

after showing the man an apartment for rent. He shot them both in the head, and the bodies were left bound and gagged in a truck bed. The Stockton man later confessed, saying he targeted the women because they were lesbians, and he figured they wouldn't have families that would miss them.

I believe that government's first duty is to defend its citizens, to defend them against the harms that come out of hate. The Local Law Enforcement Enhancement Act of 2001 is now a symbol that can become substance. I believe that by passing this legislation, we can change hearts and minds as well.

FINAL PASSAGE OF S. 27

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, on Monday, April 2, the Senate took long awaited action to approve legislation to address what the American people believe is the single most egregious abuse of our campaign finance system—that is the unlimited flow of soft money permeating our elections system. If the McCain-Feingold legislation did nothing else but close the soft money loophole, it would still be reform.

But my colleagues have accomplished much more in this legislation. I congratulate Senators MCCAIN and FEINGOLD for their vision in recognizing the powerfully negative influence of the money chase on our political system and their dogged persistence and patience in striving to craft a consensus on reform legislation that seeks to address the worst aspects of the current system.

But the Senate would not have passed this bill were it not for the equally determined leadership of TOM DASCHLE and the Democratic caucus. No member has been more consistent in support of reform than our leader, and no member has worked harder behind the scenes to hold the Democratic caucus together in support of this measure.

At the same time, I must also acknowledge the powerful influence of my colleague, the chairman of the Rules Committee, for his unstinting devotion to the principles of free speech and his unyielding belief that most, if not all, proposed campaign finance reforms are not only unwise, but unconstitutional.

While a majority of this body clearly do not share Senator MCCONNELL's views, I appreciate his willingness to allow the debate to continue unhindered, unlike debates in the past, by repeated cloture votes.

This debate has exemplified the Senate at its best. The free flow of debate, the unrestricted offering of well reasoned amendments, and the opportunity for all members to be heard are the hallmarks of this, the world's greatest deliberative body.

Finally, I must express my great respect to my colleagues in the Democratic caucus, under the very able leadership of Senator DASCHLE, who, along

with a small group of courageous Senators across the aisle, have put aside their own short-term political interests and voted time and again in favor of comprehensive, commonsense, and badly-needed campaign finance reform.

I predict that this debate will find its place in history as one of the greatest Senate debates in the last decade, both in terms of its content and its impact on our system of democracy.

I have been privileged and honored to serve as floor manager of this measure, along with the Senator from Kentucky. As my colleague from Kentucky has alluded, the stakes in this debate were considerable for many interested parties.

And although members disagreed over the need for this measure, and amendments to it, Senators were not disagreeable in their debate. I thank my colleagues for their patience and cooperation throughout this debate.

I also compliment my good friend, the Majority Leader, for his willingness to allow the Senate to have a free-flowing debate. This issue is of paramount importance to the continued health of this democracy, and his willingness to provide for free and open debate on the McCain-Feingold measure has produced, in this Senator's mind, an even better bill than was originally brought to the Senate floor.

I am hopeful there will be an opportunity to make further improvements in this measure in the House. Although I am supporting the McCain-Feingold legislation, there are two provisions, in particular, that cause me concern.

First is the so-called millionaire's provision which purports to level the playing field for candidates who face wealthy challengers. While that may be a laudable goal, the amendment ignores the fact that many incumbents who face wealthy challengers are sitting on healthy campaign treasuries, sometimes amounting to several million dollars. In those instances, this amendment serves as an incumbent protection provision.

As I stated before passage of the Durbin-Domenici-DeWine amendment to fix this inequity, I am not satisfied that the Durbin amendment went far enough to recognize the considerable war chests that some incumbents have. I urge my colleagues in the House to carefully consider this provision with an eye to improving it.

Secondly, although I reluctantly supported the Thompson-Feingold amendment to increase the individual hard money contribution limits, I did so only in the context of achieving broader reform. Quite simply, the increase in the hard money limits was the price to be paid to gain sufficient support from our Republican colleagues for banning soft money and reining in so-called sham issue ads.

Of particular concern to me is the indexing of these increases which only ensures the continuing upward spiral of money into our political system. While I understand the desire of some to

avoid a future debate on reform, the fact that the hard money limits had not been increased since 1974 is what created both the pressure and the opportunity for this reform.

Again, I urge my colleagues in the House to consider these limits and avoid the temptation to increase them ever higher; otherwise, there may come a time when the price for reform becomes too great for this Senator.

I am hopeful that the House will act expeditiously on this measure. While I do not suggest that House members forego their responsibility and right to thoroughly debate and amend this legislation, I encourage them to do so in a manner that will allow this bill to reach the President's desk before the end of this year.

I also thank the numerous staff who have assisted in facilitating consideration of this measure, not the least of which are our Democratic floor staff, including Marty Paone, Lula Davis, and Gary Myrick, along with the outstanding Democratic cloakroom staff.

I also extend my special appreciation to Andrea LaRue of Senator DASCHLE's staff. She, along with Mark Childress and Mark Patterson, were invaluable in offering much needed expertise and guidance on this legislation.

Of equal assistance were the staffs of Senators FEINGOLD and MCCAIN, including Bob Schiff, Ann Choiniere and Mark Buse, as well as Laurie Rubenstein of Senator LIEBERMAN's staff and Linda Gustitus of Senator LEVIN's staff.

I also wish to acknowledge the contributions of Senator MCCONNELL's staff, including Hunter Davis of his personal staff, and Tam Somerville and Andrew Siff of the Rules Committee staff.

Finally, I thank Shawn Maher of my personal office staff, and Veronica Gillespie, my Elections counsel on the Rules Committee staff, as well as Kennie Gill, the Democratic staff director and chief counsel of the Rules Committee.

One final point, Mr. President. The great justice, Learned Hand, once spoke of liberty as the great equalizer among men. In his words, "the spirit of liberty is the . . . lesson . . . (mankind) has never learned, but has never quite forgotten; that there may be a kingdom where the least shall be heard and considered side by side with the greatest."

That, my colleagues, should be the ultimate test of whether any matter considered by this body is worthy of support. The McCain-Feingold legislation passes that test.

THE ARKANSAS PLAN

Mrs. LINCOLN. Mr. President, today I am announcing my vision for the design of the tax cut and I am sending a message to my Chairman and to the President that I am willing to work with them on a tax cut as long as it recognizes that Arkansas taxpayers

also work hard and have earned a share of the surplus in the form of a tax cut.

The President's tax rate cuts are skewed to the rich and the average Arkansan won't see a real cut, if at all, until 2006. Forty-nine percent of Arkansans have adjusted gross incomes under \$20,000 and the average household income in Arkansas is \$29,019. About 85 percent of Arkansas families don't make enough to qualify as one of the "model families" that President Bush has been talking about in his speeches. In other words, only about 15 percent of Arkansans would get a \$1,600 tax cut. The other 85 percent of Arkansans deserve a real tax cut too.

I believe in creating a new ten percent bracket like the President, but under my plan it be fully implemented this year. That will bring thousands of dollars to Arkansas families immediately and over the next 5 years will mean significantly more to the Arkansas economy than will the Bush plan.

I also want to expand the 15 percent bracket by \$10,000. This will mean that 85 percent of Arkansas taxpayers and small businesses never make it out of the 15 percent bracket and will never pay more than about an 11 percent effective Federal tax rate. Expanding the 15 percent bracket would mean that a couple earning \$55,000 would get \$980 more than they would under the Bush plan, regardless of whether they have children or not. The only way for average citizens to get a significant tax cut under the Bush plan is to have children. Single people and people who are no longer raising their children deserve a tax cut too, and I propose to give them one.

I do believe in doubling the child tax credit as the President proposes. However, I believe it should be partially refundable for working taxpayers as their Earned Income Tax Credit is phased out. Approximately 140,000 Arkansas families, or 37 percent of Arkansas families with children, will not benefit from the President's plan because their incomes are too low to owe federal income taxes. By making the child tax credit partially refundable, low-income working parents would get the benefits of the child tax credit just like I do. At the same time, I believe it is unfair to phase out the value of exemptions and credits for high income individuals. What's good for the goose is good for the gander. If we are going to give a \$1,000 per-child tax credit to working families, then we should give that credit to all working families, rich and poor.

We also must fix the Alternative Minimum Tax, AMT. I have asked the President in person, I have asked him in writing, "How will your Administration address the AMT?" Many of you may not know that the AMT, which is designed to prevent affluent taxpayers from sheltering their tax liability in credits and deductions, will soon have an unintended consequence for 37 million Americans. These middle income workers will be paying higher rates and

filing out more forms if we do not act. At a minimum, the AMT exemptions should be raised and indexed, and family credits should be protected from the AMT's bite.

With our private savings rate at a negative for the first time in our history we should encourage more private savings by increasing the IRA and 401(k) contribution limits as part of an overall retirement security and expansion act. Increasing private savings is an important way to keep capital reserve up and interest rates low. The fiscally conservative thing to do is include the pension bill in this year's tax relief.

I support eliminating the so-called marriage penalties in the tax code, but we should do it in a way that is fair to widows and singles. Taxpayers should not be punished for getting married, but nor should they be punished when their spouse dies or if they choose not to get married.

Lastly, the estate tax should be repealed within the next three years. While the revenue estimates of repealing the estate tax have been high, I believe there are many ways we can ensure that death is no longer a taxable event without breaking the treasury. In the short run, we may have to provide for a mark-to-market fee to provide for a stepped-up basis for inherited property or a higher capital gains rate for inherited property, but no tax would be paid unless the asset was sold. In short, the U.S. tax code should not be an obstacle to family farmers and small business people who want to pass on their legacy.

At the end of the day, Vice-President CHENEY would get about a \$1 million tax cut under my plan, instead of the \$2.4 million he would get under the Bush plan. However, average Arkansans would see thousands more and those dollars will be spent and saved in Arkansas where they belong. A family of four with a \$30,000 income would get a \$1,600 per year tax cut which is approximately \$484 more per year than they would get under President Bush's plan. My plan would put more money in Arkansas and the South, and would cost \$400 billion less than the President's \$1.6 billion plan. That cost savings is important, because ultimately, I will not support any tax cut plan that would endanger the long-term solvency of Social Security and Medicare and inhibit our ability to retire the national debt.

THE VERY BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, at the close of business yesterday, Monday, April 23, 2001, the Federal debt stood at \$5,673,969,614,244.57. Five trillion, six hundred seventy-three billion, nine hundred sixty-nine million, six hundred fourteen thousand, two hundred forty-four dollars and fifty-seven cents.

Five years ago, April 23, 1996, the Federal debt stood at \$5,106,372,000,000. Five trillion, one hundred six billion, three hundred seventy-two million.

Ten years ago, April 23, 1991, the Federal debt stood at \$3,433,997,000,000. Three trillion, four hundred thirty-three billion, nine hundred ninety-seven million.

Fifteen years ago, April 23, 1986, the Federal debt stood at \$1,959,815,000,000. One trillion, nine hundred fifty-nine billion, eight hundred fifteen million.

Twenty-five years ago, April 23, 1976, the Federal debt stood at \$600,771,000,000. Six hundred billion, seven hundred seventy-one million, which reflects a debt increase of more than \$5 trillion, \$5,073,198,614,244.57. Five trillion, seventy-three billion, one hundred ninety-eight million, six hundred fourteen thousand, two hundred forty-four dollars and fifty-seven cents during the past 25 years.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR ALAN CRANSTON

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following tributes by current and former members of the Senate and House of Representatives at the memorial service for the late Senator Alan Cranston be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMORIAL TRIBUTE TO SEN. ALAN CRANSTON BY SENATOR MAX CLELAND

On February 6, over 200 admirers gathered in Hart SOB 902 to pay tribute to our dear friend Alan Cranston, who left us on the last day of the year 2000. Joining with me as sponsors of this event were the Senators from West Virginia (Mr. Rockefeller), California (Mrs. Feinstein and Mrs. Boxer), and Massachusetts (Mr. Kennedy), and the former Senator from Wyoming (Mr. Simpson). Ten members and former members spoke, and a short film about Senator Cranston's recent activities was shown. At the end of the program, Alan's son, Kim, spoke. It was a memorable afternoon for all in attendance.

The Program Cover pictured Alan and his beautiful, now seven-year old, granddaughter Evan. On the second page appeared the following words of the Chinese poet and philosopher Lao-Tzu, which Alan carried with him every day:

A leader is best
When people barely know
That he exists,
Less good when
They obey and acclaim him,
Worse when
They fear and despise him.
Fail to honor people
And they fail to honor you.
But of a good leader,
When his work is done,
His aim fulfilled,
They will all say,
"We did this ourselves."—Lao-Tzu

The program participants and sponsors were shown on the third page as follows:

Musical Prelude: United States Army Strings.

Introductions and Closing: Judge Jonathan Steinberg.

Speakers: Senator Max Cleland, Senator Alan Simpson, Senator Edward Kennedy, Senator Diane Feinstein, Senator Barbara Boxer, Representative G.V. (Sonny) Montgomery, Representative John A. Anderson,