

outdo the Democrats about 2 to 1 in this fundraising area and particularly in the area of soft money. It was crucial, as we see it, a couple of years ago in changing the majority in the Senate, because money is the mother's milk of politics. It is really what has more impact than anything else. So they objected to any changes or to any investigation in those areas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. GLENN. I ask unanimous consent to finish my statement.

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

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, they wanted to cut out any investigation of Capitol Hill. That is the reason we came to this situation. It was not that most Members don't want to correct campaign finance reform on our side. We asked for campaign finance reform legislation to be brought to the floor all this year. We would like to see the McCain-Feingold proposal voted on.

But regardless of that, we think that an airing of everything to do with what happened in campaign financing over the past several elections, really, as this has built up to a crescendo that just inundated us in 1996, we think that should be looked into to lay the base for real campaign finance reform and give us that kind of educational base.

What happened? Those who were against this got a deal cut, and instead, all the things we were going to look into which was submitted as the original part of Senate Resolution 39 from the Governmental Affairs Committee to the Rules Committee for approval were all struck, the total language, and the additional funds in the last part of this that are operable in Senate Resolution 39 as brought to the floor state that funds can only be used for the sole purpose of conducting an investigation of illegal activities. That takes out all those other areas of soft money that we wanted to look into.

The amendment I proposed would restore the scope of the investigation, as the chairman and I and as all members of the Governmental Affairs Committee, including those who are on the Rules Committee, voted out of committee. They voted for these things to go into this type of scope. They did not disagree with it then. But as part of the deal that was cut then, that kind of scope was taken away from us. Now I would propose, with my amendment, to restore that.

What has happened this morning is now the majority leader has proposed an amendment to my amendment, a second-degree amendment in the nature of a substitute, that would again say that "the Committee on Rules and Administration, not the Committee on Governmental Affairs, has jurisdiction under rule 25 over all proposed legislation and other matters relating to—(1) Federal elections generally * * * [and] (2) corrupt practices * * * [and] the Committee on Governmental Affairs shall refer to the Committee on Rules

and Administration any evidence of activities * * * [that] are not illegal but which may require investigation * * *". In other words, this takes us back where we were. It second-degrees my amendment and takes us back to the intent of Senate Resolution 39, which cut back the authority on the committee.

There has been a good discussion of this this morning. But to my way of thinking, this boils down, very, very simply, to one area. And one thing that is correct is, it is a choice. Do we want campaign finance reform or do we not?

We want the broadest possible investigation so we can come out with good campaign finance reform that I think will be follow on to McCain-Feingold if we are ever able to get it to a vote. On the other side, they do not want any investigation in this area and are opposed to campaign finance reform. That is the bottom-line choice we are talking about here.

I will end with that because my good friend from Virginia has been very kind in granting me extra time here. I have run over several minutes, I know. I thank him very much.

Mr. WARNER. I thank my colleague. I would have to say to my good friend and colleague, we will have more debate on this as the day goes on and perhaps tomorrow. Hopefully, we can finish tonight, but I will be ready to take the floor tomorrow again.

Mr. President, he misstates the case. This Senator is for campaign finance reform of some measure. I am not able to give the parameters in totality now. The distinguished majority leader sat here and opened this debate this morning indicating what is taking place. He, together with Senator NICKLES, is conducting a task force on this side of the aisle which meets on a regular basis to examine those provisions, which, hopefully, we will insert at some point in time in a bill which is clearly campaign finance reform. So, I have to strongly disagree with my good friend and colleague on that point.

Now, Mr. President, we shall stand in recess.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the hour of 12:30 having arrived, the Senate will stand in recess until the hour of 2:15.

Thereupon, at 12:31 p.m., the Senate recessed until 2:14 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. BROWNBACK).

AUTHORIZING EXPENDITURES BY THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

The Senate continued with the consideration of the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are 15 minutes equally divided to each side.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, in the absence of anyone on this side of the aisle, I suggest a quorum be reinstated and that the time not be counted against either side.

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

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENTS

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, we have a unanimous consent process that we will go through here that would allow for the withdrawal of the pending second-degree amendment and the offering of a new amendment. We are very close to an agreement on not only this procedure, but a number of other aspects of how we will deal with this pending resolution this afternoon.

We would like to get this consent agreed to, and then we will take a few minutes more to make sure everybody understands exactly what we are proposing to agree to, and we will come back and go through that process. It could lead to our having perhaps just one more recorded vote and final passage. But we want to make sure everybody understands and is comfortable with what we are doing to the maximum degree possible.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, notwithstanding the consent agreement, that it be in order for me to withdraw amendment No. 22 in order to offer a separate amendment, and the amendment be in order notwithstanding the fact that it hits the resolution in more than one place.

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

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending Glenn amendment be laid aside in order for me to offer an amendment, and no further amendments be in order prior to the vote on or in relation to my amendment.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I ask whether that is intended to preclude any further amendments on the resolution.

Mr. LOTT. At this point it is just no further amendments in order to my amendment. We are discussing the possibility of an agreement that would not provide for additional amendments, but we have not reached a final agreement on that at this point. So we would have to just talk that through with you and

other Senators and make sure everybody understands and agrees before we enter that next request. But it is not applicable here.

Mr. SPECTER. As long as this unanimous consent request is not precluding further amendments to the resolution, I do not object.

Mr. DASCHLE. Reserving the right to object, I only do so for purposes of clarification.

I think what the majority leader is proposing here goes a long way to resolving one of the issues that divided Democrats and Republicans. First, I commend him and commend those responsible for offering this amendment.

What this would do is to add the word "improper" at the appropriate places within the authorization to allow us to look at both improper and illegal activity. So, as I say, this goes a long way to resolving the conflict that we have discussed now for some time and that was the subject of debate this morning. So this moves this process along. I would certainly urge all of my colleagues to agree to this unanimous consent request.

Mr. LOTT addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for his comments. I might say, just for further clarification, it would add to "illegal" the words "and improper." The Glenn amendment of course has a number of descriptions. We are working on a discussion here of how that might be handled in a colloquy here today. But this would just add the words "and improper" at the appropriate places in the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further objection in regard to this request? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LOTT. I further ask unanimous consent that following the disposition of the Lott amendment, the Senate resume the Glenn amendment No. 21, and no amendments be in order prior to the vote on or in relation to the Glenn amendment No. 21 and he be permitted to withdraw his amendment if he chooses after our discussions take place.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 23

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I now send my amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. LOTT], for himself, Mr. THOMPSON, and Mr. WARNER, proposes an amendment numbered 23.

Mr. LOTT. 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, line 19 after the word "illegal" add "and improper".

On page 10, line 23 after the word "illegal" add "and improper".

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

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

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to proceed as in morning business for 5 minutes to introduce a measure, after which time I will suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

Mr. DODD. Will my colleague yield to make that 6 minutes so I could get a minute in?

Mr. DOMENICI. I ask unanimous consent for 7 minutes and give 3 of my minutes to Senator DODD.

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

(The remarks of Mr. DOMENICI and Mr. DODD pertaining to the introduction of S. 422 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent I may proceed for 12 minutes as in morning business.

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

RETIREMENT ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, when the 94th Congress convened in January 1975, I was 93d in Senate seniority. When the 105th Congress convened this past January, I was 12th. What a difference 22 years make.

My 22 years of service to the people of Kentucky, as their U.S. Senator, has been during a remarkable period in history. We have witnessed the end of the cold war and the fall of the Berlin Wall. We have witnessed a technological boom that was unthinkable 22 years ago and we've witnessed the growth of democracy in practically every underdeveloped nation in the world.

We have also seen the cost of a college education skyrocket. We have seen the cost of medical care skyrocket. And last but not least, we've seen the cost of a political campaign skyrocket.

The average cost of a U.S. Senate race in 1974, the first year I ran, was less than \$450,000. In fact, \$437,482. The average cost of a Senate race last year was approximately \$4.5 million. There is no job, especially the job of public servant, that is worth or deserves the effort necessary to raise and spend that much money.

The job of being a U.S. Senator today has unfortunately become a job of raising money to be reelected instead of a job doing the people's business. Traveling to New York, California, Texas,

or basically any State in the country, weekend after weekend, for the next 2 years is what candidates must do if they hope to raise the money necessary to compete in a senatorial election.

Democracy as we know it will be lost if we continue to allow government to become one bought by the highest bidder, for the highest bidder. Candidates will simply become bit players and pawns in a campaign managed and manipulated by paid consultants and hired guns.

Because of the political money chase, Washington, DC is fast becoming the center of our lives, not our people back home. The money chase has got to stop. We must reform the system so that ordinary, everyday people, who want to run for political office and make our country a better place are able to do so.

I have spent a good part of my Senate career and political life working to nudge and, occasionally shove our party back toward the center of the political road. I came to Washington as a moderate Democrat, believing then as I still do, that the will of the people comes first. I've tried to be a moderate voice and will continue to do so. I love our country too much to let the extremists ram their agenda down our throats.

There are many challenges facing the Senate and our party as we march into the next millennium. More than ever, I want to be involved in addressing some of them.

I am not in the business to get my name in lights or to appear on the national TV talk shows or make headlines in the national newspapers. My philosophy has always been and will continue to be keep a low profile, work behind the scenes with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, and come up with a solution that benefits everyone. Compromise is not a dirty word. I plan on working this way in the months ahead.

Now of a more immediate and personal concern. Do I run again for another term in 1998? My health is good, my mind is sharp, and I enjoy what I do as much as life itself. However, because my mind is sharp, it is quick to remind me that I am 72 years old and I will be 74 in November of 1998. The good Lord has a plan for every one of us, even me. My heart says that my love affair with the people of Kentucky is not over. My head says it has been a long ride and a good ride but now it is time to pass the reins on to a younger generation.

Today I will lead with my head and not my heart. So the time has come for me to announce that I will not be a candidate for reelection in 1998.

As you try to understand my decision, let me ask you to do something for me, if you will. Don't say that I'm ready to go because I'm not and, frankly, I never will be. I still get goose bumps every time I look up at the Capitol dome on my way to and from work.

You can say that my reelection campaign would be my most expensive race