

the record-setting 1994 level of \$725.2 million.

That figure does not include the huge amounts of so-called soft money spent by the political parties. In the first 6 months of the 1997-98 election cycle, \$35.4 million in soft money contributions to political parties was raised, outpacing the same period in the 1995-96 cycle.

I would take a step further to remind my colleagues that there is even softer money than that with the independent expenditures and, of course, individual, wealthy people just write themselves a check and send themselves a thank you note, and that goes into the system. It is no wonder that Americans are clamoring for campaign finance reform. It is no wonder they believe their voices are overshadowed by special interests with the ability to fill campaign coffers. It is disheartening, Mr. President, that the majority has denied us the opportunity to debate this issue. It is more disheartening that they have denied us the chance to debate legislation to help keep the doors of democracy open for all Americans. They have refused to enter into a dialog with the American people about the contorted rules which govern campaigns, and about the urgent need to reform the system. They have refused a most reasonable request from a majority of Senators—an agreement that the Senate will take up consideration of campaign finance reform legislation, under normal procedures and normal rules, with amendments and votes and deliberations on the issues, sometime next year.

Mr. President, we did not cast our votes today against cloture because we are confident that the McCain-Feingold campaign finance reform legislation could be enacted into law, or because every one of us thinks it is the "end-all, be-all" of campaign finance reform legislation, but because we believe it is imperative that the Senate engage in a real debate over this issue. We believe the Senate has a responsibility to consider this issue. We believe that what has happened here over the last several weeks as parliamentary blockage after parliamentary blockade has been erected in front of efforts to debate campaign finance reform has been an abrogation of the democratic process.

It is the business of the Senate to debate measures, offer up amendments, and vote on issues, and the Senate has done none of the above with respect to campaign finance reform.

It appears that, for the moment, the majority has succeeded in blocking debate over campaign finance reform legislation. I have no doubt, however, that this issue will ultimately come up, if for no other reason than the American people are fed up and frustrated with the current system.

It also appears that, for the moment, the majority has derailed consideration of the ISTE A reauthorization bill. Let there be no illusions, however, that ISTE A is dead. It is not dead. This leg-

islation is too important to simply wither. It will be taken up for consideration and we will enact legislation to provide our States and communities with at least the \$180 billion in highway and transit funds that this legislation promises.

I must admit that I have mixed feelings about delaying consideration of ISTE A. For my State of Illinois, and indeed, for the Nation's transportation system, delay may give us an opportunity to rework some of the provisions of the current ISTE A reauthorization bill that inadequately treat those regions of the country that are essential to the movement of our Nation's commerce.

For the most part, I believe the authors of this ISTE A reauthorization bill have done an excellent job crafting a bill that strengthens many environmental provisions, allows States greater flexibility to support Amtrak, increases funding for a variety of safety initiatives, increases funding for intelligent transportation systems, and preserves the Department of Transportation's important DBE program. It is a bill that preserves many of the most important aspects of the original ISTE A, and that strengthens many other important provisions, and I commend them for their hard work and diligent efforts in this regard.

This ISTE A reauthorization bill, however, fails to allocate funds in a manner that adequately meets the needs of our Nation's intermodal transportation system. It does not recognize and provide sufficient funds to areas of the Nation that are responsible for the majority of our Nation's commercial traffic. It does not adequately address the relationship between transportation and our economy.

In 1991, when Congress enacted ISTE A, we stated:

It is the policy of the United States to develop and National Intermodal Transportation System that is economically efficient and environmentally sound, provides the foundation for the Nation to compete in the global economy, and will move people and goods in an energy efficient manner. . . . The National Intermodal Transportation System must be the centerpiece of a national investment commitment to create the new wealth of the Nation for the 21st century.

That is what the authors of the original legislation stated as a goal. If the next ISTE A does not follow this important declaration, if it does not provide adequate funding to maintain and improve the corridors and areas that are responsible for our Nation's commerce, the effects of our negligence will ripple throughout every sector of our economy.

My home State of Illinois serves as the transportation hub for our Nation's commerce. It is home to the world's busiest airport and two of the world's busiest rivers. It is where the Nation's freight railroads come together to move goods from one side of the country to the other. It is the center of the Nation's truck traffic. If you add up the value of all truck shipments in the

Nation, Illinois' has by far the largest share of any State. If you count the ton-miles of truck shipments that pass through States on their way to their final destinations, Illinois has by far the largest share of any State.

Illinois' roads, therefore, must bear the weight of the largest share of the Nation's commercial activity. The ISTE A reauthorization bill does not recognize the burden this responsibility places on our roads. According to a recent study from the Surface Transportation Policy Project, Illinois has the second worst urban roads in the country. The newspapers all report headlines like: "Illinois Roads in Shambles"; "Highways on road to ruin"; "Illinois' roads among the worst in the Nation"; "Roads in dismal shape."

These headlines are not surprising when you consider that Chicago is the Nation's largest intermodal hub. It is literally the transportation nexus of the Nation. It is only appropriate, therefore, that the national Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act recognize this fact and adequately provide for the enormous needs that go along with our status as the transportation hub of the Nation.

Mr. President, I am confident that when the Senate does take up the ISTE A reauthorization bill, we will be able to work together on a solution that provides funds to areas with the greatest needs. I am also confident that the Senate will ultimately take up, consider, and enact serious campaign finance reform legislation. These issues are simply too important for there to be any other outcome.

I yield the floor.

THE IRAN MISSILE PROLIFERATION SANCTIONS ACT OF 1997

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I am joining a large bipartisan group of Senators in cosponsoring S. 1311, the Iran Missile Proliferation Sanctions Act of 1997.

This bill addresses one of the most pressing national security problems we face—Iran's efforts to acquire technology that will enable it to build weapons of mass destruction. Certain Russian entities have engaged in some level of cooperation with Iran, and, while the Russian Government does not appear to be aware of these activities, the effect is the same—putting very dangerous technology in the hands of a regime that intends to destabilize.

Mr. President, all Americans share the goal of stopping these technology transfers, but there are clear differences on how to achieve it. The administration has launched an aggressive diplomatic onslaught, pressing the Russian Government to do all it can to halt these activities. Vice President Gore and Secretary of State Albright are fully engaged in this effort. In addition, the President has appointed top diplomat and former Ambassador

Frank Wisner as his personal envoy to the Russians on this issue. Ambassador Wisner has made several trips to Russia seeking a crackdown on exports of sensitive technology and has scheduled another visit in several weeks.

I am hopeful this legislation will help the administration in its efforts to impress upon the Russians just how seriously the U.S. Congress takes this issue. Diplomacy clearly plays a critical role in these situations, but so does the tough approach laid out in this bill. The sanctions it provides will send a clear message to Russian entities involved in these technology exchanges that they will face heavy costs if they choose to proceed with business as usual.

The Senate version of the bill is not without its problems, however. Specifically, the bill does not include a provision allowing the President to waive the bill's sanctions if he finds it necessary to do so on national security grounds. The House version of the legislation does include a waiver, and I am hopeful that any final bill will include one. The President needs this discretion in dealing with this extremely difficult situation.

Mr. President, I look forward to continuing to work with the administration and Members on both sides of the aisle to address this critical threat. It is imperative that we all work together in an effort to prevent Iran from acquiring such dangerous and destabilizing technology.

THE VERY BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, at the close of business yesterday, Monday, October 27, 1997, the Federal debt stood at \$5,427,907,147,573.22 (Five trillion, four hundred twenty-seven billion, nine hundred seven million, one hundred forty-seven thousand, five hundred seventy-three dollars and twenty-two cents).

Five years ago, October 27, 1992, the Federal debt stood at \$4,064,077,000,000 (Four trillion, sixty-four billion, seventy-seven million).

Ten years ago, October 27, 1987, the Federal debt stood at \$2,385,921,000,000 (Two trillion, three hundred eighty-five billion, nine hundred twenty-one million).

Fifteen years ago, October 27, 1982, the Federal debt stood at \$1,141,248,000,000 (One trillion, one hundred forty-one billion, two hundred forty-eight million).

Twenty-five years ago, October 27, 1972, the Federal debt stood at \$439,190,000,000 (Four hundred thirty-nine billion, one hundred ninety million) which reflects a debt increase of nearly \$5 trillion—\$4,988,717,147,573.22 (Four trillion, nine hundred eighty-eight billion, seven hundred seventeen million, one hundred forty-seven thousand, five hundred seventy-three dollars and twenty-two cents) during the past 25 years.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia is recognized.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, what is the pending business before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is in a period of morning business.

Mr. BYRD. At the conclusion of the period for morning business, what would be the business before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The regular order would be the laying down of S. 1173, the ISTEА-II bill.

Mr. BYRD. The ISTEА bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. BYRD. The ISTEА bill. Mr. President, I have a feeling that the leader is probably not prepared to go back on that bill at the moment, so I will ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for such time as I may consume out of order.

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

INTERMODAL SURFACE TRANSPORTATION EFFICIENCY ACT

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I take the floor at this time for several reasons, one being that the Senate would be on the ISTEА bill if the regular order were called for at this point. No other legislation is before the Senate. Consequently, I feel it is appropriate to be talking about the ISTEА bill.

Second, three of my colleagues, Senators GRAMM of Texas, BAUCUS, and WARNER, and I have introduced an amendment to the ISTEА bill and we have explained that amendment and discussed it upon more than one occasion. As we have explained, our amendment provides that 90 percent of the funding will be distributed on the same basis as in the ISTEА bill before us, and that 10 percent would be allotted for discretionary as is the case in the ISTEА bill before us. In the amendment, which I have coauthored with the other three Senators, I have provided that in the 10 percent discretionary portion, \$2.2 billion would be allotted to the Appalachian regional highways—\$2.2 billion of the \$3.1 billion in discretionary funding. The overall amount of funds that would be provided by our amendment would be \$31 billion.

The basis of our amendment is that inasmuch as the 4.3-cent gas tax has been ordered by the Senate to go into the trust fund as of October 1 this year, that money should be spent for transportation purposes.

The American people, being under that impression, and having every right to be under that impression because of the legislation that was passed recently stating that the 4.3-cent gas tax would go into the highway trust fund, that would be broken down as follows: 3.45 cents for highway funding and 0.85 percent would be for mass transit.

There is a considerable amount of confusion, some of which I think has been deliberately spread, some of

which may be accidental. There is some misinformation that has been spread about the amendment that my three colleagues and I have sponsored. So I believe at this time, there should be some discussion so as to clarify our amendment, what it really will do, what it will not do, and also it is my opinion that we should understand what the Chafee-Domenici amendment will do and what it will not do.

My colleagues who are coauthoring my amendment and I have taken the floor on at least two occasions to describe our amendment. And most recently, during the time of the last discussion of my amendment, Mr. CHAFEE presented me with a copy of the Chafee-Domenici amendment.

However, I haven't heard any explanation of that amendment as yet. I think we ought to have an explanation before we act on the bill, one way or another, and certainly before sine die adjournment. I hope that we will get a 6-year highway bill, but with each passing day, the prospects of such are by that degree diminished.

But in any event, I would want Senators to have a better understanding of my amendment and certainly the amendment by Senators CHAFEE and DOMENICI before we go out or before we leave this subject entirely.

I have called for Mr. CHAFEE and Mr. DOMENICI. I wasn't able to contact Senator DOMENICI, but I was able to contact Senator CHAFEE. I wanted to let them know that I hoped we could use this time, when no other Senator is seeking recognition, to discuss this matter and particularly to have some explanation of the Chafee-Domenici amendment.

Mr. CHAFEE was in the Intelligence Committee at the time and was busy there, but he very kindly came to the floor and has indicated to me—he is here on the floor now and he can speak for himself—that on tomorrow, he will seek some time to discuss and explain the amendment that he and Mr. DOMENICI have offered.

At this time then, Mr. President, I want to say a few words about the Appalachian Regional Highway System, because that figures very importantly in the amendment which I have offered for printing, and I think that the Members of the Senate ought to have a better understanding of the background of that particular subject matter. I also want to direct some comments to today's edition of Congress Daily to an item therein which bears the headline: "DOT Study, Domenici-Chafee Letter Hit Gramm-Byrd Plan."

There are some inaccuracies in that article, and I hope to address some of my remarks to those inaccuracies. I also would be pleased if the other three cosponsors of our amendment could come to the floor and, likewise, make some remarks.

All three offices have been alerted, and it is my understanding that those Senators will come at such times as they can be free from other appointments. I apologize for, in a way, for