

turned off by negative ads. In an election in which only 39 percent of the eligible voters went to the polls, 58 percent of those who did not vote said negative ads had influenced their decision to stay home.

Now, what is the problem? What I found the problem to be, is that even if a candidate wants to take the high road and deal with issues, the simple fact is you cannot. And I want to tell you why.

Focus group after focus group suggests this: The negatives drive through; the positives do not.

When you ask in a focus group what do you remember most about this or that candidate, what they remember are the negative ads, and what they do not believe are the positive ads of record and accomplishment that a candidate may run. Therefore, what you find, as you watch poll numbers in big races, is that a candidate has to respond in kind to negative ads and if you try to respond to an attack with positives, the poll numbers drop. You also have to respond in quantity and equally to the opponent to have an effect.

Consumers can file a complaint about false advertising of consumer products. But the aggrieved candidate has no legitimate recourse in a race. In my campaign, one television station began to run its own disclaimer before an attack ad saying that although the ad, they believed, was not correct, they still had to run it.

Another disturbing problem is the specter of super-wealthy candidates being able to buy a seat. In the 1994 election, several candidates received as much as 16 to 17 percent of their total funds from loans out of their own pockets—the highest proportion since at least 1986.

At least one way, I believe, the campaign system can offset the advantage of personal wealth without running afoul of the First Amendment and the Buckley versus Valeo decision is simply to loosen the constraints on the opponent. If a candidate declares up front that, "I'm going to contribute either \$250,000, up to \$1 million, or over \$1 million in personal funds," then the individual contribution limits on the opponent are adjusted gradually so that the opponent then can compete.

Last, I strongly believe that campaign reform must look at the prevalence of contributions by PAC's. There is a real distortion in the public's mind that policymakers are beholden to special interests, and the special interests are the so-called PAC's, which overshadow average citizens, and impair, the public believes, an official's ability to make policy decisions based on national interests.

Current law is thought to favor PAC's in two key respects. Most PAC's qualify as multicandidate committees and, as such, they may contribute up to \$5,000. Now, in prior legislation, the Senate has banned PAC's altogether,

and the House has opposed such a move.

It seems to me that a fair compromise between the two is simply to limit the amount of PAC dollars a candidate can receive so that it does not exceed 20 percent of whatever the candidate raises.

So I hope, Mr. President, in the future, to present these amendments, either separately or as a whole. There is no public finance in any of them. We would establish a campaign spending limit. We would be able to better bring about truth in advertising. We would be able to level the playing field when personal wealth is considered. And we would be able to reduce considerably the so-called involvement of special interests in campaigns.

They are simple, they are direct, they make sense.

So I will, in the days to come, be approaching, on both sides of the aisle, Members in hopes that I can put together a bipartisan commitment to just these four simple amendments and move them forward, either separately or as a whole.

I thank you for your indulgence, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

Mr. GRASSLEY addressed the Chair. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I wish to thank the Senator from California for her willingness not to offer those amendments. I thank her very much, because it will help us hurry the legislation through this body and to the President of the United States.

I also want to assure her for our leader—because he has said so many times himself that there will be an ample opportunity to discuss the issues that she wants to bring up, as well as the campaign finance reform issue will be discussed—that there will be plenty of opportunity to do that.

I say that not only to assure the Senator from California of that opportunity, but also to suggest to other people on her side of the aisle, on the Democratic side of the aisle, who have amendments that deal with campaign finance reform—and there still are a few of the 20 yet to deal with tomorrow—that maybe they will follow the example of the Senator from California and not offer their amendments so that we can get done with this bill earlier tomorrow.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I thank the Senator.

I yield the floor and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMPSON). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 2:02 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Hays, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1. An Act to make certain laws applicable to the legislative branch of the Federal Government.

The message also announced that the House has agreed to the following concurrent resolution, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 1. Concurrent Resolution recognizing the sacrifice and courage of Army Warrant Officers David Hilemon and Bobby W. Hall II, whose helicopter was shot down over North Korea on December 17, 1994.

At 4:13 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Ms. Goetz, one of its reading clerks, announced that pursuant to the provisions of section 3 of Public Law 94-304, as amended by section 1 of Public Law 99-7, the Speaker appoints Representative SMITH of New Jersey as Chairman of the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following concurrent resolution was read and referred as indicated:

H. Con. Res. 1. Concurrent Resolution recognizing the sacrifice and courage of Army Warrant Officers David Hilemon and Bobby W. Hall II, whose helicopter was shot down over North Korea on December 17, 1994; to the Committee on Armed Services.

MEASURE PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the second time and placed on the calendar:

S. 169. A bill to curb the practice of imposing unfunded Federal mandates on States and local governments; to strengthen the partnership between the Federal Government and State, local and tribal governments; to end the imposition, in the absence of full consideration by Congress, of Federal mandates on State, local, and tribal governments without adequate funding, in a manner that may displace other essential governmental priorities; and to ensure that the Federal Government pays the costs incurred by those governments in complying with certain requirements under Federal statutes and regulations.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, which were referred as indicated:

EC-4. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to a Senate Rule, notice relative to the Presidential Business Development Mission to