

Mr. BROWNBACk. Just for a brief comment. I have a limited period of time.

#### CONGRATULATIONS TO SENATOR CLELAND ON HIS MAIDEN SPEECH

Mr. FEINGOLD. I thank the Senator. All I wanted to do is be the first to congratulate the Senator from Georgia on his first speech as a Member of this body. I can't tell you how delighted we all are to have the Senator from Georgia here. The Senator from Georgia ran a tough race. I know the Senator from Georgia has run other races before.

The people of Georgia know well that the Senator from Georgia did not come to this campaign finance reform issue in the last few weeks, or just after the revelations of the last election. The Senator from Georgia has been a leader in Georgia and in the country for years in authoring and considering and moving forward the issue of campaign finance reform. I can't think of anything that made me happier than when the Senator from Georgia said his first bill would be to cosponsor our bipartisan effort. On behalf of my colleagues and myself, it is a great moment in the Senate to have the Senator from Georgia join us and to hear his first speech.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I wonder if I may have 30 seconds.

Mr. BROWNBACk. Yes.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I echo what my colleague from Wisconsin has said. I believe, I say to the Senator from Georgia, that when we pass the reform bill in this Congress—and we must and we will—the words uttered in the Senator's first speech on the floor of the Senate will be remembered and will be part of a good piece of history in this country. I thank my colleague from Georgia, and I thank the people from Georgia for sending him here.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a brief comment? I ask unanimous consent that he retain his right to the floor and that the time consumed by me and by the two Senators preceding me not come out of the Senator's time.

Mr. BROWNBACk. I am happy to yield for a minute, if I could please, sir.

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

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I join with others of my colleagues in complimenting the distinguished Senator from Georgia on his maiden speech.

It used to be, Mr. President, that when a new Senator came to this body, he waited several months before he spoke. Then when he made his maiden speech, other Senators who had been notified that he was going to make a speech would come to the floor and gather around him and listen to his speech. In those days we did not have the public address system. So Senators generally moved toward the desk of the Senator who was speaking so they could hear him better.

I have enjoyed listening to the distinguished Senator. He comes here today

as someone who is fresh off the campaign trail. I am sure that what he has had to say is something of importance, and I hope it will be read by our colleagues. He comes in the great tradition of Senators from Georgia. When I first came to Washington as a new Member of the Congress, we had Senator Walter George in the U.S. Senate, and Senator Richard Russell, who was my mentor in many ways, and it was I who introduced the resolution to name the old Senate Office Building in honor of Senator Richard Russell. Of course, there was also Sam Nunn, who followed in Senator Russell's footsteps.

I congratulate the distinguished Senator. He is a true American hero. I know that he will be an outstanding Member of this institution. I congratulate him.

I hope that all Senators will take note of what Senator CLELAND has said in his speech today. It will be well worth their time to read that speech.

I thank him.

And I thank the distinguished Senator from Kansas.

Mr. BROWNBACk addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. BROWNBACk. Mr. President, I want to recognize and congratulate the Senator from Georgia for joining the body. I am joining him on his first maiden speech.

I also thank the Senator from West Virginia for educating and sharing with us some of the culture and the history of the U.S. Senate, which I think is always beneficial for us to have and to be able to share with the American people the history, the ability, and the nature of this body as it was set up by the Founding Fathers and which has been maintained with most of its integrity since that time and age of what they set forward.

I think it is always positive for us to know the history and the nature and why we serve and how we should serve.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator for his very kind and overly charitable remarks.

Mr. BROWNBACk. They are not overly charitable at all.

(The remarks of Mr. BROWNBACk pertaining to the introduction of S. 471 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. GRAHAM addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SANTORUM). The Senator from Florida.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, first, I wish to add to the remarks that have been made this afternoon in recognition of the first speech given as a Member of the U.S. Senate by our new colleague, the Senator from Georgia. He has represented this Nation with great distinction throughout his life, and we are gratified that he has now joined us in the Senate. I am confident that the remarks he made a few minutes ago will be illustrative of the contributions he will make throughout his Senate ca-

reer. I am proud to call him a friend and colleague.

#### PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Ms. Delia Lasanta, a fellow in our office, be allowed privileges of the floor during consideration of the legislation that I will be introducing this afternoon with my friend and colleague, the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CRAIG].

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

(The remarks of Mr. GRAHAM and Mr. CRAIG pertaining to the introduction of S. 472 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

#### COMMUNICATIONS DECENCY ACT

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I rise today to join with a number of my colleagues to say there was a very important argument in the Supreme Court today over the constitutionality of the Communications Decency Act, which we passed last year. You will recall that we passed a bill to make it difficult to communicate pornography to children. The day it was passed and signed, the American Civil Liberties Union jumped in to say it was unconstitutional. I'm sorry, but I think the ACLU has it all wrong. I was very pleased to be one of a group of Senators, including the occupant of the Chair, who signed a brief in support of Congress' effort to impose reasonable regulations and restrictions to prevent the worst form of pornography from reaching our children.

Congress can regulate speech when there is a compelling reason. That has been clear. That has been held constitutional in many instances, and I suggest that there is no more compelling need than to protect our children and future generations from exposure to explicit pornographic pictures and messages, and from the people who send them.

The government, both the Federal Government and State and local governments, have engaged in efforts to regulate pornography. We regulate media available to children such as the sale of books and magazines, the viewing and sale of films, the use of telephone services to communicate adult messages, and the broadcast media. So, this has been done and it has been done for a very good and I believe a very compelling reason. The standard put forth in the Communications Decency Act is even more stringent than that, in terms of the limitations of it. The constraints are more severely limited than the constraints on the broadcast media. We have tightened up the definitions and made the ban much narrower.

The Internet is clearly the latest means of communications. Any of us

who have children knows how readily accessible the Internet is. If you are like I am, when you have a computer problem you ask your child how to fix it, because the children know how to make it work. My forehead still breaks out in perspiration and my hands shake when I try to send e-mail. But the kids can not only send the e-mail for you, they can tell you how to send it, fix the problems on it, and make things happen. We want to make sure that what they do not make happen is that they get access to things that are now banned to them through adult book stores, through broadcast media, through telephone communications. They should not be subject to the deviants, the pornographers, the child molesters who want to use the Internet in an interactive way to get access to our children.

There are, unfortunately, an abundance of examples of where pervers have used Internet communications to communicate with and to lure young children to locations away from their homes. They have used pornography as a tool. Not only have they polluted children's minds with this pornography, but they have used it as a tool for their own, very sick purposes.

In Louisville, I know there was a 12-year-old girl who was sent a bus ticket and left home without her parents knowing about it. These examples have happened time and time again. I believe this Congress had every right to say it is OK for adults to communicate anything they want but you cannot be sending material to children that is pornographic. You cannot be putting pornographic information on the kiddie chat rooms.

Contrary to what the ACLU will tell you, the Communications Decency Act does not ban speech or interrupt the free exchange of ideas. There is technology available that can keep children from gaining access to it. And if it takes a pornographer a little more difficulty to communicate pornographic materials to another consenting adult, so they do not get the information before children, I am not going to lose any sleep over it.

There is every reason that we can, under the Communications Decency Act, continue to use the Communications Decency Act for communicating medical information, discussing literature—these are not banned. If the purpose is getting pornography, for pornographic purposes or even personal whims of those who communicate it, to children, that the Communications Decency Act bans.

I think this should be upheld. I am proud to be one of the signers of the brief and we will all be watching to see this very important case resolved by the U.S. Supreme Court.

I yield the floor.

Mr. COATS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

#### THE BUCK MUST REST SOMEWHERE ELSE

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, yesterday, I took the floor to detail what I thought was an extremely disturbing and very potentially abuse of Executive power of the White House to improperly influence the outcome of the American Presidential election. As part of that chronology of events of information that we now know that has been printed and that we are aware of, I detailed the situation relative to the latest scandal that has been reported in the press, and that involves Mr. Lake, former National Security Adviser to the President, an individual nominated for the job as Director of the CIA.

Mr. Lake, as we all now know, withdrew his name from consideration the day after a major story broke about a problem involving the Democratic National Committee, the Central Intelligence Agency, the National Security Council, and the fundraising operation of the White House. I think this is probably the most damaging, or at least one of the most damaging allegations relative to the entire fundraising efforts by the Democratic Party for this last election. We now know that the Central Intelligence Agency was used by the Democratic National Committee to encourage access to the President by an individual who is an international fugitive and was a major donor to the Democratic Party.

The administration, in response to Mr. Lake's withdrawal, indicated that it was the confirmation process by members of the Intelligence Committee that is at fault in the withdrawal of the Lake nomination. The fault, Mr. President, I suggest, lies elsewhere. The Lake nomination was eventually undermined because Mr. Lake was forced to operate, or at least chose to operate or was forced to operate, in the very center, the very heart of a political fundraising machine whose abuses are revealed to us each day as we pick up the paper in the morning.

The White House blames partisan Republicans, and yet a major story in the New York Times today, titled "Leading Democrat Tells of Doubt of CIA Nominee, White House Was Warned, Senator KERREY's Reservations May Have Persuaded Lake Not To Fight the GOP," hardly speaks to a partisan effort to dethrone Mr. Lake.

Legitimate questions were asked of Mr. Lake of what his role was as National Security Adviser to the President in terms of clearing certain individuals to come to the White House for various favors, coffees, Lincoln Bedroom stays, et cetera, and, on several occasions—at least two that we know of—the National Security Council issued very direct reservations and, in fact, warnings about certain individuals who, nevertheless, attended more than one meeting at the White House.

Mr. Lake's response was that he essentially was out of the loop; he did

not know what was going on. Legitimate questions were raised: If you did not know what was going on with a 150-member staff that went to the very essence of the Presidency, of who sees the President, of what the involvement of these individuals is relative to fundraising for the election, if you are not aware of that going on, how are you possibly going to manage a multithousand-member agency with 12 separate divisions as important to the security of the United States as the Central Intelligence Agency?

So even though the White House blamed partisan Republicans, we now know that the vice chairman of the Intelligence Committee had raised his own concerns about Mr. Lake's qualifications and what his role was and the role of the National Security Council in terms of all this fundraising morass that the administration is caught up in.

Mr. President, fortunately, publications that are following the story are not buying the White House response. The New York Times editorial today states:

In the end, Mr. Lake was undone by Mr. Clinton's reckless 1996 election campaign and the failure of top White House officials, including Mr. Lake, to insulate American foreign policy from fundraising efforts.

That is an extraordinary statement, Mr. President, and I want to repeat it. The New York Times editorial today refuting the White House response to Mr. Lake's withdrawal from nomination to be CIA Director, states:

In the end, Mr. Lake was undone by Mr. Clinton's reckless 1996 election campaign and the failure of top White House officials, including Mr. Lake, to insulate American foreign policy from fundraising efforts.

Jim Hoagland, in today's Washington Post, states:

[Lake] is not a victim of the system but of the President he served. His angry words try to obscure an embarrassment and the true dimension of one more political fiasco at the Clinton White House. One more close Clinton associate is badly damaged while the President cruises on with high but flagging approval ratings.

To continue:

The system that did in Tony Lake is the one that allowed the fundraisers to trump Lake's staff repeatedly over access to the White House.

In Washington the system is people—people who are supremely attuned to the wishes, needs, and whims of the boss. If Roger Tamraz, Chinese arms supplier Wang Jun, Thai trade lobbyist Pauline Kanchanalak and the others made it into the White House, it is ultimately because Bill Clinton communicated, in one form or another, that he did not want tight screening of campaign contributors. In the end, Tony Lake paid the price for Clinton's need not to know.

That from today's Washington Post. Then, finally, Maureen Dowd in the New York Times states:

Although Mr. Lake's "haywire" line got all the attention—

That is referring to a process "gone haywire" that Mr. Lake stated—it was another sentence in his letter that provided the real reason for his withdrawal.

Quoting Ms. Dowd: