

with a budget. I believe the Republican budget addresses the priorities of the American people. It puts us on the continued road of a balanced Federal budget which, of course, for many years we didn't have. We had deficit spending and we continued to increase the debt. We now, largely because of a strong economy, have a situation where we have not only a balanced budget, but a surplus which is, of course, in many ways a very happy thing to have. We have a priority, I hope, of continuing to save Social Security for seniors, not only for the immediate future but for a distance in the future where young people will be able to have benefits from the Social Security they pay in from the very first day on the job. We can commit ourselves to do that by assuring the dollars that come in that are designed for Social Security are used for Social Security.

We have a priority to improve and strengthen Medicare—obviously, one of the things that affects many people. We have to deal with pharmaceuticals and with many of the things that go together to strengthen the Medicare. In terms of dealing with the future and dealing with young people, we need to deal with our national debt which, of course, is very large. I believe we have a responsibility to begin to pay that down. Some people want to pay it down immediately, which is not practical in terms of the fact that the money is invested. But over a period of 10 years under this budget, we can pay that publicly held debt off. I think that is what we ought to do. We have an obligation to do that. We have spent the money and now we should not leave the debt over to the other people.

We are committed to improve educational funding, and we need to do that, to give every school an opportunity. We always get into the argument—of course, a valid argument—about which I feel strongly, and that is whether or not dollars that go from the Federal Government out to education should be used only for purposes that are defined in Washington, which I think is wrong, or should there be an opportunity given for people in local and State levels to use the money as they determine it is most needed for their particular school. And then, finally, we have an opportunity, which I hope we will take full advantage of, to return the surplus tax overcharges to the American taxpayers. Return the money to the people who have paid.

Of course, we also have a challenge with our economy weakening. It has weakened over the past year. We have an opportunity to do something more immediate on tax changes and put more money back into the economy in the short run. I am hopeful that we will do that.

The budget the President has proposed, the budget we will be talking about, does strengthen and reform education. It provides the Education Department with the largest percentage increase of any Federal department. It

triples the funding for children's reading programs.

It does protect Social Security. It preserves Social Security by locking away all of the \$2.6 trillion Social Security payments that will be paid in and the surplus for Social Security.

It strengthens defense, which has to necessarily be one of our priorities. We have not, over the past several years, done what we have needed to do to keep our defense the toughest in the world, or have the oversight to make an evaluation of where we are on weapons, or to do something for the volunteer service to encourage people to be in the military, or to do something about the living conditions of our military personnel.

We need to protect the environment. Right now we are faced with a challenge, a crisis in energy, and much of that will have to be resolved by more production, by, as in my State of Wyoming, producing more resources for energy.

As we do that, we must equally be concerned about protecting the environment. We are being challenged by organizations that say: If you are going to protect the environment, you cannot have access, you cannot use those lands at all. Those are not the choices. We can, indeed, have access to public land. We can, indeed, utilize those resources and allow people to hike, hunt, produce on those lands, and, at the same time, protect the environment.

Next week is going to be one of the most challenging weeks as we deal with the budget, our priorities, and what we are going to do about the surpluses. Americans are paying the highest percentage of tax of gross national product, higher than World War II. That should not be the case, and we have an opportunity to change it.

We have an opportunity to let local people and the States be involved in the decisions rather than dictating from Washington, as we have become accustomed to over the last number of years.

We have an opportunity to do some things, and I am excited about that opportunity. It is very important we pass a budget. If we do not do that, we will not be able to deal with tax reductions, which I think are terribly important, not only as a matter of fairness to the American people but as a matter of helping this economy and moving it forward as quickly as we can.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. CLINTON). The Senator from Missouri.

CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

Mrs. CARNAHAN. Madam President, we will have many important debates over the coming year on this Senate floor. Debates about tax cuts, spending priorities, education and defense, health care and agriculture. But none of these debates will be more important to the future of our democratic process than the debate over campaign finance reform.

From the time I sat at our kitchen table balancing the books on my husband's earliest campaign to his race for the U.S. Senate, I have witnessed the changing face of campaigns.

Last year's U.S. Senate race in Missouri shattered all previous records. The two opposing campaigns spent almost \$18 million. This figure does not include spending by the state parties or outside interest groups.

For \$18 million, Missouri could have done any one of the following:

- built two new elementary schools;
- hired 500 new teachers;
- sent 3800 students to the University of Missouri;
- provided day care to an additional 5000 low-income children;
- put 9,000 new computers into our schools.

There is no accounting of the hours and effort that went into raising these large sums of money. It is time and energy I am sure all Senators would rather spend discussing the issues and dealing with problems affecting their constituents.

The traditional face-to-face visits with voters at the State fair, the local diner or a town hall play a much smaller role in modern political campaigns. Instead, candidates introduce themselves with costly and skillfully packaged commercials.

According to a recent study, viewers in the Kansas City area were exposed to over 22,000 campaign commercials during the 2000 election cycle. At 30 seconds apiece, that is the equivalent of 187 straight hours of campaign ads. The same study showed that the number of ads nationwide has nearly tripled since 1998. Without reform, there is no end in sight.

Not only do candidates air ads to get their own message out, they must also respond to negative attacks. More and more, our political discourse is turning away from an honest discussion of the issues affecting the average American. Personal attacks and outrageous distortions are all too common.

What are the consequences?

Today, Americans are more cynical and more disconnected from the government than ever. They read of huge contributions from special interest groups and wonder how one small voice can possibly be heard over the shouts of large donors to political campaigns.

Election day for them is not a celebration of self-government, but a finale to months of nasty, negative messages that have invaded their homes and mailboxes.

To rejuvenate our democracy, we must change the common perception and reality that our political system is dominated by big money. To wean American politics from these excesses will be costly and painful, but we must begin.

While many reforms are necessary, purging the system of unlimited donations to campaigns through so called "soft money" is a necessary first step.

Some would argue that passing McCain-Feingold will hurt the Democratic Party, but I say if we do not pass

McCain-Feingold, we will be hurting the democratic process.

This is a time when all of us, Democrats and Republicans alike, must do what is right for our country, what is right for our democracy.

The Biblical account of Joshua and the battle of Jericho shows us the strength of a united voice. We are told that "the people shouted with a great shout, so that the walls fell down."

If we speak with one voice, the wall of "soft money" that separates ordinary citizens from their government will come down. Only then can we be confident that campaigns are decided by the power of our ideas, not by the power of our pocketbooks.

I enthusiastically support campaign finance reform and hope that we can pass legislation that reduces the influence of money in politics.

WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH AND JACKIE STILES

Mrs. CARNAHAN. Madam President, this month we celebrate Women's History Month. It is an opportunity to reflect on the successes, advances and contributions women have made and are making in American life.

Today, I have the special privilege of honoring a woman who is not only celebrating women's history this month—she is making it.

Jackie Stiles stands 5 feet 8 inches tall, but she is a giant on and off the court. Earlier this week, she led the Lady Bears of Southwest Missouri State into victory over Washington, securing her team a spot in the NCAA Final Four. It was the latest accomplishment in the life of this remarkable young woman.

In high school, she was a 14-time state track champion and once scored 71 points in a single basketball game. Her fans would show up at nine in the morning with lounge chairs to be first in line when the gym doors opened at 4:30. They just wanted to catch a glimpse of Jackie in action. She is a hero in her home town—and in towns across America where young girls dream impossible dreams. Jackie shows them dreams can happen.

At Southwest Missouri State, Jackie Stiles has scored—as of today—3,361 points, becoming the all-time leading scorer in the NCAA. She has also become the heart of the Lady Bears. Every time she plays, she thrills the sell out crowds at the Hammons Student Center—better known as the "House of Stiles."

On Friday, the team will come home to Missouri for the Final Four. And with all due respect to my colleagues from the great state of Indiana, I predict a big win over Purdue for Jackie Stiles and the Lady Bears.

Jackie Stiles didn't become a star overnight. She does it the hard way—the only way she knows how. She began training at age two with her father and has pushed herself ever since. She goes to the gym and won't leave until she makes 1,000 shots.

The story of Jackie Stiles is also the story of Title IX, the landmark civil rights legislation which set out to curtail discrimination against women and girls in education and athletics. Without Title IX, we might never have heard of heroes like Jackie Stiles. In 1971, the year before Title IX, only 25,000 women competed in college sports. Today, that figure has grown to more than 135,000 women—including one very talented player who wears the number ten jersey for Southwest Missouri State.

Jackie's success is measured in more than just rebounds, lay-ups, and jump shots. She has brought attention to women's sports, and has proven that women's basketball is exciting. Most of all, she is a role model and an inspiration for thousands of girls.

If she chooses, Jackie's next stop is probably the WNBA. I have no doubt that she will become one of the league's greatest attractions. She will help not only her team but her sport and all those who appreciate and enjoy it.

Mr. President, in honor of Women's History Month, I'd like to offer my congratulations to Jackie Stiles, the Lady Bears of Southwest Missouri State, and all the other heroes who are bringing women's sports to a new high and teaching young girls to follow their dreams. May they continue to thrill, entertain, and inspire us.

EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Madam President, with the consent of my friend from Kentucky, I ask unanimous consent we extend the morning hour until 2:30, and leave thereafter half an hour to be divided among the opponents and proponents of the two pending amendments.

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

Mr. REID. 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. WELLSTONE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be dispensed with.

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

HARD MONEY

Mr. WELLSTONE. Madam President, I will take a little bit of time because I think other Senators will be coming out to the floor soon to talk about where we are on the hard money changes. We had a proposal by Senator THOMPSON which basically raised the amount of money that an individual could give to a candidate from \$1,000 to \$2,500 per election; from \$2,000 to \$5,000 over a 2-year cycle; so \$2,500 per election, primary, general, up to \$5,000 per candidate. There are other provisions as a part of the Thompson amendment.

The other one I want to mention is raising the aggregate limit from \$30,000 to \$50,000, which actually per cycle means \$100,000.

So what we are saying now is an individual can give up to \$5,000 supporting a candidate, and in the aggregate, an individual, one individual could give as much as \$100,000 to candidates.

I have recited the statistics on the floor so many times that I am boring myself. But there is the most huge disconnect between the way in which—here on the floor of the Senate and in the ante room—the way that people who come together in the lobbying coalitions are defining compromise and victory, and the way people in coffee shops think about this. One-quarter of 1 percent of the population contributes \$200 or more, one-ninth of 1 percent of the population contributes \$1,000 or more.

So I do not really see the benefit of injecting yet more money into politics, literally turning some of the hard money into soft money. I am sure people in the country are bewildered by hard money, soft money. Let me put it this way. I don't see how politics that becomes more dependent on big contributors, heavy hitters, people who have more money and can afford to make these contributions, is better politics. I just don't get it.

On the Thompson amendment, there was a motion to table. It was defeated. I thought, frankly, some of the moderates on the Republican side who were part of the reform camp would have voted against the Thompson amendment. They did not. Senator FEINSTEIN came out with an amendment, and her amendment basically doubles the limits. So I guess we go from \$1,000 to \$2,000 and then \$2,000 to \$4,000 and it raises the aggregate amount but not a lot.

The Feinstein amendment is certainly better than the Thompson amendment. Now there are some negotiations. Regardless of what happens in these negotiations, the point is the headlines in the newspapers in the country tomorrow for the lead story should be "U.S. Senate Votes for Reform, Votes to Put More Big Money Into Politics," because that is really what we are doing. I think this is a huge mistake. I have two children who teach.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time for morning business has expired.

CAMPAIGN REFORM ACT OF 2001—Continued

Mr. WELLSTONE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to keep the floor as we move on to the debate.

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

Mr. WELLSTONE. Madam Chair, I have two children who are teachers. I