

that aggregate or within the aggregate. That would mean, if this amendment passes, we could call up a couple and say: Can you contribute \$200,000 in this cycle to our party and to the candidates we are supporting?

It is too big an amount. It puts us in a position which I believe we should not be in, which is to be competing in this arena for large contributions, which have undermined public confidence in the electoral process.

Too often when these large contributions have been what is being solicited—in the past with soft money, the unregulated money, but now if this amendment passes up to \$200,000 a cycle per couple in hard money, usually we have gotten into the sale of access, the open, blatant sale of access. Nothing hidden about that.

Just a couple of examples—one from each party because this is a bipartisan problem.

First, for a Democratic National Committee trustee, which is shown on the board before us—this is for a \$50,000 contribution or raising \$100,000—a contributor gets two events with the President, two annual events with the Vice President, an annual trade mission where the trustee is invited to “join Party leadership as they travel abroad to examine current and developing political and economic [trends].” And, by the way, this same thing was used in a Republican administration—visiting foreign dignitaries at the highest level. So this is not, again, a partisan issue. It is the sale of access for huge amounts of money. And the larger the amount of money that we permit to be solicited, the worse, it seems to me, the appearance is when access is so openly and blatantly sold for that contribution.

That is what the temptation is. There is nothing illegal about this. I think it is shocking, but it is not illegal. If we raise the hard money limits to this extent, this same kind of sale of access is going to continue for the large contribution, which I think is so totally disenchanting our constituents.

On the Republican side, I have a chart in relation to a RNC annual gala. This is for a contributor who raises \$250,000. He or she gets lunch with the Republican—Senate or House—committee chairman of their choice.

I think that is wrong. I do not know how we can stop this kind of open sale of access to ourselves for large amounts of money if we are going to increase hard limits, hard money contributions to the same extent as we see on these boards, when soft money was being used at this level of contribution to tempt people to make contributions in exchange for that access.

Another invitation to a Senatorial Campaign Committee event: This one promised that large contributors would be offered “plenty of opportunities to share [their] personal ideas and vision with” some of the top leaders and Senators. And then this invitation read the following: Failure to attend means

“you could lose a unique chance to be included in current legislative policy debates—debates that will affect your family and your business for many years to come.”

So for a large amount of money—in the view of most Americans, an exceedingly large amount of money—people are told they can have access to people who will affect their family and their business for many years to come, and explicitly that if you do not purchase that access, for a large amount of money, you could lose a unique chance to participate in a debate which “will affect your family and your business for many years to come.”

No American should think that because he or she cannot contribute a huge sum of money they are then going to be unable to participate in a debate which affects family and business for many years to come.

Another one: This one says: “Trust members can expect a close working relationship with all [of the party’s] Senators, top Administration officials and national leaders.”

The greater these contribution limits are, the worse, it seems to me, the appearance is of impropriety, which is what we are trying to stop.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be yielded 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. EN-SIGN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, the Supreme Court has held very explicitly, in *Buckley v. Valeo*, that large contribution limits can create the appearance of impropriety and that Congress has the right to stop that appearance of wrongdoing, that appearance of corruption, as the Court put it, which can be created by the solicitation of large amounts of money by people in power from constituents who have business before them. The amounts of money which we are talking about in this amendment are simply too large.

We should not be tempted. It is easier to raise money in these large amounts—we all know that—but we should not be tempted. If we are so tempted, we would be on the one hand closing the soft money loophole but on the other hand creating the same problem by lifting hard money limits to such a level that the same inappropriate appearance is created by the solicitation of contributions of this size.

I commend our friends and colleagues, Senators THOMPSON and COLLINS. They have been staunch supporters of reform. It seems awkward being on the other side from them on an amendment in this area, but I think it is a mistake to adopt this amendment. I hope we will reject it.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, this morning I was unavoidably detained for longer than expected at a doctor’s appointment. Because of that appointment I was not able to vote on the motion to table the first division of the Hagel amendment to the McCain-

Feingold bill. My vote would not have changed the outcome on this amendment. I would have voted to table.

• Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, my responsibilities to the people of the State of Montana require that I be in Montana during the President’s visit to my State. However, because campaign finance reform is such an important issue, I would like to submit this statement on how I would have voted on the following had I been present in the Senate today.

On the Hollings constitutional amendment. I voted for this amendment in the 105th Congress, and I would have voted for it again in the 107th. This amendment would ensure that Congress had the ability to combat the influence of money on the voting process.

On the Wellstone amendment, I would have voted for this amendment. I think it is a step in the right direction because it does not single out one group and reduce its ability to communicate with the voters. This amendment will create a more level playing field with regards to issue advertisements. •

#### MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there now be a period for the transaction of routine morning business with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

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

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I applaud today’s release of the Surgeon General’s report, “Women and Smoking.” It provides us with important information and recommendations to support our efforts to reduce smoking among women and prevent girls from starting the deadly habit. The results are disturbing and make it clear that we have a responsibility to combat the epidemic of smoking and tobacco-related diseases among women in the United States and around the world.

What the report makes clear is that we have been witness to an unprecedented tobacco industry marketing campaign targeted towards young women and girls. The consequences of this marketing campaign are staggering. From 1991 to 1999, smoking among high school girls increased from 27 to 34.9 percent. Since 1968, when Philip Morris introduced Virginia Slims, the rate of lung cancer deaths in women has skyrocketed. In fact, lung cancer has surpassed breast cancer as the leading cause of cancer death in the United States, accounting for 25 percent of all cancer deaths among women.

I am pleased that Secretary Thompson was able to join Dr. Satcher this morning to release the Surgeon General’s report. I hope his presence signals the Bush administration’s willingness to aggressively pursue policies and legislation to combat tobacco use among our children.

In particular, the report demonstrates the need for meaningful regulation of tobacco products by the Food and Drug Administration. Today, tobacco companies are exempt from the most basic health and safety oversight of their products. Consumers know more about what is in their breakfast cereal than what is in their cigarettes. Tobacco companies are not required to test additives for safety or tell consumers what is in their products. Nothing prevents them from making misleading or inaccurate health claims about their products.

This lack of regulation impacts women as tobacco companies aggressively target young girls through marketing campaigns linking smoking to weight loss and women's rights and progress. For example, one of the most famous ads directed at women was Lucky Strike's "Reach for a Lucky Instead of a Sweet." A recent Virginia Slims' ad campaign told women that smoking could help them "Find Your Voice." As the father of two daughters, I find it unacceptable that young girls are relentlessly barraged with slick marketing campaigns encouraging them to take up a deadly—and illegal—habit.

Also, recognizing that many women are concerned about the long term health risks of smoking, tobacco companies have been promoting "low tar" or "light" cigarettes to women as a "safer" option. Big Tobacco is well aware that the health claims in their ads are either misleading or entirely false. But it works. Currently 60 percent of women smokers use light and ultra light cigarettes.

These are just some of the reasons I, along with Senators LINCOLN CHAFEE and BOB GRAHAM, introduced the first bipartisan tobacco legislation in this Congress, the KIDS Deserve Freedom from Tobacco Act. Our bill would grant the FDA full authority to regulate the manufacture, distribution, marketing, and sale of tobacco products to protect our children from the dangers of tobacco use.

The results of the Surgeon General's report demonstrate the need for FDA authority over tobacco products. Today, I call upon Secretary Thompson to make a commitment to the young girls and women of this country: that the Bush administration will make passing legislation giving the FDA strong, meaningful regulatory authority over tobacco products a top priority.

#### NATIONAL WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, as we celebrate National Women's History month, I pay tribute to the countless contributions made by women, past and present, those heralded and those unknown to most, who have advanced the rights of women and enriched our Nation's history.

The month of March has been designated as National Women's History

Month to illuminate the tremendous accomplishments of women throughout history. I salute my colleagues, Senator BARBARA MIKULSKI and Senator ORRIN HATCH for cosponsoring legislation over two decades ago declaring National Women's History Week. The celebration of women's history has since been expanded into a month long tribute to commemorate the many contributions of women.

This year's national theme, "Celebrating Women of Courage and Vision," seeks to spark interest in the many remarkable stories of women's achievements in our schools and communities. We must strive to present history accurately, and in its entirety. History is not a womanless story and it should not be presented as such to our youth. It is imperative that we share the rich stories of women's struggles and achievements with all our children, but especially with our girls. With the benefit of strong female figures as role models, young women will have a fuller vision of what is possible in their lives.

The advancement of women in the last century has been nothing short of remarkable. At the beginning of the last century, women generally did not have the right to vote or own property. They could not hold most occupations, participate in the armed forces, or aspire to political office. But as long ago as 1872, a little known milestone in the fight for women's equality was achieved by the courageous actions of an Illinois woman.

Ellen Martin of Lombard, IL, understood her lack of legal entitlements in the late 1800s, but had the vision, the wits, and the determination to transcend the barriers around her. In the Presidential election of 1872, almost 50 years prior to the passage of the 19th Amendment, Martin and fourteen other Lombard women marched to the polls and demanded their right to vote. At the time, Lombard, IL, was governed by its local charter of incorporation, which inadvertently stated that "all citizens" rather than "all male citizens" had the right to vote.

Armed with a law book and her spectacles, Martin asserted her "citizenship" and demanded a ballot. Allegedly, the election judges were so shocked by the demand that one gentleman actually "fell backward into a flour barrel." Ironically reminiscent of this year's unusual election, the votes of those 15 courageous women were extensively debated in the courts. But eventually, those 15 votes became the first women's votes ever to be counted in Illinois in an American Presidential election.

Ellen Martin refused to be held down by the social and political mores of the day. She had the courage to challenge and conquer the barriers that attempted to restrict her. And for her efforts, she won a small but important victory. Of course, it was not until 1920 that women's fundamental right to vote was expressly protected by the

Constitution in the 19th Amendment. I am proud to say that Illinois was the first State in the Union to ratify that long overdue amendment, guaranteeing women a voice in the political arena.

There are many little known milestones, similar to the story of Ellen Martin's courage, which reveal the heroism of women throughout our history. These stories are important and they are powerful, but they can have little impact if they are not shared. Sadly, only 3 percent of our educational materials focus on women's contributions. Legislators in Illinois have recognized the need for the appreciation of the historical contributions of women and have mandated the teaching of women's history in K-12 classes. Only by recognizing the authentic contributions of women will educators be truly faithful to our national heritage.

Today, women play a central role in the Nation's political and economic arenas. I am privileged to work with 13 women Senators who provide powerful examples to young women across the Nation. At the State level, women currently hold 27.6 percent of the statewide executive offices across the country and 22.4 percent of State legislative positions. As Susan B. Anthony pointed out in 1897: "There never will be complete equality until women themselves help to make laws." Women's representation in politics is not yet equal, but their increasing prominence signals a step in the right direction.

Today, women participate in our economy in record numbers, both in the workforce and as business leaders. Women own more than 9 million small businesses across the Nation, representing 38 percent of all small businesses nationwide. In Illinois, women own more than 250,000 firms. With their comprehensive participation, it is beyond dispute that women are vital to sustaining and improving our Nation's economy.

However, despite their strong presence in the workforce, women continue to earn less than men in this country. For every dollar a man earns, women on average earn only 73 cents. In Illinois, the wage gap is even larger: For every dollar earned by a man a woman earns only 69 cents. This wage gap persists despite the passage of the Equal Pay Act over three decades ago. Although the gap continues to shrink, the progress is painfully slow, shrinking by a rate of less than a half a penny a year. In order to facilitate the closure of this gap, I urge my colleagues to consider Senator DASCHLE's Paycheck Fairness Act, S. 77, of which I am a cosponsor. That bill would strengthen the enforcement mechanisms of the Equal Pay Act as well as recognize employer efforts to pay wages to women that reflect the real value of their contributions. The wage disparities between men and women have endured for far too long. We must approach the problem pro-actively and demand results.

The dedication of March as Women's History Month provides an excellent