for the District of Columbia, for declaratory judgment and injunctive relief on the ground that such provision or amendment violates the Constitution. For purposes of the expeditiously review, provided by this section the ex- clusive venue clause for such an action shall be the United States District Court for the District of Columbia.

(b) APPEAL TO SUPREME COURT.—Notwith- standing any other provision of law, any order or judgment of the United States Dis- trict Court for the District of Columbia fi- nally disposing of an action brought under subsection (a) shall be reviewable by appeal directly to the Supreme Court of the United States. Any such appeal shall be taken by a notice of appeal filed within 10 calendar days after such order or judgment is entered; and the jurisdictional statement shall be filed within 30 calendar days after such order or judgment is entered.

(c) EXPEDITED CONSIDERATION.—It shall be the duty of the District Court for the Dis- trict of Columbia and the Supreme Court of the United States to advance on the docket and to expedite to the greatest possible ex- tent the disposition of any matter brought under subsection (a).

SA 168. Mr. HARKIN proposed an amend- ment to the bill S. 27, to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to provide bipartisan campaign re- form; as follows:

On page 37, strike lines 15 through 24 and insert the following:

**TITLE I—NONSEVERABILITY OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS; EFFECTIVE DATE**

SEC. 401. NONSEVERABILITY OF CERTAIN PROV- ISIONS

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (b), if any provision of this Act or amendment made by this Act, or the applica- tion of a provision or amendment to any person or circumstance, is held to be unconsti- tutional, the remainder of this Act and amendments made by this Act, and the applica- tion of the provisions and amendment to any person or circumstance, shall not be affected by the holding.

(b) NONSEVERABILITY OF PROHIBITION ON SOFT MONEY OF POLITICAL PARTIES AND IN- CREASED CONTRIBUTION LIMITS.—If any amend- ment made by section 101, or the appli- cation of the amendment to any person or circumstance, is held to be unconstitutional, each amendment made by sections 101 or 308 (relating to modification of contribution limits), and the application of each such amendment to any person or circumstance, shall be invalid.

SA 169. Mr. DURBEN (for himself, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. DeWINE, and Mr. LEVIN) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 27, to amend the Federal Election Cam- paign Act of 1971 to provide bipartisan campaign re- form; as follows:

On page 37, between lines 14 and 15, insert the following:

**SECTION 340. RESTRICTION ON INCREASED CONTRIBU- TIONS AND INCENTIVE TO SUPPORT CANDIDATES AVAILABLE FUNDS.**

Section 315(k)(1) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 441a(k)(1)), as added by this Act, is amended by adding at the end the following:

(E) SPECIAL RULE FOR CANDIDATE’S CAM- Paign Funds.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of deter- mining the aggregate amount of expendi- tures from personal funds under subpara- graph (D)(1), such amount shall include the net cash-on-hand advantage of the candidate.

(ii) NET CASH-ON-HAND ADVANTAGE.—For purposes of clause (i), the term “net cash-on- hand advantage” means the excess, if any, of

(I) the aggregate amount of 50% of the contributions received by a candidate during any election cycle (not including contributions from personal funds of the candidate) that may be expended in connection with the election, as determined on June 30 and Dec. 30 of the year preceding the year in which a general election is held, over

(II) the aggregate amount of 50% of the contributions received by an opposing can- didate during any election cycle (not includ- ing contributions from personal funds of the candidate) that may be expended in connec- tion with the election, as determined on June 30 and Dec. 30 of the year preceding the year in which a general election is held.

**ORDERS FOR MONDAY, APRIL 2, 2001**

Mr. KYL. Madam President, again, on behalf of the leader, I ask unanimous consent that Stephen Bell of Senator DOMENICI’s staff be accorded the privilege of the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tem. Without objection, it is so or- dered.

**ORDERS FOR MONDAY, APRIL 2, 2001**

Mr. KYL. Madam President, again, on behalf of the leader, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in recess until 5 p.m. on Monday, April 2, 2001.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so or- dered.

**PROGRAM**

Mr. KYL. Madam President, again, on behalf of the leader, for the informa- tion of all Senators, the Senate will reconvene on Monday and resume the campaign reform bill for 30 minutes for closing remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sen- ator from Oklahoma.

Mr. NICKLES. Madam President, thank you very much.

I say to my friend and colleague, we both have been here a long time. It is my intention to speak on campaign fi- nance for probably 10 or 15 minutes. Does my colleague want to make a few remarks? His patience is wearing about as thin as mine.

Madam President, I will be happy to yield my colleague a few minutes if that would accommodate his schedule.

If the Senator from North Dakota is seeking a few minutes, I am happy to accommodate his schedule.

Mr. CONRAD. I thank the Senator from Oklahoma. I will yield.

Mr. NICKLES. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BYRD). The Senator from North Dakota is recognized.

CONSIDERATION OF THE BUDGET RESOLUTION

Mr. CONRAD. I thank the Chair and the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. President, I wanted to further engage the Senator from Arizona be- cause the Senator from Arizona as- serted that we have received the esti- mates of the cost of the President’s tax package, and that is simply not the case. It is not true. If he has received it, he would like him to give me a copy because we haven’t received it.

We haven’t received it because the Joint Tax Committee has said they don’t have sufficient detail about the President’s package to do such a reestime, and so we are being asked to go to a budget resolution without having the President’s budget, without having the estimates from an independent source of the cost of the President’s budget proposal, and with no markup in the Senate Budget Committee, which is unprecedented, not even an at- tempt to mark up in the Senate Budget Committee, and all under a reconcili- ation which denies Senators their funda- mental rights to engage in extended debate and amendment.

There were remarks made on the floor that are just not true. It is one thing to have a disagreement, and we can disagree. We can even disagree on the facts. The facts are clear and di- rect. The differences between the present and 1993 are sharp. In 1993, we did not have the full President’s bud- get. We did have sufficient detail for an independent, objective review of the cost of the President’s tax proposals.