

are meritorious projects that deserve the support of the conferees. I hope the conferees to this bill will agree to include these projects to improve the quality of life and to support the missions at New Jersey's military installations in the final version of this legislation.

These projects are vital to New Jersey's defense infrastructure, and to those who work on these bases. I hope the chairman and ranking member will support these important New Jersey projects in the conference agreement to the fiscal year 1998 military construction bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the committee amendments are considered and agreed to en bloc.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendments and third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair informs the Senator from Washington that she has 5 minutes, 29 seconds remaining on her time. Does she wish to use it or yield it back?

Mrs. MURRAY. I yield my time back.

Mr. BURNS. I yield my time back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the bill, H.R. 2016, as amended, pass? The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 98, nays 2, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 192 Leg.]

YEAS—98

Abraham	Faircloth	Lott
Akaka	Feingold	Lugar
Allard	Feinstein	Mack
Ashcroft	Ford	McConnell
Baucus	Frist	Mikulski
Bennett	Glenn	Moseley-Braun
Biden	Gorton	Moynihan
Bingaman	Graham	Murkowski
Bond	Gramm	Murray
Boxer	Grams	Nickles
Breaux	Grassley	Reed
Brownback	Gregg	Reid
Bryan	Hagel	Robb
Bumpers	Harkin	Roberts
Burns	Hatch	Rockefeller
Byrd	Helms	Roth
Campbell	Hollings	Santorum
Chafee	Hutchinson	Sarbanes
Cleland	Hutchison	Sessions
Coats	Inhofe	Shelby
Cochran	Inouye	Smith (NH)
Collins	Jeffords	Smith (OR)
Conrad	Johnson	Snowe
Coverdell	Kempthorne	Specter
Craig	Kennedy	Stevens
D'Amato	Kerrey	Thomas
Daschle	Kerry	Thompson
DeWine	Kohl	Thurmond
Dodd	Landrieu	Torricelli
Domenici	Lautenberg	Warner
Dorgan	Leahy	Wellstone
Durbin	Levin	Wyden
Enzi	Lieberman	

NAYS—2

Kyl

McCain

The bill (H.R. 2016), as amended, was passed.

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mrs. MURRAY. I move to lay it on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KEMPTHORNE). Under a previous order, the Senate insists on its amendments, requests a conference with the House, and the Chair appoints the following conferees.

The Presiding Officer appointed Mr. BURNS, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr. FAIRCLOTH, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. STEVENS, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. REID, Mr. INOUE, and Mr. BYRD, conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. BURNS. I thank Senator MURRAY's staff, Dick D'Amato, Emelie East, and also on my staff Sid Ashworth, Kelly Hartline, and Jennifer Chartrand. I also thank Ben McMakin and Mazie Mattson. It was a pleasure working with these folks. They did the majority of the work.

I yield the floor.

DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1998

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under a previous order, the clerk will report Senate bill 1034, the VA-HUD appropriations bill.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1034) making appropriations for the Department of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, commissions, corporations, and offices for fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes.

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. TORRICELLI. Thank you, Mr. President.

GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. President, with the first phase of the hearings of the Senate Governmental Affairs Committee into the abuses of the electoral process through campaign fundraising having just concluded, and the second phase about to begin, it is perhaps an appropriate time to reflect on those things that we have learned in these first few weeks and those questions that remain.

It is, I think, important to note that despite some incentive for partisanship, a tendency by the media to sometimes reach conclusions before the facts, and a persistent failure of some witnesses to cooperate, the committee has begun its work, I think, in the best traditions of the Senate. Democrats and Republicans are working together. We do have a common objective, and I think we are doing service to the institution.

These things, however, have already been learned. First, it is a result of insufficient management and poor decisionmaking and the continuing upward spiral of pressure to raise campaign funds, the Democratic National Committee made a series of bad decisions during the last election that clearly resulted in some violations of Federal law and were a disservice both to the President and the Democratic Party. Among these were the inadequacy of any process of checking the names or backgrounds of contributors or the sources of their funds. The good work of some members of the Democratic National Committee and its staff was compromised, unfortunately, by the addition of some inexperienced people who were not properly supervised or trained for their positions. John Huang was clearly among them, and it is now clear from testimony before the committee that there is a substantial chance that the result was a violation of Federal law.

Second, it is also becoming clear that the Chinese Government, the People's Republic of China, as a result or in reaction to the visit of President Li of Taiwan to the United States, planned and potentially embarked upon a plan to influence the 1996 Federal election. It is clear from the evidence provided to date that this plan targeted neither political party in particular, but probably both in general. It seems to have been primarily designed to influence the U.S. Congress. It is unclear to date the extent of those designs on the Presidential election. It is also clear that that plan involved both legal and potentially illegal means to accomplish its goal. The extent of its success, to what extent it was achieved, is not at this point known. The fact that it existed and there were any intentions implemented is disturbing enough to warrant the committee's investigation.

Third, it is established, I believe, at this point, to at least some degree of satisfaction, that the illegal activities that may have been embarked upon by John Huang or others to seek and receive foreign contributions or otherwise violate Federal Election Commission regulations and the laws of the United States with regard to fundraising were not either known or encouraged by senior personnel at the Democratic National Committee. Richard Sullivan, who was the direct superior of Mr. Huang, denied under oath that there was any plan by the Democratic National Committee to solicit Chinese or other foreign contributions. It is, however, clear Mr. Huang's activities were not sufficiently monitored or known as should have been the case in an organization of the importance of the Democratic National Committee.

Fourth, John Huang's own activities raise substantial suspicion. It is not enough for the committee to conclude that it was not properly supervised or to take any comfort in the fact that his superiors or other people in either

the White House or Democratic National Committee did not have knowledge of his efforts to raise foreign contributions. Nor is it enough to simply dismiss his activities as a poor judgment to hire him because he was inexperienced or unqualified to be vice chairman of finance of the Democratic National Committee.

His activities while at the Commerce Department in operating out of the Stevens Corp., where he both received and made telephone calls, received and sent faxes and perhaps, most suspiciously, received packages, raised continued questions. In the coming weeks, the committee will want to explore as to the nature of his activities, not simply while at the Democratic National Committee, but in the months preceding it while a Federal employee. The committee is also left with the unanswered question as to why he continued to receive briefings by the intelligence community and of what use he made of that information.

The committee is also left with questions regarding the alleged Chinese plan. While it is comforting that there is no evidence to date that policy was impacted, it is also not enough for us to rest in a comfort that it was bipartisan and not apparently solicited by either political party, based on information known to date. The question remains of whether policy was ever changed as a result of these contributions, whether the plan was actually fully implemented, and whether or not it continues. This naturally is a first priority of the committee and remains of overwhelming importance.

And questions, finally, remain with regard to John Huang. Of what use did he make of this information for corporate purposes of the Lippo Group or any other foreign interest? Were these questions both continuing before the committee and some of these preliminary issues answered?

The committee next turns its work to the National Policy Forum, its relationship with the Republican National Committee and its chairman, Haley Barbour. The committee in the coming days will receive testimony, I believe, that will indicate that Mr. Barbour, while chairman of the Republican National Committee, designed a plan, which was implemented with his participation, to solicit and eventually did receive foreign contributions in excess of \$2 million, which helped, through a series of transactions, to fund the 1994 Republican campaign to take control of the U.S. Congress. Evidence will be presented that this was an active plan, fully implemented.

After a week of testimony, therefore, we will know the extent of involvement of the Democratic and Republican National Committees in these efforts to receive foreign contributions and their impact on the 1994 and 1996 elections.

With those two phases of the committee's work completed, what we will not have done is get any closer to the question of genuine and complete cam-

paign finance reform. Several weeks have now passed since President Clinton's deadline was passed for the July 4, 1996, consideration of campaign finance reform. No campaign finance reform bill has been considered or released by any subcommittee of this Senate. No date has been set for the Senate to even begin discussion of any such genuine reform.

Indeed, there are some who would argue that the Governmental Affairs Committee deliberations are an excuse to wait until next year to even begin consideration of any campaign finance reform legislation. Using the deadline of the end of 1996 to begin consideration will assure that the 1998 Federal elections are conducted under the same campaign finance laws that bred the very problems now being discussed by the Governmental Affairs Committee. And it begs the question that, for all the important things that this Senate can learn from these hearings, all the unfortunate revelations the Senate is now experiencing, the tragic lessons the American people are now learning about this system, which Senator does not already know enough that we are raising too much money, spending too much money, and inviting both these abuses and violations of the law every day that we do not reform this system?

I know that there is a perception in our country that this failure to initiate campaign finance reform is a genuinely bipartisan problem. The American people can be forgiven for believing this because both parties have abused the system, and our hearings are resulting in learning that both the Democratic and Republican National Committees have not only violated the vested policy but clearly violated the law in this downward spiral of campaign fundraising.

It is, however, becoming less and less of a bipartisan issue when it comes to the question of reaching solutions. Last weekend, Jim Nicholson, the new chairman of the Republican National Committee, announced his opposition to banning soft money, his opposition to any limit on campaign expenditures, his opposition to controlling the costs of television. In essence, the Republican chairman of their national committee announced his opposition to any campaign finance reform.

Indeed, that mirrors our experience in the House and in the Senate. The overwhelming majority of the caucus of the Democratic Party in this Senate is prepared to vote for campaign finance reform now. It has been endorsed by our leadership. President Clinton has indicated that he would sign such legislation. Yet, only three members of the Republican caucus are prepared to even vote for campaign finance reform, and no committee chairman has been willing to bring it to consideration.

Mr. President, as our committee continues its work, we will continue to be saddened by revelations that both political parties have not challenged the best within us in raising funds for con-

ducting these campaigns. Our only comfort is that the political leadership of this institution will at some point see the need to wait no longer and begin initiating real change. There is no room in this debate for anyone to take comfort in their actions to date.

Not only have the political committees of both parties not conducted themselves in our best traditions, not only have both possibly violated the laws, but other institutions have equal fault. While the media each day reminds us of the problems of campaign financing, the cost of television advertising continues to spiral upward. The overwhelming costs of these campaigns is a result of the rising cost of television. While every night the media rails against the system, complains against the abuses, their lobbyists roam the Halls of Congress fighting efforts to control the cost of television advertising.

So, in neither party, nor in the private institutions of the media, nor in the institutions of the political parties is there any reason for pride. Only this, that there are still people in this institution in both parties who continue the investigations, Members of the Senate who are prepared to vote to change the system, people not simply who have not succeeded in the system, but Members who have succeeded, who have raised the funds, conducted successful campaigns, but still recognize that even though individuals can succeed, it does not serve the national interests.

Mr. President, the first phase of our investigation by the Governmental Affairs Committee has now concluded. We begin two more important weeks of our work. I believe we are conducting ourselves, pursuing our objective as this Senate has commanded us to do. Much has been learned. There remains much to be done. I hope every Senator will continue to follow our work, but, mostly, join us in the commitment to change this system, find those who have abused it in the past, ensure that the law is enforced, and then give the American people a political system financed by means in which they can take real pride.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1998.

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I am very disappointed that we cannot stay on the bill. We have a number of Senators wishing to present amendments, so I am going to propose a unanimous-consent request. I would note that the discussions we just heard are most appropriately made in the Governmental Affairs Committee which is doing business at this time, and I am not going to answer some of what I think were partisan charges because those would best