

have worked with local governments and housing authorities to provide needed rental assistance statewide.

I joined my Democratic colleagues on the Senate Banking and Housing Committee in writing to Chairman BOND and Ranking Member MIKULSKI, asking them to fund additional Section 8 vouchers and restore the Community Builders program during their negotiations with conferees from the House of Representatives. I am pleased that Chairman BOND and Ranking Member MIKULSKI were able to secure funding for an additional 60,000 Section 8 vouchers. The VA-HUD Appropriations Conference Report also reiterates the need for Community Builders in HUD to help bring important HUD programs to an increasing number of Americans.

This legislation will help address the affordable housing shortage in my state of South Dakota. Currently, South Dakota families in need of housing assistance spend an average of 9 months on a waiting list for current Section 8 vouchers. While not helping all of those in need, the additional Section 8 vouchers contained in the VA-HUD Appropriations Conference Report will begin to shorten the time it takes for low-income families to receive much needed assistance.

Community Builders will also be able to continue to work with South Dakota communities to increase access for affordable housing. In the past, Community Builders worked with the Northeastern Council of Governments in South Dakota to spread information to several northeastern counties on the services that HUD provides, and how to access these services. Community Builders have facilitated FHA loans for the construction of affordable homes in Rapid City, while also helping the Sioux Empire Housing Partnership become a HUD-approved housing counseling agency. The Community Builder program has begun to address the housing needs in historically underserved communities, including the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation. Community Builders have enabled tribal leaders to better utilize HUD's programs to the benefit of one of the most poor populations in the nation.

I would like to thank Chairman BOND and Ranking Member MIKULSKI for improving the VA-HUD Appropriations bill despite the strict budget constraints the committee faced. I believe it is a wise investment in our country's future when we ensure that our working families have adequate housing, and I look forward to continue working with my colleagues to find ways to help South Dakota families and families across the nation address their housing needs.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I support the conference agreement on appropriations for fiscal year 2000 for the departments of Veterans Affairs, Housing and Urban Development, and other independent agencies.

I thank Senator MIKULSKI and Senator BOND for their hard work and com-

mitment to providing adequate health care for our veterans and housing for our citizens.

The conference agreement provides \$19 billion for veterans health care, \$1.7 billion more than the President requested. I am pleased that Congress has made a commitment to take care of our veterans. I do wish that we had agreed to Senator WELLSTONE's amendment to provide \$20.3 billion, but I believe that our nation's veterans will be cared for under this legislation.

Mr. President, I am very pleased that housing needs will also be addressed with this legislation. First, the agreement provides a much needed 60,000 additional Section 8 vouchers. A far greater need for vouchers exists in California, let alone across the nation. But this is a much acknowledged vital step in the right direction towards addressing the housing needs for the poorest of Americans. Second, public housing, Housing for Persons With AIDS (HOPWA), and homeless assistance programs will all experience an increase in funding. Third, the agreement also provides additional tools for preserving existing affordable housing. Specifically, HUD will be provided with significant new legal authority to address the Section 8 "opt-out" crisis—including longer contract renewal terms. Last, the agreement exhibits strong support for HUD's Community Builder program. This program has been a key component of HUD's reinvention efforts and is working. I received numerous letters from elected officials and nonprofit organizations throughout California expressing support for the Community Builder program and am grateful that the conference committee agreed to reinstate earlier cuts to the program.

The conference agreement also addresses other key areas, such as the environment and space exploration and research. The Environmental Protection Agency will receive \$7.59 billion to carry out its important functions. The National Aeronautical and Space Administration is funded at \$13.65 billion. I am pleased that the conferees agreed to restore the drastic cuts in NASA programs that were in the House version of the bill.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I call for the yeas and nays on the VA-HUD appropriations conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now occurs on agreeing to the adoption of the conference report accompanying H.R. 2684, the VA-HUD appropriations bill. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) is necessarily absent.

I also announce that the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD) is absent because of family illness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber who desire to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 93, nays 5, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 328 Leg.]

#### YEAS—93

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

#### NAYS—5

Bayh	Kyl	Voinovich
Feingold	McCain	

#### NOT VOTING—2

Dodd	Kennedy
------	---------

The conference report was agreed to. Mr. BOND. I move to reconsider the vote.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

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

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

#### APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES—S. 2990

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that with respect to H.R. 2990, the Chair now be authorized to appoint conferees on the part of the Senate.

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

The Presiding Officer (Mr. GORTON) appointed Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. GREGG, Mr. FRIST, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. NICKLES, Mr. GRAMM, Mr. ENZI, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. DODD, Mr. HARKIN, Ms. MIKULSKI, and Mr. ROCKEFELLER conferees on the part of the Senate.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, in light of the agreement, there will be no further

votes today. Members can expect a rollcall vote at 5:30 on Monday relative to an amendment to campaign finance reform or on any judicial nomination or other Executive Calendar matter that may be cleared for a vote.

Let me emphasize, there will be a vote or votes at 5:30 on Monday. I hope an agreement can be worked out as to how to proceed on the campaign finance reform debate this afternoon. I had been willing to actually be in on Saturday to have debate on that and/or votes, but that was not well received on either side of the debate and on either side of the aisle. So we will not be in session on Saturday. I am hoping we can have some good debate and we can get an agreement on some amendment or amendments, if we can get more than one done, that actually can be voted on Monday afternoon at 5:30.

We will have votes on that or we will have a vote on probably a judicial nominee at that time, if that is what is necessary.

I yield the floor.

#### BIPARTISAN CAMPAIGN REFORM ACT OF 1999—Resumed

AMENDMENT NO. 2298

(Purpose: To provide a complete substitute)

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I have an amendment at the desk, and I ask for its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. DASCHLE], for himself, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. REED, Mr. KERREY, and Mr. KERRY, proposes an amendment numbered 2298.

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

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

(The text of the amendment is printed in today's RECORD under "Amendments Submitted.")

AMENDMENT NO. 2299 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2298

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID] proposes an amendment numbered 2299 to amendment No. 2298.

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

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

(The text of the amendment is printed in today's RECORD under "Amendments Submitted.")

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, Thomas Paine, the famed orator of the American Revolution, once offered an explanation for why corrupt systems last so long. He said:

A long habit of not thinking a thing wrong gives it a superficial appearance of being right, and raises, at first, a formidable cry in defense of custom.

That is certainly true of the way we pay for campaigns in this country. Our reliance on special interest money to run political campaigns is such an old habit that for a long time it had the superficial appearance of being right but not anymore.

While there is still a vocal minority who deny it, a clear majority in this Congress, and an overwhelming majority of the American people, know that our current campaign finance system is broken.

The American people understand that special-interest money too often determines who runs, who wins, and how they govern.

Opponents of change tell us that no one cares much about campaign finance reform.

I believe they're mistaken.

I believe the tide has turned.

Instead of hearing a "formidable cry in defense of custom," to use Tom Paine's expression, what we are hearing now is a growing demand for change.

One of the newest voices demanding change belongs to a group of more than 200 CEOs of major corporations. They call themselves the Committee for Economic Development, and many of them are Republican. They're pushing for a ban on soft money because, they say, they're "tired of being shaken down" by politicians looking for campaign contributions.

They, like the rest of America, will be watching this debate, Mr. President.

Another reason I believe the tide has turned is because this election cycle has gotten off to such an ominous start.

At both the Presidential and congressional level, we are on pace to shatter all previous records.

During the first six months of this year, soft money donations—the unlimited, unregulated contributions to political parties—were already 80 percent above where they were at this point in the last Presidential election cycle, in 1995.

There really are no limits any more, Mr. President. We all know that.

The current system is more loophole than law.

Opponents argue that our Constitution forbids us from correcting the worst abuses in the system. I disagree with their pinched interpretation of our Constitution. In any case, I believe our conscience demands that we at least try to fix the system.

And so during this debate, Senator TORRICELLI and I, and others, will offer the Shays-Meehan plan.

As I said, I have great admiration and respect for what Senator FEINGOLD and Senator MCCAIN have attempted to achieve. But I believe we can—and must—go further than their bill now allows.

Shays-Meehan is fair. It does not place one party or another at an advan-

tage. It treats incumbents and challengers in both parties fairly.

Shays-Meehan is bipartisan.

Shays-Meehan is passable. It has already passed the House. It is signable. The President will sign it into law.

Most importantly, Shays-Meehan is comprehensive. Not only does it ban unregulated "soft money" to political parties—the biggest loophole in the current system—it also prevents soft money from being re-channelled to outside groups for phony "issue ads."

This is critically important, Mr. President.

Spending on sham "issue ads" by advocacy groups and special interests more than doubled between the '96 and '98 election cycles—to somewhere between \$275 million and \$340 million.

A 1997 study by the respected Annenberg Public Policy Center at the University of Pennsylvania found that phony "issue ads" are nearly identical to campaign ads—with two exceptions. The "issue ads" are more attack-oriented and personal. And, it is harder to identify the sponsor. These ads epitomize the negative campaigning—without any accountability—the public so dislikes.

Shays-Meehan closes the "issue ad" loophole. It does so by applying existing rules to ads targeting specific candidates that are run by advocacy groups within 60 days of an election.

It does not silence anyone. It merely says, if you want to participate in the election process, you have to follow the rules.

In addition to closing the "soft money" and "issue ad" loopholes, Shays-Meehan makes two other important changes.

First, it provides for expanded and speedier disclosure of both campaign contributions and expenditures—plus, stiffer penalties for anyone who violates the requirements.

Second, it bans direct and indirect foreign contributions to political campaigns.

Shays-Meehan won a bipartisan majority in the other body, Mr. President. It deserves the same in this Senate.

When a person gives money to a judge who is deciding his case, we call that bribery. But when special interests give money to politicians who vote on bills that help or hurt them, we call that "business as usual."

Some mistakenly call it "free speech."

Let's be very clear: Shays-Meehan is not an attack on free speech. It advances free speech by ensuring that those with the biggest checkbooks are not the only voices that are heard.

Shays-Meehan represents extraordinarily modest reforms.

It doesn't fix every problem with our current system. But it bans the worst excesses.

It is not a panacea. But it is a credible and necessary first step in rebuilding people's trust in government.

I have no doubt we will hear a great deal over the next few days about abuses of the current system.