

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I do not want to conclude this debate without, again, acknowledging the commitment to crime victims of the Senator from Arizona and the Senator from California. I know that they are sincere in their support for crime victims. I compliment them as well for the manner in which they have conducted themselves throughout this debate and throughout the Judiciary Committee's work on this matter. I view them not as opponents but as allies in our mutual efforts to assist crime victims.

I also want to acknowledge the extraordinary efforts of the senior Senator from West Virginia and the thoughtful guidance of the Democratic Leader: Senators DORGAN, DURBIN, SCHUMER, DODD, MOYNIHAN, FEINGOLD, MURRAY, THOMPSON, WELLSTONE, LEVIN, and BINGAMAN each contributed greatly to the debate.

I thank Senators from both sides of the aisle—Senators who supported preserving the Constitution and those who supported the proposed constitutional amendment. I commend the Senate for doing its duty and upholding the Constitution and Bill of Rights.

I would also like to thank Rachel King and her colleagues at the ACLU; Sue Osthoff, Director of the National Clearinghouse for the Defense of Battered Women; John Albert, Public Policy Director of Victims Services; Donna Edwards, Director of the National Network to End Domestic Violence; Renny Cushing, Director of Murder Victims' Families for Reconciliation; Arwen Bird; Scott Wallace; Beth Wilkinson; Emmet Welch; and Professor Lynne Henderson. As always, I thank my staff, as well as the hard-working staff of our distinguished Democratic Leader.

Finally, my special thanks to Professor Robert Mosteller of the Duke Law School, who has given so generously of his time, over many years, to many of us on the Judiciary Committee and in the Senate. Professor Mosteller is a leading scholar in this field, and his expertise and counsel have been invaluable.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

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

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, first, I compliment the wonderful statement by the Senator from Michigan in opposition to this amendment. On all issues I appreciate his knowledge and his understanding, and particularly his extremely clear way of presenting his views on this very important issue.

Mr. LEVIN. I thank my friend.

CALLING OF THE BANKROLL KICK-OFF

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, as many of my colleagues may remember, during the first session of this Congress I initiated the Calling of the Bankroll. It is a time when I come to the floor to

chronicle the massive amount of PAC and soft money pumped into the campaign finance system by donors looking to influence the work we do here on this floor.

I called the bankroll many times last year—19 times, to be exact.

And I included not just donations by business interests but from interests on both sides of these debates, including trial lawyers and gun control advocates.

Last year when I began my Calling of the Bankroll effort, I did so because I thought it was time for someone in this body finally to talk about what we all think about and what the American people really are quite angry about; and that is, how money can influence what we do here and how we do it.

I know that this is an uncomfortable topic, and I know full well that there are some who would prefer that I stop Calling the Bankroll—that there are those who wish that I would stop putting the spotlight on facts that reflect poorly on our system, and in turn on the Senate, and on both major political parties.

I have to tell you, Mr. President, no one wishes I could stop Calling the Bankroll as much as I do.

I wish wealthy interests with business before this body didn't have unlimited ability to give money to our political parties through the soft money loophole, but they do.

I wish these big donors weren't able to buy special access to our political leaders through meetings and weekend retreats set up by the parties, but they can.

I wish fundraising skills and personal wealth weren't some of the most sought-after qualities in a candidate for Congress today, but everyone knows that they are.

Most of all, I wish that these facts didn't paint a picture of Government so corrupt and so awash in the influence of money that the American people, especially young people, have turned away from their Government in disgust, but every one of us knows that they have.

But I also know something else: that we have the power to change this embarrassing state of affairs.

Here in the Senate we have the power to show the American people that we have the will to shut down the soft money system.

As I said, I Called the Bankroll 19 times last year—and I could have done it even more times.

Unfortunately there is never a shortage of material.

When I Call the Bankroll I describe how much money the various interests lobbying on a particular bill have spent on campaign contributions to influence our decisions.

I Called the Bankroll on: A mining rider to emergency supplemental appropriations, the gun control amendments to the juvenile justice bill, the Super Hornet amendment to DoD authorization, the Y2K liability legisla-

tion, the Patients' Bill of Rights—we did it twice on that, China/NTR, the tobacco industry, last summer's tax bill, agriculture appropriations, the FCC rule on the siting of telecommunications towers, oil royalties—we did it twice on that one, consolidation in the railroad industry, the Passengers' Bill of Rights, the F-22 program, the Africa Growth and Opportunity Act, the Financial Services Modernization bill, and finally the Bankruptcy Reform Act.

As I said, there was no shortage of material for calling the bankrolls.

This year, it's time again to examine legislation before this body with an eye to the interests that seek to influence the legislative process.

I have already begun that effort—I recently called the bankroll during the debate on the budget resolution. Of course, the budget process itself is tainted by the flood of money that flows to those of us who decide the nation's spending priorities. During that debate we addressed the question of whether or not we should drill for oil in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, and I called attention to the significant contributions by the companies with an interest in the outcome of that debate.

Before that I also called the bankroll on the interests lobbying both sides of the nuclear waste debate.

I talked about phony issue ads, PAC contributions, unlimited soft money contributions—the money that's always here, just beneath the surface of our debates.

It's our unwillingness to discuss it or even acknowledge the influence of this money that speaks volumes about how uncomfortable so many of us are with the current campaign finance system.

The purpose of the Calling of the Bankroll is to force this body to face up to the appearance of corruption the system causes and face up to our responsibility to do something about it.

So I can assure my colleagues that I will keep Calling the Bankroll until we do something about the campaign finance system that causes the American people to question our motives when we act on legislation, and, I am afraid, to question the very integrity of this body and our democracy.

And today they have more reason than ever to take a cynical view of our work.

Because last year was another record-breaker in the annals of soft money fundraising—the national political party committees raised a record \$107.2 million during the 1999 calendar year—81 percent more than they raised during the last comparable presidential election period in 1995, according to Common Cause.

An 81 percent increase is astounding, especially considering that the year it's compared with—1995, the last off-election year preceding a presidential election—which was itself a record-breaking year for soft money fundraising.

This year one of the most notable fundraising trends hits very close to home, or to the dome, as the case may be: Congressional campaign committees raised more than three times as much soft money during 1999 than they raised during 1995—\$62 million compared to \$19.4 million.

That's a huge increase, Mr. President.

It is three times as much soft money—much of it raised by Members of Congress. The latest reports show record-breaking soft money figures for the first quarter of the year 2000, as well.

How should the public view this?

What can we expect them to think as Members of Congress ask for these unlimited contributions from corporations, unions and wealthy individuals, and then turn around and vote on legislation that directly affects those donors?

Frankly Mr. President, it's all the more reason for Americans to question our integrity, whether those donations have an impact on our decisions or not.

But we can regain some of the public's trust by doing one simple thing—banning soft money.

On January 24, in its opinion in the *Shrink Missouri* case, the Supreme Court stated even more clearly to us that we may take that step today without the slightest offense to the First Amendment.

I'll continue the fight to ban soft money this year, and ask every one of my colleagues to join me.

The fight to ban soft money is a fight to regain the public's trust, and Mr. President, there's no fight in our democracy today more worthwhile than that.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed as in morning business.

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

The Senator from Alabama.

NATIONAL DEFENSE INDUSTRIAL ASSOCIATION AWARD DINNER

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, last night Senator JOHN WARNER, chairman of the Armed Services Committee, was the recipient of the James Forrestal Memorial Award at a gathering of 900 distinguished leading individuals involved in the industrial and military affairs of this Nation. It was awarded last night in Washington. The Forrestal award has been given since 1954 to distinguished Americans who most effectively applied Secretary Forres-

tal's ideas of a close working relationship between the Government and the requirements of a strong national defense. Other recipients were George Bush, Sam Nunn, Scoop Jackson, John Tower, Barry Goldwater, John Stennis and, I believe, our Presiding Officer, the distinguished Senator from Alaska, TED STEVENS.

The award is given to a citizen of the United States who may be from the military services, government, or industry. Senator WARNER was honored last night with the Forrestal award for his distinguished public service relating to national security and national defense in a wide range of responsibilities. All of us in the Senate know that Senator WARNER was a former Navy enlisted man in World War II, enlisting as a 17-year-old, then serving again in Korea as a marine officer. I have heard him say he has gone through two basic trainings, both Navy and Marine.

Later, during the cold war era, JOHN served his Nation as Secretary of the Navy. His service to the Nation in this body began in 1978, and he has been on the Senate Armed Services Committee ever since, a total of 21 years. I know that JOHN enjoyed being honored by 900 of his friends and companions who provide the equipment our soldiers and sailors, marines and airmen use every day to maintain a strong national defense.

JOHN's public thanks to those in industry and in the services is an expression of thanks from all of us in Congress. I associate myself with his remarks that he made so eloquently last evening.

There is no one in this body who cares more about the men and women in uniform, our military retirees, and our veterans than JOHN WARNER. There is no one more committed to the defense of this Nation. The markup of our committee's bill for defense will be undertaken next week, and the debate on this floor will show, without question, the depth of Senator JOHN WARNER's commitment to the Nation.

We owe men such as JOHN WARNER our gratitude for leading us in times of turmoil. There have been many in history who have provided this kind of essential leadership. We are part of JOHN's team. As a member of the Armed Services Committee, I am proud of him, his leadership and his friendship. Congratulations, JOHN, on being the recipient of the year 2000 James Forrestal Memorial Award.

I have the honor of serving with Senator WARNER on the Armed Services Committee. He is a gentleman's gentleman, a patriot's patriot. He is proud of being able to preside this year over a budget that produced the first real increase in defense spending in 15 years, a 4.8-percent pay raise for our men and women in uniform. It was a real accomplishment.

I have been honored to serve with him. I share with this body my pride in his being selected for this prestigious award.

I yield the floor.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that after the Senator from Alabama deals with the procedural matters I be recognized for 5 minutes and then Senator FEINSTEIN be recognized following me for 15 minutes as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. WELLSTONE. Reserving the right to object. I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to follow Senator FEINSTEIN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a period for the transaction of morning business with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

THE RETIREMENT OF DR. HERB CHEEVER

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, quite often on the floor of the Senate, we give speeches about extraordinary people who do extraordinary things. Today, I'd like to recognize someone whose name you won't see in the headlines, but who is truly extraordinary in every sense of the word. Earlier this year, my good friend Dr. Herb Cheever, Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences at South Dakota State University (SDSU), announced that he would retire.

Dr. Cheever grew up in Brookings, South Dakota and received his undergraduate degree from SDSU. After earning his doctorate from the University of Iowa and teaching in Kansas and Wisconsin, Dr. Cheever returned to his alma mater. He and his wife Sydna raised three boys in Brookings—Jason, Michael and Gene—and Herb and Sydna have long been tireless advocates of the arts in our state.

South Dakota State University is a wonderful school. Its reputation for academic excellence and cutting edge research is known across the country. Dr. Cheever is to be commended for the critical role he played in the development of the University, but he should also be recognized for his commitment to the things one can't measure by a standardized test.

Dean Cheever is a passionate believer in the importance of public service.