



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 105<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 144

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 24, 1998

No. 14

## Senate

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore [Mr. THURMOND].

### PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Lloyd John Ogilvie, offered the following prayer:

Gracious God, You have planned perfectly for the balance of our listening and speaking. Help us to do both well. You have called us to listen to You in prayerful meditation on Your truth revealed in the Bible. You also speak through Your Spirit to our inner being. Sometimes You shout to our conscience; other times it is a still small voice that whispers to our souls. The world around us asks, "Is there any word from the Lord? What does He want? Is what we are doing in plumb with His plans?"

When we have listened to You, what we have to say cuts to the core of issues. We are decisive and bold. Our voices ring with reality and relevance.

The psalmist longed for this equipoise. He prayed, "Let the words of my mouth and the meditation of my heart be acceptable in Your sight, O Lord, my strength and my Redeemer."—Psalm 19:14.

Bless the men and women of this Senate with the grace to hear Your voice and then speak with an echo of Your guidance and wisdom.

Now we join our hearts in intercession for the people of central Florida whose homes and communities have been devastated by tornados. Bless Senators BOB GRAHAM and CONNIE MACK as they care for their people. Especially, be with those families that have lost loved ones. Comfort and strengthen them. Through our Lord and Saviour. Amen.

### RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The able majority leader, Senator LOTT of Mississippi, is recognized.

Mr. LOTT. Thank you, Mr. President.

### SCHEDULE

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, this morning the Senate will be in a period of morning business until 10:30 a.m., as under the previous consent order. At 10:30 a.m., the Senate will resume consideration of S. 1663, the campaign finance reform bill. Also, under the previous unanimous consent order, the time from 10:30 a.m. until 12:30 p.m. will be equally divided between the opponents and proponents of the legislation.

In addition, by consent, from 12:30 p.m. to 2:15 p.m., the Senate will recess for the weekly policy luncheons to meet. Following those luncheons, at 2:15 p.m., the Senate will resume consideration of the campaign finance reform bill, with the time then going until 4 o'clock being equally divided between the opponents and proponents.

Following that debate, at 4 p.m., the Senate will proceed to a vote in relation to the pending McCain-Feingold amendment. Therefore, the first roll-call vote today will occur at 4 p.m. Senators can also anticipate the possibility of additional votes after that vote on the McCain-Feingold amendment. But we do not have a definite time agreement on that presently. Before the 4 o'clock vote, we will notify Senators about the schedule for the remainder of the day.

I yield the floor, Mr. President.

### MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, there will now be a period for the transaction of morning business.

Mr. BOND addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is recognized.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. BOND pertaining to the introduction of S. 1669 are lo-

cated in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. BYRD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BOND). The able Senator from West Virginia.

### THE HIGHWAY BILL

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, other Senators and I have spoken numerous times over the past several weeks about the significant problems that will arise in States across the country if the Senate further delays action on the highway bill. Each day we delay adds to the burden of commuters sitting in traffic that is often moving at a crawl or brought to a complete stop because many of our highways are simply overcrowded. Each day we delay brings us closer to the May 1 deadline—just 39 session days away from today. That includes today—39 days. The time bomb is ticking. Senate session days remaining before May 1 deadline: 39. That includes May 1 as it includes today.

Since 1969, the number of trips per person taken over our roadways increased by more than 72 percent and the number of miles traveled increased by more than 65 percent.

The combination of traffic growth and deteriorating road conditions has led to an unprecedented level of congestion, not just in our urban centers but in our suburbs and rural areas as well. Congestion is literally choking our roadways as our constituents seek to travel to work, travel to the shopping center, to the child care center, and to the churches. According to the Department of Transportation, more travelers, in more areas, during more hours are facing high levels of congestion and delay than at any time in our

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S865

history. And these congested conditions make us more susceptible to massive traffic jams as the result of even the most minor of accidents. The DOT tells us that, during peak travel hours, almost 70 percent of the urban interstates and just under 60 percent of other freeways and expressways are either moderately or extremely congested. That is lost man hours, reduced productivity, wasted fuel, and wasted time.

The worsening congestion is taking a horrible toll on our economic prosperity. I direct the attention of my colleagues to a study conducted by the Texas Transportation Institute at Texas A&M University. According to the Institute's study, the annual cost of highway congestion in our nation's 50 most congested cities has grown from \$26.6 billion in 1982 to almost \$53 billion in 1994. In other words, it has doubled. Delay accounted for 85 percent of this cost, while fuel consumption accounted for 15 percent. While more recent data are still being collected, the Institute's researchers state that, in the last four years, the cost of congestion in these cities has only continued to grow. This multi-billion dollar hemorrhage is found not only in our largest cities where eight of the top ten cities had total annual congestion costs exceeding \$1 billion; we find congestion taxing severely the economies of several small- and medium-sized cities as well. According to the Institute, the economy of Albuquerque, New Mexico endures an estimated annual cost of congestion approaching \$150 million per year; Memphis, Tennessee—almost \$150 million per year; Nashville, Tennessee—almost \$200 million per year; Norfolk, Virginia—more than \$350 million per year; Columbus, Ohio—more than a quarter of a billion dollars per year; Jacksonville, Florida—more than \$350 million per year; and San Bernadino-Riverside, California—over \$1 billion per year.

There are a lot of explanations for traffic congestion's growing impact on our cities, but a principal cause of congestion, clearly, is the fact that road mileage has not kept pace with a growing population, a growing work force, and an American lifestyle in which the personal mobility afforded by automobiles is as essential to daily life as are eating and sleeping. Many people say that Americans have a love affair with their cars. More than a love affair, however, Americans simply depend on their cars to squeeze their myriad chores and activities into a busy work day.

A vehicle is one tool that many American workers cannot do without. They do not just drive to and from work anymore. Americans stop at the day care, the grocery store, the dry cleaners, the PTA meeting, the gymnasium, and at volunteer programs, all in the course of driving to and from work. Transportation researchers call this phenomenon "trip-chaining," and it is a trend that continues to grow and shows no sign of slowing.

While the size of our highway network has remained relatively static for years, the condition and performance of those roads has deteriorated. Poor road and bridge conditions must share part of the blame for our nation's congestion problem. According to a 1995 U.S. Department of Transportation's report to Congress, 28 percent of the most heavily traveled U.S. roads are in poor or mediocre condition. That means that those roads need work now—work now—to remain open and protect the safety of the traveling public. And more than 181,000 bridges, or 32 percent of our nation's 575,000 bridges, are in need of repair or replacement, including 70,000 bridges built in the 1960's and designed to last 30 years under 1960's travel conditions. These roads and bridges that have outlived their useful life or that are falling apart from under-investment often are traffic choke-points that can be corrected with the proper repairs.

And Senators don't have to travel very far away to see the traffic choke-points, as they attempt to cross the bridges, get on the bridges and cross the Potomac every morning and every evening. It took me an hour and 15 minutes to get from my home in McLean, 10 miles away, this morning, to get to my office because of traffic congestion feeding into the streets, and feeding on and feeding off the bridges. We have to get across that Potomac. As I say to my colleagues, we don't have to travel far to see these choke-points working against us, against the traveling public.

If Senators would like examples of a choke points, they need look no further than the bridges that cross the Potomac River. Most of these bridges were not designed to carry the traffic that accompanies the morning and evening rush hours. As a result, traffic jams back up for miles every work day, in both directions. That is the gridlock that poor roads and bridges can cause. I am sure that if Senators contact their own state transportation departments, they will find numerous examples of traffic choke-points in their own states where a new bridge, smoother pavements, where an additional lane would alleviate the problem and get people and freight moving again.

And congestion means more than just economic costs. Obviously, congestion costs Americans time that could otherwise be spent with the family, with those children who are coming in from school and times that otherwise could be spent at work, time that could be otherwise spent in school or elsewhere. According to a study by the Texas Transportation Institute, commuters in the country's 50 largest urban areas lose an average of 34 hours each year idling in traffic. Now that is not only time wasted, it is not only gasoline wasted, it is pollution in the air.

Another, and equally important, cost of congestion is, as I say, its impact on

air quality. As cars and trucks are slowed by traffic congestion, they emit more pollutants, thereby impeding efforts in many parts of the country to come into compliance with federal air quality standards. Road improvements aimed at smoothing the flow of traffic can reduce auto-related pollutant emissions substantially. All such improvements, however, cost money. And the Senate should be doing everything possible to ensure that our state and metropolitan officials do not run out of federal highway funds that can help them relieve congestion and improve air quality.

Today, Mr. President, Americans rely on automobiles for 90 percent or more of all trips. In many areas of the country, we need additional highway capacity to accommodate that travel. And federal highway funds are often a critical source of capital for these projects.

What can we do about congestion, Mr. President? What can Congress do to help eliminate the \$53 billion annual burden borne by commuters in our large cities? What can we do to give people more time at home with their families or on the job instead of stuck in traffic? What can Congress do to our cities and counties to help their air quality?

Probably the single most important action Congress can take to help alleviate these problems is the prompt enactment of the 6-year highway bill. That bill is on the Senate calendar, ready to go, and the country cannot afford to wait any longer. The May 1 deadline after which States will have no more Federal money—the Governors are in town and I hope that some of them are watching the Senate at this moment—the May 1 deadline after which States will be unable to obligate any more money, and if there is any doubt as to whether or not the States may obligate any more money after midnight, May 1, take a look at what the law says, public law 105-130, the Surface Transportation Extension Act of 1997, which is the short-term highway authorization that Congress passed last November before adjourning Sine die.

Here is what it says. This is the law. ". . . a State shall not"—it doesn't say it may not—" . . . a State shall not obligate any funds for any Federal-aid highway program project after May 1, 1998 . . . ."

There it is. That is the law. Unless a new law is passed that will be the law on midnight, May 1, all the highway departments throughout the country, the Governors and mayors and other officials and the employees of the various highway agencies throughout the country, will feel the pinch. So the May 1 deadline, after which States cannot obligate new Federal money to finance congestion relief projects, as I say and I repeat it, is just 39 session days away—including today and including May 1. It is drawing nearer with every passing minute.

Mr. President, we cannot afford to delay. Our constituents stuck in traffic

jams need our help. They want their highway taxes used to get them out of gridlock, but we cannot do that while the Senate is stuck in legislative gridlock. I urge the majority leader to get the Senate—and the country—out of gridlock by calling up the highway bill now.

#### THE VERY BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, at the close of business yesterday, Monday, February 23, 1998, the Federal debt stood at \$5,519,492,792,898.57 (Five trillion, five hundred nineteen billion, four hundred ninety-two million, seven hundred ninety-two thousand, eight hundred ninety-eight dollars and fifty-seven cents).

Five years ago, February 23, 1993, the Federal debt stood at \$4,195,090,000,000 (Four trillion, one hundred ninety-five billion, ninety million).

Ten years ago, February 23, 1988, the Federal debt stood at \$2,472,592,000,000 (Two trillion, four hundred seventy-two billion, five hundred ninety-two million).

Fifteen years ago, February 23, 1983, the Federal debt stood at \$1,207,534,000,000 (One trillion, two hundred seven billion, five hundred thirty-four million).

Twenty-five years ago, February 23, 1973, the Federal debt stood at \$452,993,000,000 (Four hundred fifty-two billion, nine hundred ninety-three million) which reflects a debt increase of more than \$5 trillion—\$5,066,499,792,898.57 (Five trillion, sixty-six billion, four hundred ninety-nine million, seven hundred ninety-two thousand, eight hundred ninety-eight dollars and fifty-seven cents) during the past 25 years.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call.

Mr. DASCHLE. 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.

#### CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I want to thank those who have participated thus far in this debate about campaign reform. I am sure that many of those who view C-SPAN with any regularity are experiencing a sense of déjà vu about this debate, wondering whether or not we haven't already had debate very similar to this and whether we are not stuck in the same spot, whether we are ever going to stop talking about it and actually start moving toward some resolution. Today we are about to find out. This will give us the opportunity for the first time to vote this afternoon at 4 o'clock to indicate to the Amer-

ican people that, indeed, we have resolved to deal with the extraordinary problems that we have in campaign finance today. This is probably going to be our best chance in a generation for meaningful campaign reform, and a clear-cut vote is something that will allow us to move to that next step toward resolution. We do not need any procedural excuses, no amendment trees, no obfuscation. This will be clearly an up-or-down vote on the McCain-Feingold bill, through a tabling motion, that we have sought now for some time.

The vote on Senator MCCAIN's amendment answers the question, are you for reform or not? A vote against McCain-Feingold is a vote, in my view, to end reform, at least for this Congress, once again. I am very proud of the fact that each one of the members of the Democratic caucus will stand up and be counted. And my hope is that a number of Republicans will join us in this effort. The only question is how many Republicans and Democrats will come together in the middle to make this a reality this afternoon.

I believe the fate of campaign reform rests in the hands of those who have not yet publicly taken their positions with regard to campaign reform. It has been a generation since the last time we passed any meaningful legislation having to do with campaigns. In 1971 and in 1974, Congress enacted major reforms that first limited the amount of money in politics and, second, required candidates for the first time to disclose how they got their money. Today those laws are outdated and virtually useless, and some have been circumvented by new decisions and, as a result of those decisions, loopholes that have been created in the campaign finance law.

Other aspects of that reform effort in 1971 and 1974 today are unenforced or completely unenforceable because of the systematic defunding of the FEC, the Federal Election Commission. Still others have been overturned by narrow and, many believe, incorrect court decisions. Many reforms were thrown out by the Supreme Court in 1974 in the 5-to-4 ruling, a very controversial ruling, in *Buckley v. Valeo*.

So, for the last 23 years now, Democrats have tried to overcome obstacles put in place by the Buckley ruling and to pass a campaign finance reform modification, a realization that what happened in 1974, and what was addressed in that Court decision, needs to be addressed with clarification in statute.

So, consider the record of a decade, beginning in 1988. At the opening of the 100th Congress, then majority leader ROBERT BYRD introduced a bill to limit spending and reduce special interest influence. We had a record-setting eight cloture votes when that happened. Democratic sponsors modified the bill to meet objections, but the fact is that it was killed in a Republican filibuster.

In the Democratic-led 101st Congress, the House and the Senate passed cam-

paign finance bills. President Bush threatened to veto the bill, effectively killing it, because it contained voluntary spending limits.

In the 102d Congress, also a Democratically-led Congress, again the House and Senate passed campaign finance reform bills and President Bush vetoed the bill with the backing of all of his Republican filibuster.

In the Democratic-led 101st Congress, the House and the Senate passed campaign finance bills. President Bush threatened to veto the bill, effectively killing it, because it contained voluntary spending limits.

In the 102d Congress, also a Democratically-led Congress, again the House and Senate passed campaign finance reform bills and President Bush vetoed the bill with the backing of all of his Republican colleagues.

In the 103d Congress, again under Democratic control, we passed a campaign finance reform bill with 95 percent of the Democrats in the Senate and 91 percent of the Democrats in the House voting for reform. Again, Republicans filibustered the move to take the bill to conference.

That brings us, then, to the 104th Congress, supposedly the reform Congress. Senators MCCAIN and FEINGOLD introduced their bipartisan reform plan, and reform at that point, for the first time in almost 2 decades, actually seemed to be within reach. Republicans, again, in the Senate, filibustered the measure, while Republicans in the House introduced a bill to allow more spending—a family of four would have been able to contribute \$12.4 million in Federal election. The legislation again failed to produce results of any kind. As a result of that impasse, nothing was done for the remaining months of the 104th Congress, which now brings us to this Congress and last year.

In his State of the Union Message in January of 1997, President Clinton called on Congress to pass campaign finance reform by July 4, 1997. In the House, Republicans have voted time and again against bringing campaign finance reform to the floor. Speaker GINGRICH has promised consideration this year, but also shook hands with the President on a campaign reform commission that really never came to pass. Here in the Senate, we have traveled a tough road to get here today. We forced our way to the floor and refused to yield; poison pills, amendment trees and cloture votes were all tactics used, and this is probably the last opportunity we have to do something meaningful in the 105th Congress.

The problem is really one that can be described in one word: money. The amount of money, after two decades of delay, has skyrocketed. That is the fundamental problem. We hear talk in this debate about hard money and soft money, this money and that money. They are not the core of the problem. The core of the problem is that there is just too much money in politics, period. Total congressional campaign