benefits. They could learn much from Admiral Zumwalt, who understood the importance not only of boosting pay, but also of changing the service to reflect the wants and needs of service members.

We should follow Admiral Zumwalt's example and take a broader view when we look to improve the lives of our military personnel.

Mr. President, in his later years, Admiral Zumwalt dedicated himself to assisting Vietnam War era veterans who had been exposed to Agent Orange. He played an instrumental role in getting Agent Orange-exposed veterans with cancer a service-connected illness designation. I had the honor of meeting with him to discuss his efforts to increase research funding for Agent Orange related illnesses and to explore options for international cooperation in that research.

Admiral Elmo Zumwalt was a great naval leader, a visionary and a courageous challenger of the conventional wisdom. We will not see the likes of him again. We mourn his passing and salute his accomplishments.●

ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, JANUARY 25, 2000

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until the hour of 11:30 a.m. on Tuesday, January 25. I further ask consent that on Tuesday, immediately following the prayer, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be deemed expired, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and the Senate then begin a period of morning business with Senators speaking for up to 5 minutes each, with the following exceptions: Senator BOND or designee from 11:30 a.m. until 12 noon, and Senator DURBIN or designee from 12 noon to 12:30 p.m.

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

Mr. GRAMS. I also ask consent that the Senate stand in recess from the hours of 12:30 p.m. to 2:15 p.m. for the weekly policy conferences to meet, and that upon reconvening the Senate resume consideration of S. 625, the bankruptcy reform bill.

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

PROGRAM

Mr. GRAMS. For the information of all Senators, tomorrow the Senate will be in a period of morning business until 12:30 p.m., and will then recess until 2:15 p.m. to accommodate the weekly party conferences. When the Senate reconvenes, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 625, the bankruptcy reform legislation, under the previous consent agreement. Time agreements have been made on the remaining bankruptcy amendments. Therefore, the Senate is expected to complete action on the bill during Wednesday's session of the Senate. As a reminder, the 12 noon cloture vote for tomorrow has been vitiated, and the debate on the remaining amendments will begin tomorrow, with votes expected to occur on Wednesday at a time to be determined.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—S. 625

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the agreement with respect to the bankruptcy bill be vitiated at the request of the majority leader or minority leader up to the hour of 12 noon on Tuesday.

Mr. REID. Reserving the right to object.

Mr. President, this new unanimous consent request literally just came to our attention. I want the record to be very clear that the minority, the Democrats, have worked very hard throughout today to obtain the unanimous consent we have already agreed to. If the bankruptcy bill does not go forward, it is not the fault of the minority.

We have done everything we can. We have spent all day coming up with a unanimous consent agreement. I have talked to Senators literally all over the country, getting them to agree to the unanimous consent which has already been agreed to and is now spread across the record of this Senate.

In short, I hope that the majority leader would not object to the unanimous consent agreement that is already in the record. I acknowledge that the majority leader wants permission, and we are going to grant him that permission, to vitiate the unanimous consent agreement prior to noon tomorrow. I hope he does not do that. It would be a shame for this body and a shame for the country if this objection is made because it will take down the bankruptcy bill for the rest of the year. That would be a shame because we have already worked too hard in the effort to get this legislation passed.

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

Mr. GRAMS. I thank the Senator from Nevada for all his efforts.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GRAMS. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in adjournment under the previous order, following the remarks of Senator FEINGOLD.

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

Mr. GRAMS. I yield the floor.

The Senator from Wisconsin is recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

SUPREME COURT CAMPAIGN FINANCE RULING

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, this morning the Supreme Court issued the most significant ruling in the area of campaign finance and election law since the 1976 landmark decision in Buckley v. Valeo. I am happy to report the Court reaffirmed the core holding of Buckley: The public's elected representatives have the constitutional power to limit contributions to political campaigns in order to protect the integrity of the political process from corruption or the appearance of corruption.

It is most fitting that this ruling came down this morning as the Senate prepares to return from its long recess. As you know, Mr. President, one of the most important unfinished pieces of business on our agenda is campaign finance reform and the McCain-Feingold bill. The House passed a reform bill last year by a wide bipartisan margin, and now today's Court decision leaves no doubt that a soft money ban, which is the core provision of that bill and of our bill in the Senate, is constitutional. Today's decision has dispatched one of the most persistent and most erroneous arguments against reform. The Court did it by a decisive vote of 6–3. We, as a legislative body, must step up and do what is right, what is constitutional, and what is demanded by the public and pass a ban on soft money.

I will take a minute to discuss this important Supreme Court decision and its implications for our work in this body. The case is Nixon v. Shrink Missouri Government PAC. It was an appeal of the decision of the Eighth Circuit Court of Appeals that struck down contribution limits enacted by the Missouri Legislature to cover State elections. Those limits were modeled on the Federal limit—$1,000 per candidate per election in a statewide election, somewhat lower for candidates for the State legislature. The State statute includes an inflation adjustment so that the limit for statewide races had become $1,075 per election by the time this challenge was filed.

The Missouri limits were upheld by the district court, but they were struck down by the court of appeals. The court of appeals held that the State had not provided adequate evidence of actual or apparent corruption stemming from large contributions to justify the restrictions. It also suggested that the limits were too low and therefore unconstitutional because inflation has eroded the value of a $1,000 contribution since 1974, when the Congress chose that limit for Federal elections.

Today the Supreme Court squarely and decisively rejected the court of appeals analysis. It did so by a 6–3 vote. I might note that it did so by a 4–3 vote of Justices appointed by Republican Presidents. The Court held that there was more than adequate evidence of actual or apparent corruption on which the State legislature could base its judgment that contributions should be limited. The Court noted that the