

Scan revealed he suffered a stroke in utero, which caused excess fluid to build up in his brain. It showed that the lower level quadrant of his brain was missing. Within a week of his birth, he had the first shunt surgery to drain fluid, and he had a follow-up procedure in three months. He exceeded everybody's expectations. So a baby, which doctors initially believed was blind, had no capacity for learning, grew to a little boy who talked, walked, ran, sang, enjoyed playing baseball and basketball. He attended preschool. His heroes were Cal Ripken, Jr., Batman, Spiderman, and the Backstreet Boys. He loved whales and dolphins. His favorite movie was Angels in the Outfield. And he especially loved his baby sister, who was two years younger than he. Christian brought joy to all who were fortunate enough to know him.

In August, Christian began experiencing head pains. Here is little Christian in this photo, and this is his little baby sister. His shunt was malfunctioning, and it had to be replaced.

After surgery, Christian experienced cardiac arrest respiratory distress. He slipped into a coma. Fluid continued to accumulate on his brain. He fought hard to live. But he didn't. He died 2 years ago on August 8 at the age of 4.

If you think these kids don't matter, if you think this option is just all pain, ask Mark and Dianne whether they would trade the 4 years. They have those wonderful memories—difficult, sure; painful, sure. But they believed in their child. They loved him. They nurtured him. And he returned much more than they ever gave—not just to them but to all of us.

Do you want to know how they felt about their little brother?

Last year, on his anniversary, these are little ads taken out in the Harrisburg Patriot News by his sisters, his brother, his mom and dad.

His sister said:

Christian, we love you, we miss you, we wish we could kiss you just one more time.

His brother, Mark:

I have a poem for you.

Blue jays are blue, and I love you; robins are red, and I miss you in bed; sparrows are black, I wish you were back; I am sorry for the bad things I did to you, you are the best and the only brother I ever had, please watch over us and take care of us. Love Mark.

His mom and dad:

Our arms ache to hold you again. Our hearts are forever broken, but we thank God we had a chance to love you. We know your smile is brightening up the heavens, and that Jesus loves the little children. Please help us to carry on until the day we can all play together again.

What would be missed, as some would suggest, if we just take all of this pain away, and kill this baby before it would suffer through this horrible life?

The McNaughtons would not trade a minute. I think it is obvious they wouldn't trade a minute.

All of the stories are not happy ones. All of the sad stories do not have a

bright side. Some are just tragic and tragic and tragic.

But I can tell you as a family who has gone through the loss of a child, and what we thought was a normal pregnancy didn't go the way we had hoped, accepting your child, loving your child, taking your children as they are, for as long as they are to be may be the hardest thing you can do. But it is the best that we can do—not just for the child whose life you have affirmed and accepted but in your life.

In the case of Mark, the little boy knew he was loved. He lived a couple of hours. Karen and I and our family have the knowledge that for those hours we opened up our arms to him, and during those 2 hours he knew he was loved.

What a wonderful life we could all have if that is all we had.

We have a chance tomorrow to draw a bright line. A bright line needs to be drawn for this country. If there is a time in our society and in our world when we need a bright line separating life and death, I can think of no better time.

This debate today and tomorrow is drawing that line, affirming that once a baby is in the process of being born and there is a partial-birth abortion outside of the mother, the line has been crossed. It is not a fuzzy line. If we perform that kind of brutality to a little baby who would otherwise be born alive, it is beneath us as a country.

History will look back at this debate, I am sure, and wonder how it could have ever occurred. How we could ever have done that to the most helpless among us? How did we ever cross the line?

But tomorrow those Members of the Senate will have a chance to tell a different story for history, to say that the greatest deliberative body in the world will strike a clear blow for the right to life for little children during the process of being born.

I don't think it is too much to ask. But I do ask it of my colleagues. I plead with them to find somewhere in their hearts the strength to stand up and do what is right for this country, what is right for the little children, and say no to partial-birth abortions.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

#### SUBMITTING CHANGES TO THE BUDGETARY AGGREGATES AND APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE ALLOCATION

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, section 314 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended, requires the Chairman of the Senate Budget Committee to adjust the appropriate budgetary aggregates and the allocation for the Appropriations Committee to reflect amounts provided for emergency requirements and arrearages for international organizations, international peacekeeping, and multilateral development banks.

I hereby submit revisions to the 2000 Senate Appropriations Committee allo-

cations, pursuant to section 302 of the Congressional Budget Act, in the following amounts:

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget authority	Outlays	Deficit
Current allocation:			
General purpose discretionary	550,441	557,580	.....
Violent crime reduction fund	4,500	5,554	.....
Highways	.....	24,574	.....
Mass transit	.....	4,117	.....
Mandatory	321,502	304,297	.....
Total	876,443	896,122	.....
Adjustments:			
General purpose discretionary	+7,063	+4,118	.....
Violent crime reduction fund	.....	.....	.....
Highways	.....	.....	.....
Mass transit	.....	.....	.....
Mandatory	.....	.....	.....
Total	+7,063	+4,118	.....
Revised allocation:			
General purpose discretionary	557,504	561,698	.....
Violent crime reduction fund	4,500	5,554	.....
Highways	.....	24,574	.....
Mass transit	.....	4,117	.....
Mandatory	321,502	304,297	.....
Total	883,506	900,240	.....
I hereby submit revisions to the 2000 budget aggregates, pursuant to section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act in the following amounts:			
Current allocation: Budget resolution	1,445,390	1,428,962	-20,880
Adjustments: Emergencies and arrearages	+7,063	+4,118	-4,118
Revised allocation: Budget resolution	1,452,453	1,433,080	-24,998

#### EXPLANATION OF VOTE

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I was necessarily absent while attending to a family member's medical condition during Senate action on rollcall votes Nos. 328 and 329.

Had I been present for the votes, I would have voted as follows: On rollcall vote No. 328, adoption of the conference report on H.R. 2684, a bill making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, I would have agreed to the conference report. On rollcall vote No. 329, the motion to table Senate Amendment No. 2299, a Reid perfecting amendment to the campaign finance reform bill, I would have voted not to table the amendment.

#### CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, we have now set aside—until the next time!—the McCain-Feingold legislation on campaign finance reform. I did not speak during this most recent debate. The third in three years, and for certain not the last as Senator FEINGOLD made clear last evening on the "NewsHour with Jim Lehrer." I supported the reform with only a faint sense of familiarity. Here we are, reforming the results of the last reform. A not infrequent task of Congress. But now it might be useful to offer a few related observations.

The first is to state that raising money for political campaigns has never been a great burden for this Senator, and for the simple reason that I

hardly do any. One dinner a term, perhaps two. Some receptions. Lots of mail. Not surprisingly the results are not exactly spectacular. In 1994, my last campaign, and which will be my last campaign, the Federal Elections Commission records our having raised \$6,100,147. This is for the State of New York, the third most populous in the nation. But it sufficed. For practical purposes, all the money went to television, with the incomparable Doug Schoen keeping an eye on the numbers lest trouble appear unexpectedly. Our campaign staff never had ten persons, which may sound small to some, but I believe was our largest ever. Even so, we have done well. In 1988, I received some 4,000,000 votes and won by more than 2,000,000 votes, the largest numerical margin of victory in any legislative election in history. I say all this simply to note that just possibly money isn't everything. But if we think it is, it might as well be. And so we must persevere.

This July, in his celebrated Wall Street Journal column, Paul Gigot referred to me as an "old pol" and an "ever loyal Democrat." I wrote to thank him, for this is pretty close to the truth. If I have spent time in universities it was usually seeking sanctuary after a failed election, my own or others. I go back before polling, and before television. (Although in 1953 I did write a 15-minute television speech for the Democratic candidate for Mayor of New York City, Robert F. Wagner, Jr. It might have been seen by 10,000 people.) But of course polling caught on, as the mathematics got better, and television has never stopped. And these, of course, are the technologies that seemingly confound us today. But this subject has been with us the longest while.

Congress first placed restrictions on political spending with the Naval Appropriations Bill of 1867 which prohibited Navy officers and Federal employees from soliciting campaign funds from navy yard workers.

Faced with allegations that corporations had bought influence with contributions to his campaign, President Theodore Roosevelt called for campaign finance reform in his 1905 and 1906 State of the Union addresses. In response, Congress passed the Tillman Act of 1907, banning corporate gifts to Federal candidates. And during World War II, the War Labor Disputes Act of 1943, known as the Smith-Connally Act, temporarily prohibited unions from making contributions in Federal elections. In 1947, the Taft-Hartley Act made this wartime measure permanent. As my colleagues well know, these bans have been made virtually irrelevant with the advent of so-called "soft money."

Requirements for the disclosure of donors originated in the so-called Publicity Act of 1910 which required the treasurer of political committees to reveal the names of all contributors of \$100 or more. Congress expanded the

disclosure rules with the 1925 Federal Corrupt Practices Act, requiring political committees to report total contributions and expenditures. The Court upheld this Act in *Burroughs v. United States*, declaring that Congress has the prerogative to "pass appropriate legislation to safeguard (a Presidential) election from the improper use of money to influence the result." We continue to debate how to exercise that prerogative today.

But may I focus on one particular aspect of campaign funding, which is relatively new? Money for television. Ease this by providing free television time—those are public airways—and as much about the problem goes away as will ever be managed in this vale of toil and sin.

Max Frankel, the long-time and venerable editor of the New York Times and a wise and seasoned observer of American politics, addressed this issue in the October 26, 1997 New York Times Magazine:

The movement to clean up campaign financing is going nowhere for the simple reason that the reformers are aiming at the wrong target. They are laboring to limit the flow of money into politics when they should be looking to limit the candidates' need for money to pay for television time. It is the staggering price of addressing the voters that drives the unseemly money chase.

To run effectively for major office nowadays one needs to spend millions for television commercials that spread your fame, shout your slogans, denounce your opponents, and counteract television attacks. A campaign costing \$10 million for a governorship or seat in the Senate is a bargain in many states. The President, even with all the advantages of the White House at his command, appears to have spent more than \$250 million on television ads promoting his reelection in 1996. \$250 million!

The problem of so-called "issue advocacy" is only fueling the amount of money going into television ads and further distorting our electoral system. On February 10, 1998, Tim Russert delivered the fifth annual Marver H. Bernstein Symposium on Governmental Reform at Georgetown University. In his address, he asserted that "television ads paid for by the candidates themselves are (not) going to be the problem in future election cycles. That distinction will be earned by so-called 'issue advocacy' advertising by ideological and single issue groups." He made the point that, unlike candidates, these groups are not subject to campaign contribution limits or disclosure requirements.

In *Buckley v. Valeo* the Supreme court held that these ads are protected speech under the First Amendment. We are told that requiring such groups to disclose their list of contributors might be a violation of the First Amendment under *NAACP v. Alabama*. Mr. Russert contends that "unless the Fourth Estate is able to identify these groups and ferret out their funding, and explain their agenda, many elec-

tions could very well be taken hostage by a select band of anonymous donors and political hit men." There must be a better way.

Might I suggest that the way to reduce the influence of these "select band of anonymous donors and political hit men" and to reduce the ungodly amount of money being used in campaigns is free television time for candidates. Frankel writes:

It would be cheaper by far if Federal and State treasuries paid directly for the television time that candidates need to define themselves to the public—provided they purchased no commercial time of their own. Democracy would be further enhanced if television stations that sold time to special interest groups in election years were required, in return for the use of the public spectrum, to give equal time to opposing views. But so long as expensive television commercials are our society's main campaign weapons, politicians will not abandon the demeaning and often corrupt quest for ever more money from ever more suspect sources.

The version of the McCain-Feingold bill we have been considering restricts so-called "soft money"—contributions that national, state, county, and local party organizations may collect and spend freely provided only that the television messages they produce with the funds are disguised to appear "uncoordinated" with any candidate's campaign. This is a good first step. But it is not enough. Even if soft money and slimy variants were prohibited, political money would reappear in liquid or vaporous form. If we want to make significant changes with regard to how we conduct campaigns, we must—to repeat Frankel—look beyond limiting the flow of money into politics and rather look to limiting the candidates' need for money to pay for television time. Frankel concludes his piece on campaign finance reform by stating that "there is no point dreaming of a law that says 'you may not' so long as the political system daily teaches the participants 'you must.' Until candidates for office in America are relieved of the costly burden of buying television time, the scandals will grow." He could not be more right.

#### DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS

##### VERMONT RURAL FIRE PROTECTION TASK FORCE

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I first thank Senator BOND for all of his hard work on the FY 2000 Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development Appropriations bill, and the attention he paid to priorities in my home State of Vermont. I would like to briefly discuss with the Senator from Missouri the \$600,000 provided in the Conference Report for the Vermont Rural Fire Protection Task Force.

It is my understanding that the funds provided are for the purchase of personal safety equipment that includes, but is not limited to the following: self-contained breathing apparatus, fire resistant turn out gear (helmets, coats