field toward (a) incumbent politicians, who enjoy the megaphone of public offices; (b) very rich, who buy unlimited megaphone time (which is why so many new populate the Senate); and (c) media moguls, who own the megaphones.

The conceit of McCain-Feingold is that politicians prostitute themselves only for big corporate or individual contributors. But they get more care and feeding, flattery and deference to the lords of the media. It stands to reason.

They can be helped or hurt infinitely more by the public interest, or network news shows than by any lobbyist. By restricting the power of contributors, McCain-Feingold magnifies the vast power of those already entrenched in control of Norman.

How to mitigate the effects of money? By demanding absolute transparency, say, full disclosure on the Internet within 48 hours of a contribution, so that contributions can be the object of debate during, not after, the campaign. And by requiring TV stations, in return for the public licenses that allow them to print money, to give candidates a substantial amount of free air time.

Far better to reduce the demand for political money rather than the supply. For the Robespierres—American politicians, however such modest steps are almost contemptible. McCain’s mission is not the mitigation of sin but its eradication. Yet like all avengers in search of political purity, McCain would leave only wreckage behind: a merely different configuration of influence-peddling—from money rather than the supply. For the public channels and thus protect the identity of parties is not the problem, since we at least know where the money is coming from.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, William Raspberry has made some astute observations on this issue over the years. In the March 23, 2001 Washington Post, in a column entitled “Campaign Finance Frenzy,” Mr. Raspberry makes a refreshing observation, conceding that while he is drawn to “reform” he is not sure just what “reform” means. What is it? A fair question.

“I don’t quite get it,” Mr. Raspberry writes. He’s for it but confesses to not being embarrassed to admit he doesn’t understand it. I venture to guess Mr. Raspberry speaks for a lot of people who are not intimately familiar with the McCain-Feingold bill and the jurisprudence which governs this arena. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Raspberry’s column be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 23, 2001]

CAMPAIGN FINANCE FRENZY

(William Raspberry)

When it comes to campaign finance reform, now being debated in the Senate, I don’t quite get it.

I know what the problem is, of course: People and organizations with big money (usually people and organizations whose interests are inimical to mine) are buying up our politicians, and the problem is disgraceful, and I’d like to stop it.

What I don’t get is how the reform proposals being debated can stop it.

Up to now, I’ve been too embarrassed to say so, but I’m for McCain-Feingold, but that’s largely because all the people whose politics I admire seem to be for it. Besides, John McCain looks so sincere (I don’t really have a pet for a Secretary of the Air Force) and the Arizonan has made campaign finance reform such an important matter that he was willing to risk offending a president of his own party. I’m attracted to people of principle.

Similarly, I’ve been denouncing the substitute lately put forward by Sen. Chuck Hagel (R-Neb.), because my colleagues who know about these things say it is a sham—a even step backward. I don’t like shams.

The problem is (boy, this is humiliating!) I don’t know what I want.

Do I want to keep rich people from using their money to support political issues? Political parties? Political candidates? No, that doesn’t seem right.

Does the Supreme Court say money is speech, thereby bringing political contributions under the protection of the First Amendment? That pronouncement, unlike much that flowed out of the court, makes sense to me. If you have a First Amendment right to use your time and shoe leather to harvest votes for your candidate, why shouldn’t Mr. Plutocrat use his money to support of his candidate? If it’s constitutional for you to campaign for gun control, why shouldn’t it be constitutional for Mr. Charlton Heston to contribute to the man who will send him money to campaign against it?

If money is speech—and it certainly has been speaking loudly of late—how reasonable is it to put an absolute limit on the amount of permissible speech? Is that any different from saying I can make only X number of speeches or stage only Y number of rallies for my favorite politician or cause?

But if limits on money-speech strike me as illogical, the idea that there should be no limits is positively alarming. Politicians—and policies—shouldn’t be bought and sold, and as happening far too much these days.

The present debate accepts the distinction between “hard” and “soft” contributions—hard money given in support of candidates and soft referring to money contributed to political parties or on behalf of issues.

McCain-Feingold would put limits on hard money to candidates (a); but it is the soft ban money contributions to political parties. Hagel would be happy with no limits on contributions to parties but has said he might accept a cap of, say, $60,000 per contribution.

Hagel’s view is that the soft money given to parties is not the problem, since we at least know where the money is coming from. More worrisome, he says, are the “issues” contributions that can be made through non-public channels and thus protect the identity of the donors.

Why has money—hard or soft—come to be such a big issue? Because it takes a lot of money to buy the TV ads without which major campaigns cannot be mounted. Politicians jump through all sorts of unseemly hoops for money because they’re dead without it.

So why aren’t we debating free television ads for political campaigns? Take away the politician’s need for obscene sums of money and maybe you reduce the likelihood of his being bought. I’d be arguing about how much free TV to make available or the thresholds for qualifying for it, but at least that is a debate I could understand.

All I can make of the present one is that I’m for campaign reform, and I’m against people who are against campaign finance reform. I just don’t know what it is.

SENA'TE'S FINEST HOUR

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. President, are we now in morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. President, what is in my experience, its finest hour.

I will confess, when this debate began on McCain-Feingold, I had real reservations as to whether, indeed, an attempt at narrow reform could genuinely result in comprehensive campaign finance reform. This legislation has exceeded my expectations. The public may have expected simply an elimination of soft money, but many of us who have lived in this process know that the rise of soft money contributions was only one element in a much broader problem.

This legislation is genuine comprehensive campaign finance reform. We have dealt with the need to control both hard and soft money, but also reduced the costs of campaigns themselves, allowed a more realistic participation through hard money contributions, and dealt with the rising scepter of eliminating the class of middle-class candidates in this country by opening this only to become the province of the very wealthy.

The burden may soon go from this Congress to the Supreme Court. I only hope that the Supreme Court meets its responsibility to protect our First Amendment, assuring that in our enthusiasm to deal with campaign finance abuses we have not trespassed upon other fundamental rights of the American people. I understand that is their responsibility. I know they will meet it. I hope they also balance that this Congress felt motivated to deal with the problem of public confidence, assuring the integrity of the process; that the Senate, the House, and the leadership that we have attempted to meet that responsibility.

I have never felt better about being a Member of this institution. I am proud.
of my colleagues. I believe we can feel good about this product. It is not partisan in nature. It does not deal with one part of this problem. It is broad. It is deep reform. It has been a good moment for the Senate.

I yield the floor.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is in morning business with Senators allowed to speak for up to 10 minutes.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak out of order without a limitation on time. I do not intend to speak at great length. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE BUDGET RESOLUTION

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the Senate will debate, beginning next week, legislation that will be remembered by Americans for decades to come.

The budget resolution that the Senate will debate will set the Nation on a course that will change, that will affect, and that will impact upon people's lives for a generation or more.

How long is a generation? One might think in terms, in speaking of a generation, 30 years. We are at a unique moment—hear me—we are at a unique moment in the history of this Nation when we must decide what is the most appropriate way to allocate a projected surplus when we know that just over the horizon we are facing the staggering costs of the retirement of the baby boom generation.

What do we mean in terms of the calendar when we speak of the baby boom generation? I started out in politics in 1946. The baby boom generation began then and is now, for the most part, in 1946. That was a good starting point. Ten years from now, when 53 million Americans are expecting Social Security—hear me—10 years from now, when 53 million Americans will be expecting Social Security to be there for them in their retirement, they will remember—they will remember—whether we voted for a budget resolution that failed to address the long-term financing crisis that faces the Social Security program. They will remember, and so will we.

Ten years from now, when 43 million Americans—hear me, again—10 years from now, when 43 million Americans are expecting to rely on the Medicare program for their health care, they will remember whether we voted for a budget resolution that failed to address the long-term problem—they will remember whether we failed to address the long-term problem—the financing crisis that faces the Medicare program. Forty-three million Americans will remember the decade, the financing crisis that faces the Medicare program.

Ten years from now our elderly citizens will remember if we, in our day in time, voted for a resolution that failed to provide a fair prescription drug benefit.

Ten years from now our children—our children—will remember if we voted for a budget resolution that resulted in a nation with a failed infrastructure, with our roads in a shambles, with our bridges an unsanitary, with our water polluted, with our water system that is not safe to drink. They will remember if we voted for a budget resolution that forced them to go to crumbling schools. What will we say, when they ask Where were you?

When God walked through the Garden of Eden—in the cool of the day, when the shadows were falling, when the rays from the Sun were dying out in the west—Adam was hiding. God said, "Adam, Adam, where art thou?"

Ten years from today, the people of America will look at today's legislators, on both sides of the aisle—they will look at the mighty men and women who were given the awesome honor and the profound duty to serve this country in this hour—and they will say to us: Where were you? Where were you? You were there at a time when you could have acted to preserve this system, this Social Security system, Medicare, our infrastructure, our Nation's schools and parks.

You were there. You had the chance. You had the duty. Where were you?

This is a critical debate. I have been through lots of them. This is as critical a debate as you will ever participate in or witness or hear or see in your lifetime, this debate that is coming up on the resolution next week. And yet as we approach this critical debate, we are being forced into this situation, and we can't even see through a glass darkly, as the Apostle Paul said. We are flying blind. You know the old saying: It is your money.

In all a lot of talk about bipartisanship. I think that is what the people want—bipartisanship. Let us hope we can give it to them. But they want something else, too. They want us to do our work, and they want us to do our work well. That is what they are paying us to do. That is why they gave every Senator here the votes that placed upon our shoulders the toga of senatorial honor. With that honor goes the duty.

They want us to do our work. They want us to do it well. They want us to represent their views and their interests well. Doing that—representing their views and their interests well—should be a bipartisan concern, a concern of every Member of this body regardless of party.

It is our sworn duty, especially now, now when we are debating a budget that will set the course of this Nation for the next decade. And the ramifications of this budget will go far beyond the next decade. We owe our people our very best judgment.

How can we exercise that judgment, if we don't know the details of the