

few people give way too much of the money that is given, and are given access and influence, and too many people are left out of the loop. This becomes a real problem for a representative democracy because it is not true any longer that each person counts as one and only one.

So I ask my colleague whether he would agree that it is going to be important, not just for us to speak 20 minutes a day, but now for us to begin to get together? I ask him whether, as a leader in this effort—and he has been a leader of this effort—whether we might really be reaching out to other colleagues who feel very strongly about this, who really want people in our country to believe in the political process—all of us should want to change this—and get some people together and come out on the floor of the Senate? We are going to keep framing this issue and we are going to keep calling for reform and we are going to make it crystal clear that we are not going to let the Senate, or the Congress, become a politics of diversion on this.

It is fine to identify problems. If some people want to say we do not have disclosure, fine. If some people want to say it is influence of foreign money, fine. If some people want to say it is just the rules that have been broken and no more than that, fine. But the people in the country know too much money is spent, there is too much special access, there is too much time spent raising money, and we have to build the McCain-Feingold bill that is out there. We want to move that forward and we want to eventually have an up-or-down vote.

Does my colleague agree that we need to start turning up the heat?

Mr. FEINGOLD. Not only do I agree, but I ask the Senator and I make sure we reach out to Members of both parties in this body who are cosponsors, and others who I think are very interested in reform and have not yet chosen to cosponsor it, to do just that.

There are myths about the legislation and about the effort that have been perpetuated in an effort to make the public ignore the issue, thinking it cannot be resolved. But the facts speak differently. There have been newspaper articles indicating that we have fewer cosponsors than last year. That is just false. We have 30 Members of the U.S. Senate as cosponsors of this bill. I guess if we do not come out here on the floor and start to indicate these facts, it is very hard for the average citizen to relate to it.

One of the reasons it is hard for them to relate to it is, when they start hearing about \$100,000, \$200,000 contributions, it is pretty hard for them to feel invited into the process. It is pretty hard for them to believe that anything will ever change. They are so used to believing that this system and this town is dominated by interests and powers that they cannot control, that the people of the country, when they are asked in a poll, may not say that

campaign finance reform is the No. 1 issue. I think, if you ask them whether they think we ought to do the job and whether it is important, of course they would say yes. Many would support almost every aspect of the legislation we are proposing.

But, for the average citizen, if you asked them what is their No. 1 concern, what are they going to say? They are going to say, "We are concerned about our kids' education, we are concerned about crime in our neighborhood." Those are the things that people should identify, should feel free to identify, and they should not have to worry about a system that has gone out of control so far away in Washington. That is not the stuff of the daily lives of people in this country. That is not what it takes to make ends meet.

But the fact is, until we clean up this system here, the ability of this Government to assist those families in getting through and making ends meet will be seriously compromised. When we reach the point that Members of this body get on the floor and say that what the problem is is that we do not have enough money in politics, and then we do not pass a piece of legislation, and then we have an election—we find out the result. More money was spent in these last elections than in any other election and we had the lowest voter turnout in 72 years. That is not just a fluke. It is because more and more people are feeling that they are no longer part of a system that is supposedly premised on the notion of one person one vote.

So, today begins the effort to speak here on the floor on a regular basis—not just about the McCain-Feingold bill, but about the fact that we are not going to allow this year to pass without an effort to bring this issue back to the floor. Again, my lead author on this bill, the Senator from Arizona, Senator MCCAIN—I always have to apologize for his being right and my being wrong last year when he said it would probably take a scandal to get this passed. I said, please, don't say that. I want to get it passed this year. But he was right. It took something like the abuses of the 1996 election to get people in this body, to get people across the country, to realize that this just is not a quantitative change in what has been happening in elections since 1974. What happened was a qualitative change, a major change in the way in which elections are conducted.

Basically, the current election system is falling apart through the use of loopholes and abuses and how much money people are willing to raise through soft money and their own campaigns.

So our goal here is to make sure everyone knows this issue is not "not there." It will become one of the dominant issues, not just in the media and the newspapers, as it has been, but it will become one of the dominant issues here in the floor in the not too distant future.

How much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COATS). The Senator has 2 minutes 28 seconds remaining.

Mr. FEINGOLD. I yield the remainder of my time and I yield the floor.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. 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, what is the order? How much time does each Senator have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under a previous order, the Senator from New Mexico, or his designee, is recognized to speak up to 15 minutes, but at 10 o'clock, the order also requires that the bill be laid down.

Mr. DOMENICI. Also required to do what?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That the pending bill will be laid down. Technically, the Senator from New Mexico has approximately 11 minutes.

Mr. DOMENICI. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. DOMENICI and Mr. WYDEN pertaining to the introduction of S. 718 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. DOMENICI. I yield the floor.

TRIBUTE TO MOE BILLER

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, today I want to recognize one of America's great labor leaders—Moe Biller, president of the American Postal Workers Union, AFL-CIO—on the occasion of the 60th anniversary of his hiring by the Postal Service.

On May 8, 1937, Moe Biller was hired as a postal clerk in New York City by what was then called the U.S. Post Office Department, beginning a long career of service to the American public. At the same time, Moe became a postal union member and activist—a journey that led him to the presidency of his New York City local in 1959 and then to the presidency of the national APWU in 1980.

Moe's six decades of service included 2 years during World War II in the Army's Adjutant General Corps from 1943 to 1945, where most of his service was in Northern Ireland. We thank him for this service as well.

Moe's steadfast and determined struggle on behalf of all postal workers led to enactment of the Postal Reform Act of 1970. By virtue of that legislation, postal workers were given the right to bargain for wages, benefits, and working conditions under the National Labor Relations Act. These events also led to the merger of five separate craft unions into the APWU in 1971, an historic event in postal labor history in which Moe played a leading role.

At 81 years young and still going strong, Moe has rightfully been called the "dean" of the American labor movement and is held in high regard within the highest councils of the AFL-CIO and its affiliated unions. As we wish Moe congratulations on this, his 60th postal anniversary, we look forward to many more years of visionary leadership on his part.

Congratulations, Moe Biller.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, morning business is now closed.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS AND RESCISSIONS ACT OF 1997

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 672, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 672) making supplemental appropriations and rescissions for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1997, and for other purposes.

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill.

Pending:

Reid/Baucus amendment No. 171, to substitute provisions waiving formal consultation requirements and "takings" liability under the Endangered Species Act for operating and repairing flood control projects damaged by flooding.

Byrd amendment No. 59, to strike those provisions providing for continuing appropriations in the absence of regular appropriations for fiscal year 1998.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. WARNER] is now recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 66

(Purpose: To modify the requirements for the additional obligation authority for Federal-aid highways)

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment filed at the desk, No. 66, be the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. WARNER], for himself, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. NICKLES, and Mr. ROBB, proposes an amendment numbered 66.

Mr. WARNER. 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:

At the appropriate place add the following:

Notwithstanding any other provision of this act, the language on page 39, line 12 through 18 is deemed to read, "had the Highway Trust Fund fiscal year 1994 income

statements not been understated prior to the revision on December 24, 1996: *Provided further*, That the additional authority shall be distributed to ensure that States shall receive an additional amount of authority in fiscal year 1997 and that the authority be distributed in the manner provided in section 310 of Public Law 104-205 (110 Stat. 2969):".

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask the indulgence of the Senate. I have a little hoarseness this morning, but I will do my very best.

Mr. President, this is an amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia, together with the Senator from Florida [Mr. GRAHAM]. And we entitle it simply a "fairness amendment."

I hesitate to take on the wisdom of the distinguished chairman and the distinguished ranking member of the Appropriations Committee, but I do so out of a sense of fairness toward all 50 States.

Mr. President, the amendment relates to the bill's provision affecting the distribution of \$933 million in additional—I point out, additional—obligation authority in the Federal Highway Program to the 50 States. A small part of this funding is fully justified. It provides to correct the mistake made by the Department of Treasury in 1994 in underestimating gas tax receipts into the highway trust fund.

As a result of this mistake, 10 States did not receive their correct apportionment of Federal highway dollars in 1996. And I fully agree and commend the Appropriations Committee in its efforts to make whole these few States, 10 in number, who received less than they should have in 1996 dollars.

The amendment offered by Senator GRAHAM and I, however, ensures that these 10 States are compensated as was intended by the Appropriations Committee and as they are legally entitled to be compensated, and in the amount of funds that they should have received in that fiscal year.

The Appropriations Committee, however, then provides an additional \$793 million for this fiscal year and directs how these funds should be distributed among the several States. The distribution of these additional funds—\$793 million—is in direct conflict, Mr. President, direct conflict, with the distribution formulas contained in the current law that is ISTEA passed in 1991, the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991, and amounts to nothing more than changing the rules right in the middle of a very—and I emphasize, a very—conscientious, bipartisan effort by the U.S. Senate to rework a future piece of legislation to succeed the 1991 ISTEA Act.

The amendment Senator GRAHAM and I offer is very simple, Mr. President. Our amendment states that the \$793 million in obligatory authority provided by the Appropriations Committee will be distributed according to current law, ISTEA 1991. I just wish to repeat that. We have a law carefully crafted in 1991. And all that we ask in this amendment is that this \$793 million be allocated to the States in accordance with existing law.

Mr. President, as the chairman of the Transportation Subcommittee of the Environment and Public Works Committee, I am leading a bipartisan effort—Senator MAX BAUCUS is the distinguished ranking member of that committee—working together with all of the members on the committee to achieve a successor piece of legislation to ISTEA 1991.

We have held 10 hearings this year on various issues relating to ISTEA. Four major bills—I repeat, four major bills—have been introduced regarding the successor piece of legislation to ISTEA 1991, including one that Senator GRAHAM and I are cosponsoring. Certainly establishing fair distribution formulas that recognize the differing regional goals of the country will be a matter of extensive discussion. It will not be an easy task to provide adequate funding to address the many legitimate transportation needs that exist today.

I stipulate, Mr. President, there are many, an overwhelming number of needs in transportation today. And it is very difficult for Senators to reach their determination as to how to vote on this knowing that in every Senator's State there are crying needs for money today. But what Senator GRAHAM and I are doing is asking that the Senate stick with its process, respect the authority given to the authorizing committees to work through legislative matters in a conscientious, bipartisan way, which we are doing, to try and reach and craft a bill to succeed ISTEA 1991.

A part of that consideration will be whether or not we do change the very formula that I am recommending to the Senate in this amendment, the very formula in ISTEA 1991. I happen to be on the side that thinks changes should be made. But there is honest difference of opinion among the 50 States. But let us leave it to the process that is underway—with 10 hearings—in an effort to resolve those disputes.

Mr. President, I have been one who has been critical of ISTEA 1991's formula. I believe they fail to reflect the current use or demands of our current transportation system. There are many archaic base points on which that formula rests. And we hope to change that. It is my hope that during the reauthorization of ISTEA, the subcommittee will devise a more fair distribution of Federal highway dollars based on needs and use of our transportation system.

At this time however, when our States are in the last year of the 1991 ISTEA, it is not in the best interests of the U.S. Senate to set a new distribution formula. And that is precisely what the inclusion in the bill does by the Appropriations Committee.

I know that my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee will try to persuade Senators that the bill's provision only attempts to ensure that each State's 1997 funding level is equivalent to what each State received in 1996.