose is simply a way to sweep this issue under the rug. That is all it is. That is a deadly combination. That would be the death of campaign finance reform, to simply pretend that a vote on a constitutional amendment, with the barriers that are involved there in a limited hearing, will somehow take care of this problem.

Many of the people who are saying that they are concerned and want to work on this issue are the very ones that voted last year to not even put campaign finance reform on the agenda of the 104th Congress. So we ought to very carefully examine their claims that the combination of a couple days of debate on a constitutional amendment and limited hearings will do the job. If it can be accomplished, it will be a very neat trick. And it worked in the 104th Congress, but it will not work in the 105th Congress.

Mr. President, it will not be possible to contain this issue. It will not be possible to just sweep it under the rug.

Mr. President, make no mistake, the investigations and the issue of legislating campaign finance reform are automatically and inextricably linked to each other. Let me say, if these investigations are done right, it can help.

An investigation that shines a spotlight on the darkest corners of our campaign finance system can be a useful endeavor so long as those who benefit the most from our current campaign finance rules are willing to turn the spotlight on themselves.

Passage of this resolution, if done right, is a first step. But I do not believe its passage will change one bit the public's perception that their Government and the elected leaders are for sale.

The only way we can truly begin the process of restoring the trust and faith of the American people in their elected officials is to pass meaningful, bipartisan campaign finance reform. It is my sincere hope that opportunity presents itself in the coming months. And I look forward to a thoughtful debate on the issue as well as negotiations with regard to the specifics.

So although I will support this resolution, I will also support efforts to strengthen it by explicitly broadening its scope to include both legal and illegal fundraising activities as well as including the elections prior to 1996 where the seeds of much of this abuse were planted.

Mr. President, what I just described was the original scope of the hearings approved by the Governmental Affairs



Committee on a bipartisan, unanimous vote of 16 to 0. And those who supported the narrowing of this scope owe the American people an explanation of why we are only going to examine some of the abuses but not all of the abuses.

In my view, many of the issues can be investigated even under the wording of the resolution before us. In other words, I think it is going to be very difficult to simply make a legal ruling that something was legal or illegal without looking at the facts. And I do think, however, though it would be preferable to restore the specific language regarding the detailed scope that was originally outlined by the Governmental Affairs Committee. Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

Mr. WARNER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. President, I would like to ask my distinguished colleague from Wisconsin a question.

We reviewed your bill with great care in the Rules Committee. You will recall that. I think you appeared before the committee, am I not correct in that?

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I do recall that.

Mr. WARNER. Essential to this whole debate is the question of unions. Yet my colleague from Wisconsin excluded that from consideration in his bill.

What do you say as to why you purposefully left an important part of reform out of your proposed legislation?

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, the answer to the question is, the distinguished Senator from Virginia must be talking about a different bill. This bill bans soft money. The labor unions in this country, I believe, spent \$7 million this year on soft money. That is wiped out by the McCain-Feingold bill.

Second, this bill added last year, and it has in this year's version, significant limitations on political action committees. I believe the unions in this country spent about \$14 million on political action committees.

Our bill says, if you want the benefit of the voluntary limits within the bill, you have to limit how much you get from political action committees to total to less than 20 percent of your total campaign contributions.

It also takes down the amount that a political action committee can give from \$5,000 to \$1,000 to the individual limit.

These are severe and real restrictions which I can assure you that the labor unions do not like. In fact, last year there was a meeting of various labor unions and business groups and women's groups and others saying they were very unhappy.

Finally, Mr. President, let me say, in answer to the question, the Senator from Arizona and I have said in the past we are willing to look at other

provisions relating to this broader issue as long as it is fair from the point of view of looking at issues of corporate giving, of share-holding money and the giving activities of other organizations that use their members' dues. That is possible.

So we have two major limitations on unions in the bill now. And we are willing to discuss an evenhanded provision that relates to other issues. It is simply not the case—

Mr. WARNER. If I—

Mr. FEINGOLD. Let me finish. It is simply not the case, Mr. President, that anyone has barred limitations that affect unions in our bill.

Mr. WARNER. Do I understand that on the question of dues, these are in many instances deducted from the paycheck. Am I not correct in that?

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, that is one of a variety of issues that has to do with how unions operate. There are issues of how corporations take money from shareholders, profits to use on campaigns. There are issues about how the National Rifle Association, for example, takes its members' dues and uses that for their activities. These are issues that can be considered.

Now, I will agree with the Senator, we have not put a provision relating to all of this in our bill at this point because I think it is possible that if we try to take all of that on, it could kill campaign finance reform. It could make it very difficult for us to ban soft money and to put a voluntary limitation system on Members of Congress with incentives.

But the Senator from Arizona and I have been very careful in saying everything is potentially on the table, and we want to negotiate. Nothing has been stopped from being considered as this bill comes forward.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I just conclude by saying that over \$35 million was spent by the unions in the last election, to the best of my knowledge.

I yield the floor.

Mr. FEINGOLD. A brief rejoinder on that.

The Senator mentioned \$35 million spent by the unions in the last election. As I illustrated in my remarks, our bill certainly affects at least \$20 million worth of spending that unions did with regard to soft money and political action committees. And may I just point out that the amount of money spent by corporations and other interests in this country, I think, would simply dwarf the figures that are being thrown out around here. That has to be addressed as well.

I thank the chair.

Mr. GLENN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, before I introduce my amendment, I would like to correct the statement I made in the earlier debate.

The Democrats voted against the \$6.5 million recommendation that came out of the committee, but we were out-

voted on that at the end. We had favored the smaller amount and letting the committee back for additional allocations of money as were required later on if paydirt was being hit, if the hearings were being fruitful.

So, the original resolution to rules went with a partisan vote on the money, but not on the scope because there was unanimous agreement on the scope. And that is what now is largely at issue here. So I just wanted to correct that so there would be no misunderstanding on it.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 21

(Purpose: To clarify the scope of the investigation, and for other purposes)

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. GLENN] proposes an amendment numbered 21.

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 10, strike lines 17 through 20 and insert the following:

“(b) PURPOSE OF ADDITIONAL FUNDS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The additional funds authorized by this section are for the sole purpose of conducting an investigation into illegal or improper fundraising and spending practices in the 1996 Federal election campaigns, including the following:

“(A) Foreign contributions and the effect of those contributions on the United States political system.

“(B) Conflicts of interest involving Federal office holders and employees, and the misuse of Government offices.

“(C) Failure by Federal employees to maintain and observe legal limitations relating to fundraising and official business.

“(D) The independence of the Presidential campaigns from the political activities pursued for their benefit by outside individuals or groups.

“(E) The misuse of charitable and tax exempt organizations in connection with political or fundraising activities.

“(F) Amounts given to or spent by a political party for the purpose of influencing Federal elections generally that are not subject to the limitations or reporting requirements of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 431 et seq.) (commonly referred to as ‘soft money’) and the effect of soft money on the United States political system.

“(G) Promises or grants of special access in return for political contributions or favors.

“(H) The effect of independent expenditures (whether by corporations, labor unions, or otherwise) upon the current Federal campaign finance system, and the question as to whether such expenditures are truly independent.

“(I) Contributions to and expenditures by entities for the benefit or in the interest of Federal officers.

“(J) Practices described in subparagraphs (A) through (I) that occurred in previous Federal election campaigns to the extent that those practices are similar or analogous.

“(2) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to limit the

authority of the Committee on Governmental Affairs under the Senate Rules or section 13(d) of this resolution.

### MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into a period of morning business for not to exceed 5 minutes for each Senator.

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

### THE VERY BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, at the close of business Friday, March 7, the Federal debt stood at \$5,353,405,261,722.26.

One year ago, March 7, 1996, the Federal debt stood at \$5,017,741,000,000.

Twenty-five years ago, March 7, 1972, the Federal debt stood at \$427,832,000,000 which reflects a debt increase of nearly \$5 trillion (\$4,925,573,261,722.26) during the past 25 years.

### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted on March 6, 1997:

By Mr. WARNER, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. Res. 39: An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. HATCH, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment and with a preamble:

S. Res. 56: A resolution designating March 25, 1997 as "Greek Independence Day: A National Day of Celebration of Greek and American Democracy."

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

The following report of committee was submitted on March 10, 1997:

By Mr. THOMPSON, from the Committee on Governmental Affairs:

Report to accompany the resolutions (S. Res. 39) authorizing expenditures by the Committee on Governmental Affairs (Rpt. 105-7).

### INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second time by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. LAUTENBERG (for himself and Mr. DEWINE):

S. 412. A bill to provide for a national standard to prohibit the operation of motor vehicles by intoxicated individuals; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mrs. HUTCHISON:

S. 413. A bill to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1977 to require States to verify that prisoners are not receiving food stamps; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mrs. HUTCHISON (for herself, Mr. LOTT, Mr. BREAU, and Mr. GORTON):

S. 414. A bill to amend the Shipping Act of 1984 to encourage competition in inter-

national shipping and growth of United States imports and exports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. BAUCUS (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, and Mr. THOMAS):

S. 415. A bill to amend the medicare program under title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve rural health services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MURKOWSKI:

S. 416. A bill to amend the Energy Policy and Conservation Act to extend the expiration dates of existing authorities and enhance U.S. participation in the energy emergency program of the International Energy Agency; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

S. 417. A bill to extend energy conservation programs under the Energy Policy and Conservation Act through September 30, 2002; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. WARNER:

S. 418. A bill to close the Lorton Correctional Complex, to prohibit the incarceration of individuals convicted of felonies under the laws of the District of Columbia in facilities of the District of Columbia Department of Corrections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

### SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. FORD:

S. Res. 62. An executive resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding a declaration to resolution of ratification of the Chemical Weapons Convention; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

### STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. LAUTENBERG (for himself and Mr. DEWINE):

S. 412. A bill to provide for a national standard to prohibit the operation of motor vehicles by intoxicated individuals; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

#### THE SAFE AND SOBER STREETS ACT

• Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I introduce a bill that, if enacted, will go a long way toward reducing the deadly combination of drinking and driving. I am proud to stand with Senator MIKE DEWINE of Ohio in introducing this bill. The Safe and Sober Streets Act of 1997 sets a national illegal blood alcohol content [BAC] limit of .08 percent for drivers over 21 years of age. The bill gives States that have a limit above .08 BAC, 3 years to adopt .08 laws. States that fail to enact this limit will have a percentage of their highway construction funds withheld.

Mr. President, drunk driving continues to be a national scourge that imposes tremendous suffering on the victims of drunk driving accidents and their loved ones. In 1995, drunk driving increased for the first time in a decade. That year, 17,274 people were killed in alcohol-related crashes. Every one of

those deaths could have been prevented, had the driver decided to call for a ride, handed the keys to a friend, or did anything other than taking the wheel.

Every 30 minutes someone in America—a mother, husband, child, grandchild, brother, sister—dies in an alcohol-related crash. The numbers are increasing. Our highways are turning into death traps and our concrete clover leaves into killing fields.

Mr. President, we have made progress over the past few decades in the fight against drunk driving. In 1982, 53 percent of motor vehicle fatalities involved alcohol; today, alcohol-involved motor vehicle crashes is 40.5 percent. In 1984, I authored the bill that President Ronald Reagan signed into law to increase the drinking age to 21. Since 1975, 21 drinking age laws have saved roughly 15,700 lives. And, 2 years ago, Congress passed and President Clinton signed into law a zero tolerance bill with sanctions, making it illegal for drivers under 21 years of age to drive with any amount of alcohol in their system.

While that shows promise, we know we must do more—17,274 lives lost is 17,274 too many. Instituting a national standard for impaired driving at .08 BAC is the next logical step in the fight against drunk driving.

There are those who ask why the standard for impaired driving should be .08 BAC. But I think the better question is: why should the standard be as high as .10? We know that any amount of alcohol affects motor skills and driving behavior to some degree. A 1991 study by the Insurance Institute for Highway Safety indicates that each .02 increase in the BAC of a driver with nonzero BAC, nearly doubles the risk of being in a fatal crash. This means that the risk a driver faces begins much earlier than when his or her blood alcohol content is at .10 or .08, after the first or second drink. In fact, the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration [NHTSA] reports that in single vehicle crashes, the relative fatality risk of drivers with BAC's of .05 and .09 is over 11 times greater than for drivers with a BAC of zero.

Mr. President, .08 BAC is not an insignificant level. A 170 lb. male must consume four and a half drinks in 1 hour on an empty stomach to reach .08 BAC. This is not social drinking. While most States have .10 BAC as their legal limit, it is actually at .08 BAC where driving skills are seriously compromised. At that level, the vast majority of drivers are impaired when it comes to critical driving tasks. Braking, steering, speed control, lane changing, and divided attention are all compromised at .08 BAC.

Thirteen States have .08 BAC limits, and many industrialized countries have .08 BAC limits or lower. Canada, Great Britain, Austria, and Switzerland have .08 BAC limits. France and The Netherlands have a .05 BAC limit. They adopted these laws because they know that