

Now, in a new twist, we have embarked on international rescues. What would compel anyone in this Government to think it is the role of the United States to rescue overseas banks?

This year we loaned \$12.5 billion to Mexico. The money came from the Exchange Stabilization Fund, a fund used to help maintain the value of U.S. currency. A good part of that fund has been used in Mexico.

The United States taxpayers may have to and probably will have to replenish this fund if Mexico does not pay its loan back. We have had the first indication that they will not pay or will be slow paying because they have had to roll over one loan four times already.

The President did all this on his own. The President did all this without congressional approval. Now comes this new plan without any congressional approval input in any way to rescue Japanese banks.

Mr. President, this whole policy needs to be examined by the Congress. We have to make clear that we are not the world's banker. We have to make it clear to the world that we are not the lender of last resort. We cannot be the lender of last resort.

I strongly urge the Federal Reserve to cancel any plan it has to engage in this bailout.

Financial bailouts with tax dollars have to stop, and it is the responsibility of the Congress to stop it. Moreover, I cannot think of a less worthy use of tax dollars than bailing out foreign banks, particularly Japanese banks, when Japan has a positive trade balance of over \$100 billion.

Mr. President, since 1980 we have spent \$4 trillion we did not have. We have borrowed and borrowed. Soon, we will raise the limit to \$5 trillion. We cannot afford to continue spending this way. This is the first place I think we should stop it—in bailing out foreign banks.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

#### CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

Mr. KERREY. Mr. President, yesterday's long-awaited testimony by Speaker NEWT GINGRICH on the subject of campaign finance reform was, to say the least, disappointing for me. I hope it does not represent a roadblock in the path of needed legislation to reform our campaign finance system in a fashion that does give citizens the sense that they have more power or control over the political process than they currently do.

It seems to me, the top of the list of items I would put on an agenda of

things needed to be done in order to restore people's confidence in democracy would be to change our laws that govern campaigns for election either to the U.S. Senate or to the U.S. House of Representatives.

We had legislation. I actually did not support the legislation last year because I thought it created a new, publicly funded entitlement, and I did not like that. We had legislation last year that came close. The now-majority leader has indicated he believes it is a top priority. A lot of us talk about campaign finance reform. We always get right to the end and we say, "Yes, I am for campaign finance reform, but there is something about this proposal I do not like," and there is always a good excuse not to do it.

The decision I made earlier this week was, in part, a response to that. I am the chairman of the Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee, a legal organization—there is a Republican counterpart as well—that is designed to go out and find candidates and support candidates for office. It is a later subject, as to whether or not those committees themselves ought to be part of campaign finance reform. I certainly would like to see them as part of it. There is something unsavory about going out and campaigning against people you are working with all the time. But, as I said, I will leave that for a later discussion.

I, this week, endorsed and became a cosponsor of a piece of legislation that has been developed by Senator MCCAIN of Arizona and Senator FEINGOLD of Wisconsin, as well as Senator THOMPSON of Tennessee, Senator SIMPSON of Wyoming, and a number of others. It has a bipartisan group of people in the House of Representatives who are supporting it as well. Not just to say I support this legislation. There are changes I want to make in the legislation, particularly as it relates to smaller States such as mine, that I think might not be positively affected by this. What it represents is an effort to say to Republicans: Look, on this issue we have to, at some level, set down our political party concerns and embrace legislative change that will, perhaps, increase the risk to us as incumbents. It seems to me at the end of the day that becomes one of the most important risks that personally one factors in, when thinking about whether or not to support a particular piece of legislation.

I feel strongly we cannot continue to give the American people an excuse as to why we cannot do it. It seems to me that is what we always do. We say, "I am for campaign finance reform, but \* \* \*." That is what I did last year. I do not want to do it this year. I want to be able to stand here as a Democrat with Senator MCCAIN, a Republican, Senator THOMPSON, a Republican, Senator SIMPSON, a Republican, and vote for final passage of legislation that has an opportunity of being conferenced with the House bill, if not in this calendar year certainly in this session of

this Congress. I find, in the Speaker's recommendation, some things I simply cannot support. He is recommending a 16-member commission on power and political reform in the information age.

It goes on. There is an article here I am holding that says, in typical expansive, characteristically expansive fashion, he urges all of us, if we really want to understand campaign finance reform and get to the heart of the matter, he urges all of us "to study ancient Greece and Rome, pre-Civil War United States and the words of Thomas Jefferson, James Madison, Abraham Lincoln, Theodore Roosevelt, Woodrow Wilson, and Henry Cabot Lodge."

Mr. President, I have read most of those. I have been educated far more on these matters listening to the distinguished Senator from West Virginia, I must point out, than almost any other speaker on this floor. We have, it seems to me, not a shortage of historical information. What we have is a shortage of will to vote for something that might put our own political careers at risk.

I would object personally to being told that what I have to do is what the Speaker is recommending—that we are going to have a 16-member commission. They are going to decide. If two-thirds of them vote for a specific proposal, then we have to vote for it up or down. That is a recipe, it seems to me, that on the one hand we are saying we are not going to get involved—Senator MCCAIN, Senator FEINGOLD, Senator THOMPSON, Senator SIMPSON, myself, and Senator DODD, and many others of us are saying it is time for us to enact legislation that we can reach agreement on. I reject that premise on the one hand. On the other hand, what it calls for is another delay. This commission is supposed to make its report on the 1st of May of next year. That will, in my judgment, likely cause us to not be able to enact legislation.

Second, I must say with respect to the Speaker's proposal that he has broadened this thing to a point where it is almost a self-defeating mission. By broadening it, I mean he wants to include not just campaign finance reform but the power of private sector individuals in the information age. Specifically, he references in here and compares in here, a multi-millionaire broadcaster on ABC News being given tremendous access to the American people. That individual does not represent political power; whereas, the thousand-dollar contribution being written by the broadcaster's spouse does. Then he says—and I must say, in his typically characteristic way, only the Speaker seems to be able to come up with these sorts of phrases—"This is simply a nonsensical, socialist analysis based on hatred of the free enterprise system."

Anybody that does not see it the way the Speaker sees it hates the free enterprise system and is a socialist. Interesting argument. I will leave it to somebody else to figure that one out.

Mr. President, the Speaker knows quite well that there are many free enterprise organizations that give you—for example, Rupert Murdoch put \$10 million into a magazine called *American Standard*. He has a political orientation there. We do not restrict that activity. I hope the Speaker is not suggesting that we get into that kind of activity because it is a self-defeating mission, if that is what we are going to do. He may not like the views of somebody on television, or somebody writing an editorial page, or something like that. But, for gosh sakes, that is not the issue.

The issue is people who decide to run for office. Once we get to office, we have power that a challenger does not have. Specifically, in my own case in the last Senate reelection campaign, I started off the campaign with nearly 100 percent name recognition. Anybody who wants to challenge me will have to spend \$1 million, let us say, on the TV just to get their name up as a credible candidate. That really is a hurdle that an individual has to be able to get over if they are going to be competitive against an incumbent.

So the legislation that Senator MCCAIN and Senator FEINGOLD have put together—the reason, it seems to me, that it has merit—deals with this problem of financing head on. The Speaker, on the other hand, says—it is a remarkable headline. I cannot remember exactly. I cannot see the print. I did not bring my glasses. But he said something to the effect that there is a great myth going on in the country today that we spend too much on campaigns. That is a myth? I think he is maybe the only person in America who has discovered that is a myth, that we spend too much. That we do not spend too much is the Speaker's view. He says it is not that we spend too much, but that we do not spend enough. What we need, instead of \$4 million Senate races in Nebraska, are \$8 million Senate races.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, if my colleague will yield, I have my glasses on. I was very excited to hear my colleague from Nebraska over here, so I decided to join him.

The quote here is, rather than limit campaign spending, GINGRICH said, "One of the greatest myths in modern politics is that campaigns are too expensive. The political process, in fact, is not overfunded but underfunded."

So that quote in that particular instance is one of the great myths I have ever heard about. I do not know about the Speaker, but I can tell you as someone who has been through seven elections, that for the average Senate race, either Republican or Democrat, candidates must raise \$12,000 a week every week for 6 years to meet the cost of the average Senate campaign in the

United States. If the Speaker thinks that is underfunded, then he lives on a different planet than I do.

One of the problems is too many Members spending too much time—way too much time—out there raising the money, sitting down with the people who can raise and give them the kind of resources necessary. I promise you, if we continue on the path we are going, it is going to destroy this process in this country. It has to stop.

Mr. KERREY. Mr. President, I appreciate that comment. I would like to ask the Senator from Connecticut, he is the chairman of the Democratic National Committee, and when we earlier this week endorsed what is genuinely a bipartisan bill where at the moment there are at least more Republicans on it than Democrats—what we are trying to do is get Chairman Barbour and Chairman D'AMATO, not necessarily because they like every detail. I do not like every detail in the bill, nor does the distinguished Senator from Connecticut like it. But to say we know—I think Chairman Barbour knows and Chairman D'AMATO knows. They are out there a lot with the people making contact with citizens, and citizens are saying loud and clear to us, "Change this electoral system. Change it so that we feel like we have more power, more control, and more opportunity to participate."

One of the things that I hope comes out of this is, rather than this just being a couple of Democrats coming down to the floor of the Senate, I am not trying to seek partisan advantage as a consequence of what Speaker GINGRICH says. I am not going after Chairman Barbour or any Republicans down here at all. Indeed, quite the opposite. I am praising Republican leadership in recognizing, as Senator MCCAIN has, and Senator THOMPSON and Senator SIMPSON have, that this process has to change. I am hopeful that leadership of our parties can say to the American people, "OK, we are going to put our swords down. We are going to stop cranking the fax machine for a while, and we are going to let the legislative process work."

The Members of the Senate and the House go home over the weekends. They know what is going on. You ask at the townhall meeting for a show of hands for how many favor limiting campaign spending and for reform of the process. If it is an audience of 100, you will get 100 hands. If you ask the audience how many think we do not spend enough in political campaigns, not a single hand will go up, unless somebody owns a television station and wants to spend more money or something like that.

I really believe that we know. I doubt that there is a single Member of this body who would say that the campaign laws ought to stay the same as they are. My guess is 100 out of 100 know this thing ought to change.

I hopeful, at least on this issue, that we can stop being partisan for a mo-

ment and be Americans instead and pass legislation that the American people are saying is a top priority for them.

Mr. DODD. If my colleague will yield, I want to underscore, Mr. President, what the Senator from Nebraska has said today with his leadership on this issue. The author of the legislation that the Senator from Nebraska and I are speaking about is our colleague from Arizona, Senator MCCAIN. And in the House of Representatives, similar legislation is sponsored Representative LINDA SMITH, who I gather is a freshman Member of the House—I do not know her personally, and I do not know if we have ever met. CHRISTOPHER SHAYS, a House Republican Member and a colleague of mine from the State of Connecticut whom I know, is another sponsor of the House legislation. To suggest that what we are doing is somehow partisan, is to belie the facts. I have been a strong supporter, as my colleague has, for years on campaign finance reform.

What we see with this legislation being offered by our colleagues from Arizona—and Washington and Connecticut in the House—is an opportunity to get beyond the partisanship; and, that is, to join together here, Republicans and Democrats who believe that despite whatever differences we may have on other issues and on this issue of trying to slow down and limit the proliferation of money in these campaigns, it is a worthy cause.

Whatever other differences we may have on this issue, we ought to be able to come together. By supporting a bipartisan piece of legislation, we can achieve it. How anyone can believe what the Speaker says—I read what the Speaker says here, and I quote him:

I would guess that over half of the money I raise is spent offsetting the weight of the Atlanta Journal-Constitution.

Half the money is spent running against a newspaper in Georgia. The last time I heard, my opponent was not the newspaper. I normally end up with someone on the other side I debate with and face.

So now let me see if I understand this. We raise this much money because we have to take on our local newspapers and radio stations? That is ludicrous, Mr. President, absolutely ludicrous to make that case, for the Speaker of the House to make the case, that we need to spend more money so we can take on the media.

That is what this is about. I have never heard that argument before. I have heard other arguments about why we do not want to limit campaign expense, but never the suggestion that somehow we have to do it in order to beat back our local newspaper and columnists.

Mr. KERREY. If the Senator will yield on that one point, I find it rather ironic; Speaker NEWT GINGRICH at the start of the session made Rush

Limbaugh an honorary Member of Congress, so apparently if the views line up with your views—

Mr. DODD. It is OK.

Mr. KERREY. You make them an honorary Member. I would say it is more than just ironic that the Speaker, on the one hand, is willing to make Rush Limbaugh an honorary Member of Congress because he believes that he and talk radio have been enormously helpful, but the Atlanta-Constitution is an enemy.

The Senator from Connecticut is lucky; he has Bob Shrepf in that State so he does not have that problem. There have been many views expressed by media highly critical of the Senator from Nebraska. I think they have been wrong, almost never justified. Always some outrage boils up inside of me, and I have said, "This is not fair."

Well, that is free speech. It is fair. That is the press. I walked into the arena, and I should not look for somebody to blame for the problems I have. It seems to me the American people have said overwhelmingly—I do not know about Connecticut but in Nebraska over and over they say to me, "We're sick of all that money." I had trouble in 1994 getting people excited about my campaign because very often they would say to me, "We give too darned much money. We are sick of it. We are tired of seeing these 30-second ads over and over. We get sick of your face. We would like to have a race that is a bit more on the issues, a bit more opportunity for people to become competitive."

I can think of 100 reasons why not to vote for campaign finance reform. I have a lot of reasons why I would not want to vote for it, and they are all good. I do not like public finance. I do not like this. I do not like limits. There are all kinds of reasons why I would not want to support it. But it seems to me one of the dominant things that occurs is, gee, is this going to hurt the Democratic Party or is this going to hurt the Republican Party or is this going to hurt me as an incumbent? I think we are hurting democracy the longer we wait to change this political system so the American people feel they do have more power, more control, and more opportunity to participate.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I just want to echo the comments made by my colleague from Nebraska. As I mentioned a moment ago, we are all too familiar with the cost of these campaigns, the ever-increasing costs. To give you an idea, 20 years ago, the most expensive race statewide ever in the history of Connecticut was when Ella Grasso ran for Governor; she spent about \$400,000 in a statewide race. I am told that in 1998, should I seek reelection, the cost of a competitive race in my State, given the price of New York media, Boston media, my own State media, would hover somewhere between \$4.5 and \$6 million. That is in 20 years.

That is the average cost, by the way, nationwide, taking California on the

one hand, the extreme case, because of the size of that State and on the other hand a State I suppose like Rhode Island. Or maybe that is not a good example—maybe a smaller State in population, Montana, Idaho, whatever it may be—the average cost is roughly \$4.5 to \$5 million.

That means the average Senator would have to be raising \$12,000 a week every week for 6 years—from the day they arrive and are sworn in in the Chamber of this Senate, from that day forward, \$12,000 a week every week.

When you consider as an incumbent the advantage of that, considering someone who might 2 years out decide to take a shot at being a U.S. Senator, what are their chances? What is the population pool from which we are likely to draw candidates for the Senate?

If you decide 24 months out that you would like to run for the Senate, you have to raise not \$12,000 a week; you have to raise something like \$50,000 or \$60,000 or \$70,000 a week, or you have to have the wealth yourself.

Last year we saw in California one individual spend \$28 million of his own money, and I do not think people want to see an institution proliferated by either people who have only the personal wealth that allows them to run or that have only the access to that kind of wealth—knowing the kinds of commitments that get made in this business, have them come here already in a sense committed on a whole host of issues where the public interest would be jeopardized.

So again, I emphasize I think Congresswoman LINDA SMITH had it right, with her opinion on this idea of a commission. We have had many commissions and many studies on this. No one is fooled by that one. Forming a commission to go out and study this issue again is laughable. There has been much analysis and much study on this. The question is whether or not we have the intestinal fortitude to come to terms with an issue that demands resolution.

So I hope that these commission ideas would be shelved, and that we would get about the business here of putting a bill in the Chamber. Let Senator MCCAIN and Senator FEINGOLD bring up their bill. Let amendments be brought up to moderate and change it. As the Senator from Nebraska said, he and I may have some modifications to offer to that legislation, but we are never going to have that chance if it does not get called up.

So, while I may disagree with Congresswoman SMITH on many, many issues, on this one she is right. Senator MCCAIN is right. We better get about the business of allowing this bill to go forward.

I am saddened when I see the continued call for more and more money being spent. And to suggest somehow that you need to spend more, as this headline says, "Gingrich Calls For More Not Less Campaign Cash," be-

cause he has to take on the Atlanta Constitution, is going to be met I think with the kind of derision that it ought to be. No one buys that argument. Not a single person in this country will buy that argument.

And so I hope that our colleagues will support what Senator KERREY and I have done over the last several days. Get behind the McCain-Feingold bill. Senator SIMPSON has done so. Our colleagues as well, several, have offered this. Senator NUNN and Senator SIMON on our side over here have been supportive of it. I believe it is on the right track.

Again, it is not going to be perfect in every detail, but certainly it is the only way that I can see in the short run we are going to get anything done on this.

Believe me when I tell you that Senator KERREY and I have certainly been challenged in our own party for cosponsoring this bill. This was not met with wild applause by everybody who wears the label of Democrat.

And so do not misunderstand us here today. This is not something that is greeted with great applause in every quarter. But we happen to believe as the leaders of our respective groups, as chairman of the Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee and chairman of the Democratic National Party, this is truly in the national interest. It is truly in the national interest to put a stop to what I would, I think, appropriately call the obscene amount of money being spent in American politics. It is turning people off by the day in this country. They are sick of it. They want it to stop. They want choices that they can make when they go to the polls, and they see the amount of money being spent is a real detriment in that effort. So we urge the leadership to allow the bill to come to the floor for a vote.

Mr. KERREY. Mr. President, one last comment and I will yield the floor. I see the Senator from Pennsylvania is here. He and I just had a couple of minutes of conversation on this subject.

Polls are very popular methods of trying to determine the attitudes and views of the American people or some segment of the American people, and sometimes those polls are encouraging and sometimes those polls are discouraging. One of the most, if not the most, discouraging polls that I have ever read was a poll that asked the American people who has the most power in Washington, DC, the President of the United States, the Congress, the special interests?

I understand that the special interests can mean one thing to one person and another to another. I can be a good special interest and a bad special interest. But by a margin of 3 to 1 the American people believe that the special interests have more power than a Member of Congress does or than even the President of the United States.

That is a very disturbing fact. We all know that perception becomes reality. If that is the belief of the American people, that means they would say we do not have any opportunity. If we want to change a law, if there is something that we would like to influence in Washington, DC, we would like to bring in an idea and have it become incorporated into a piece of legislation, we just do not think we have a fighting chance.

We have to change that perception.

I believe, among other things, campaign finance reform can be a means to that end. There may be other things that people have on the list, but I would put that very high—indeed, I would put that at the top of my list in the ways to change the law so we can begin to change that perception, so the American citizens out there can say, as, for example, Sarah Brady did, we can change the law. It may not be a popular change, maybe it will produce a lot of heartache where people will have to take a position on legislation we want to change, but we want to fight to change the law.

We have to change the perception that people have that there is no opportunity for them to come to Washington, DC, and change the law of the land. If we are able to do that, not only will we get increased participation at the day of the election, we will get increased participation all year long from citizens who feel this really is a government of, by, and for the people.

Mr. SPECTER, I yield the floor.

Mr. SPECTER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SPECTER. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I believe that campaign finance reform is long overdue. I have just had a conversation with the distinguished Senator from Connecticut—if I could have the attention of the Senator from Connecticut—and one of the real problems in the electoral process involves the soft money, where, on both sides of the political spectrum, Republicans and Democrats have sought enormous sums of money with the \$100,000 contribution being made which is totally outside the system.

I have just talked to Senator DODD about that. And I am glad to know his acquiescence on the issue of eliminating the soft money, because you can have all the limitations you like in many other respects, but if that soft money is available, it is all for naught. So I thank my colleague from Connecticut.

Mr. DODD. If my colleague would yield.

The bill does do that. And I think there is value in that. I neglected to say to my colleague in our private conversation that I think you might be able to make a case, for instance, in the area of local—not national—but local, statewide elections, and so forth, where you want to promote a certain activity, that you might find a way to have some exceptions and caveats.

In the underlying point, I think the Senator from Pennsylvania is correct, but I can also see where some modifications in that might meet the concerns of the Senator from Pennsylvania and my concerns, what he properly describes as the proliferation of this kind of resource that comes into our national coffers, in a way to promote, I think, sound, intelligent, and worthwhile political activity at the grassroots level.

Mr. SPECTER. If I may pursue that discussion for one more moment with the Senator from Connecticut.

I get concerned when you say caveat. What kind does the Senator have in mind?

Mr. DODD. I do not have one in mind. I think, like the Senator from Nebraska said, this 60-percent requirement, that the funds be 60 percent from your State, that might be fine in California, Pennsylvania, even Connecticut, but in some other States you may want to have some flexibility in that, small States that do not have that kind of population. You may want to modify that.

That is what I mean by some of the provisions here. I support this bill. I am a cosponsor of it. I think that speaks volumes about where we stand. I am willing to consider ways in which we can accommodate some legitimate questions being raised.

But my view is it is better to get behind a bill you fundamentally support so we have some possibility of reform, than to not support the bill at all. If I had as my standard here that I disagreed with a couple of points here and believed that there needed to be some modifications before I could support it, we would never get anything done in this area. In all the years I have supported campaign finance reform, that is what has happened here. The Democrats offer a bill, the Republicans offer a bill, and nothing ever gets done. We both go out and issue our press releases saying how much we are for campaign finance reform.

What the Senator from Nebraska and I have decided to do here backs our colleague—here is a colleague from the other side of the aisle who cares deeply about the issue, with two Members of the House, both of the Republican Party, Congressman SMITH and Congressman SHAYS, along with some Democrats, who offer a proposal. Because there are a number of Republicans and Democrats who endorse the McCain bill, we thought maybe, just maybe, we might be able to get beyond what has been the traditional response, Mr. President, to the historic way we have dealt with this issue, and that is a couple of bills and the press releases go out.

I am not going to endorse every aspect of this bill. I would not expect everyone else to. In the soft money area, my general view is we ought to get out of it. You may make some exceptions on the local level or State level. That may have some value. But I still believe honestly we ought to get behind

this bill and get something on the floor that would change the way we run our campaigns in this country.

#### INTERNATIONAL TRIBUNAL ON WAR CRIMES

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I have sought recognition today to lend my support to a request made by the prosecutor on the International War Crimes tribunal on the Bosnian situation, where the International tribunal on War Crimes in Bosnia has formally asked the United States to make the surrender of the indicted suspects a condition for any peace accord.

As we know, right now in Dayton there are negotiations underway to try to resolve the Bosnian conflict. But indictments have already been issued for Gen. Ratko Mladic, the Bosnian Serb military commander, and Radovan Karadzic, the Bosnian Serb leader, on indictments which specify their leadership role in the ethnic cleansing and reported massacres and organized rapes that marked the first months of the Bosnian war.

The tribunal prosecutor, the distinguished lawyer Richard J. Goldstone, has been pursuing these matters with real diligence, and it poses a real test for the international community. Part of the test arises because the President of Serbia, President Slobodan Milosevic, is involved in these negotiations. He was identified some time ago by the then-Secretary of State, Lawrence Eagleburger, as having been involved possibly in international war crimes in connection with the Bosnian Serbs' ethnic cleansing in the early months of that campaign.

I am pleased to note that ranking Clinton administration officials have committed that there will be no amnesty granted, but I think it is very important as a matter of international law that these prosecutions go forward and the United States cooperate with these prosecutions.

For more than a decade, Mr. President, I have urged the formation of an international criminal court to deal with crimes such as hostage taking, terrorism, and drug dealing where we find that there are people in custody who they will not extradite to the United States; for example, in Colombia where there are drug leaders and drug criminals who ought to be brought to trial, but because of domestic politics in Colombia, they are not willing to extradite them to the United States. If there were an international criminal court, then I do believe there would be a tribunal set up where the political disadvantage of extraditing, say, to the United States would not be present.

And I note today, Mr. President, that there are ceremonies marking the tragedy of Pan Am 103, where indictments have been issued for two Libyans implicated in the tragedy of Pan Am 103, and the intransigence of the Libyan