

and into the rural countryside. This pattern of development is altering the character of our state by diminishing both its traditional villages and surrounding open farms and forests. It also has a significant impact on local and state budgets as expensive new schools and roads are built to service these new neighborhoods.

Your initiative would provide important federal funds to be matched by state and private dollars. As you know, Maine voters showed their strong support for conserving open land when they overwhelmingly endorsed the \$50 million Land for Maine's Future bond in 1999. Furthermore, the success of Maine's 88 land trusts (perhaps the highest number of trusts per capita in the nation) is a testament to Mainers' commitment to maintaining the rural character of the state. Your proposal would help leverage hard-won public and private dollars.

I was particularly pleased to learn that your proposal would complement the Forest Legacy Program. Forest Legacy has been a critically important source of federal funds for conserving large tracts of Maine's northwoods. Its continuation is vital.

Thank you ever so much for your creative leadership and hard work on behalf of land conservation efforts in Maine and across America.

Sincerely,

JAMES J. ESPY,
President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to consideration of H.R. 2646, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2646) to provide for the continuation of agricultural programs through fiscal year 2011.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, all after the enacting clause is stricken and the text of S. 1731, as amended, is inserted in lieu thereof.

The question is on the engrossment of the amendment and third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill was to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. DOMENICI) and the Senator from Utah (Mr. BENNETT) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 58, nays 40, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 30 Leg.]

YEAS—58

Akaka	Durbin	Miller
Allen	Edwards	Murray
Baucus	Feingold	Nelson (FL)
Bayh	Feinstein	Nelson (NE)
Biden	Fitzgerald	Reed
Bingaman	Graham	Reid
Boxer	Grassley	Rockefeller
Breaux	Harkin	Sarbanes
Byrd	Hollings	Schumer
Cantwell	Inouye	Sessions
Carnahan	Jeffords	Shelby
Carper	Johnson	Snowe
Cleland	Kennedy	Specter
Clinton	Kerry	Stabenow
Collins	Kohl	Torricelli
Conrad	Landrieu	Warner
Daschle	Leahy	Wellstone
Dayton	Levin	Wyden
Dodd	Lieberman	
Dorgan	Mikulski	

NAYS—40

Allard	Frist	McConnell
Bond	Gramm	Murkowski
Brownback	Gregg	Nickles
Bunning	Hagel	Roberts
Burns	Hatch	Santorum
Campbell	Helms	Smith (NH)
Chafee	Hutchinson	Smith (OR)
Cochran	Hutchison	Stevens
Corzine	Inhofe	Thomas
Craig	Kyl	Thompson
Crapo	Lincoln	Thurmond
DeWine	Lott	Voinovich
Ensign	Lugar	
Enzi	McCain	

NOT VOTING—2

Bennett Domenici

The bill (H.R. 2646) was passed.

[The bill will appear in a future edition of the RECORD.]

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote and to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate insists on its amendments and requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses.

The majority leader.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a period for morning business until 2:30 p.m. today, with 60 minutes under the control of Senator BYRD and the remaining time controlled equally between Senators BROWNBACK and TORRICELLI or their designees, and that at 2:30 p.m. today the Senate begin consideration of Calendar No. 239, S. 565, the election reform bill.

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

The Senator from New Jersey.

CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. President, the Congress may now be closer to comprehensive campaign finance reform than at any time in 30 years. It holds the promise of restoring public confidence by reducing the amount of money flowing into American politics while simultaneously reducing the costs of campaigns themselves. It gives a fair chance to challengers, an oppor-

tunity for people to bring different ideas and a broader national debate because we end the dominance of special interests money.

This can be an extraordinary, even historic week in the life of the Congress. But the well-crafted balance reached in the Senate is now in jeopardy. Campaign finance reform has meant a change in various institutions within our political culture. One of those institutions is resisting the change. I am speaking of the network broadcast industry. Just as political candidates would be challenged under the law to raise less money under stricter limits, and the political parties would operate under different rules, and the American people would operate under more restrictions to assure that money did not dominate the process, the broadcast industry, operating under Federal license in the use of the public airways, would be challenged to reduce the costs of advertising for Federal campaigns.

The Congress could have insisted on free air time. We could have insisted that time be made available for public debate as in many of the great democracies of Western Europe. Our request was much more modest. Indeed, our request was to put into law that which we believe we had done 30 years ago anyway. In 1971, Congress required that the networks provide advertising rates at the lowest unit rate. Through evasion, by finding loopholes in the law, the television networks have evaded their responsibility under the law.

Senators CORZINE, DURBIN, ENZI, and many of my colleagues offered an amendment on the floor of the Senate, adopted 69 to 31, on a bipartisan basis, requiring once again that the networks provide television advertising at the lowest unit rate in the period immediately before a primary and general election. We did this because a 1990 audit by the FCC found that 80 percent of network television affiliates were failing to make time available as required by law at the lowest unit rate, meaning that a typical candidate ad sold for 65 percent more than what should have been charged—65 percent higher costs than should have been required had the law been followed.

If in this debate on campaign finance reform we lower the amount of money raised without lowering the costs of the campaigns themselves, we will have achieved very little. The best funded incumbents will always find the resources to advertise. The question is, What about those candidates for Federal office who do not represent popular ideas or powerful interests? And what of the challengers who would challenge the status quo, represent new ideas or sometimes unpopular ideas? They will never have the resources to enter into the national political debate.

The goal of campaign finance reform is not to lessen the national debate. It is not to bring less political discussion to the country. It is to have a more vibrant debate, of more varied ideas, less