

decisions about what is really important in our lives. As I have traveled across this country and in my home State of Montana, I keep hearing the same thing over again. Everybody in America wants to protect their family, they want to provide a safe and secure living environment, they want to protect their loved ones from harm.

There is one thing that is undisputable. I represent an energy State. We have been in the production of energy for a long time in Montana so we know a little something about it. There is also something else that is indisputable and that is that a comprehensive energy policy is absolutely paramount to American freedom. Let me put it this way: Energy security is economic security is national security.

If that magic word that goes across our television screen and across our mind is "security," we cannot separate those three. Energy security is economic security is national security, so that the decisions we make here in the Senate will affect and direct the lives of every single American, without exception. The policy we set here on the Senate floor should ensure that energy is affordable, and that it is abundant. Affordable energy means businesses stay open and businesses prosper and people keep working. It means senior citizens who are on fixed incomes are able to pay their electricity bill at the end of the month without having to give up something else. It means someone can fill up their car with gas and drive their kids to school; fill up a truck and deliver goods across the country without breaking the bank; and, yes, to my State, crank up the combines, harvest a crop and put another one in, without fearing the repercussions of high fuel prices.

Every one of us will be affected no matter how basic the level. So we have to answer a lot of questions. How do we get dependable, affordable supplies of energy? That will be the focus of this debate, and the policy that carries us not through my generation but also the next generation and the next. And that is about the time we will have another policy change because technology and circumstances will change.

We have heard some of my colleagues claim Americans use too much energy, that we are greedy, that we use more than our fair share of the world's supply of energy. Would those same people stand up and argue that the United States produces more than its fair share of goods and services? Would they say we have an oversupply of American ingenuity?

Are we producing more computers, more cars, more agricultural goods than we should? I don't think so. I don't think the hard-working people who produce those goods think so either. We can do that because we are good at it and because we have used our energy with the best conservation technology known until this date.

Let's go one step beyond the economic security that affordable energy

provides. Think about the security it provides this country when we improve our ability to produce different kinds of energy domestically. For example, this country buys 56 percent of its oil from other countries. Think back to the 1970s when we had the lines at the gas stations. Then it was around 35 or 36 percent from foreign countries. I don't like that kind of vulnerability. Much of that oil is produced from countries or producers that have very honest intentions, but, I will remind Americans, not all of them and not all of it.

Every drop of oil we produce domestically is one that we do not buy from Saddam Hussein. Every barrel bought from a rogue nation could mean a bomb built to hurt this country. I think it is about time we turn off the spigot of terrorist oil.

In this debate we will start talking about the Alaska National Wildlife Refuge. While at times the point may be confused, like in the colloquy that just preceded me—ANWR was a wildlife refuge created by law and that law gave express permission or grant to drill within parts of it. I can think of no other public land that was created with that express intention and law.

I would like to point out that the debate over ANWR will boil down to whether we open up 2,000 acres for exploration in Alaska. It will be examined. It will be turned inside and out, over and over again. We will debate this a long time.

I say to my good friend from Oklahoma, whose State is an energy producer like my state of Montana, that since 1997, in my State alone, the Federal Government and the executive branch have managed to shut off 727,000 acres from gas and oil development in Montana in two different decisions. There was no congressional discussion either time.

I agree with open debate and I am glad to be a part of this process, but I wonder why we only get to do it when we want to open Federal land, and not when we shut it off. Why is it that a midlevel manager in the Forest Service can make the decision to close 350,000 acres, and we don't hear a whimper or whisper on the Senate Floor.

Because of a decision made in a federal bureaucracy or through executive order, it has been decided we are going to take that land out of production. That denies my State the ability to produce energy for a country that really needs it, and the jobs it provides and the revenue it provides to my State to build schools, build roads, provide government services.

Of course, this debate will extend beyond domestic oil and gas production, and it should. We are developing excellent technology. We are tapping resources to create energy from new sources. I heard mention today about renewables. They want to use thermal activity.

We live next to an area that has more thermal activity than any place in our country: Yellowstone Park. There is

thermal potential all the way around it. You just try to develop it. It cannot be done because you have to cross federal land to get there, which makes absolutely no sense.

We will talk about fuel cells. We will talk about biomass. We will talk about ethanol. We will talk about wind. Those are only a few of the opportunities we have to use our resources in new ways.

I am proud to support alternative and renewable energy, and will continue to do so. But we can't short-change our energy needs today by focusing our efforts on alternative energy alone. Many of the technologies are promising but are still in the developmental and very expensive stages in comparison to our traditional energy sources. By continuing to develop and encourage alternative fuels and create markets for those technologies, we can approach this country's energy future with optimism.

It is time we go to work. It is time we debate those issues one by one. But keep in mind what I said at the beginning of this speech. I do not know of a military airplane we fly that doesn't burn oil-based fuel. And if something really bad happens in this country, I tell you something: The fire truck that shows up and the emergency vehicle will burn gasoline. In order to fight this great battle against terrorism and against people who would erode our freedoms, who work in the shadows, and who are a faceless enemy, the weapons we need still burn gasoline.

We have to think about the American people and their safety and their security. What we are asking in this is a policy that will develop those new technologies. But we cannot turn our backs on the demand for the energy sources we have used for so long in this country. Let us work to give the American people what they need—a safe, steady energy supply that will ensure economic stability and national security.

I thank the Chair. I yield the floor.

#### UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator would yield very briefly so we might propound a quick unanimous consent request.

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

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the majority leader, following consultation with the Republican leader, may at any time turn to the consideration of H.R. 2356, the campaign finance reform legislation; that there be 4 hours of debate equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees; that no amendments or motions be in order to the bill; that upon the use or yielding back of time the bill be read the third time, the Senate vote on passage of the bill, with this action occurring with no further intervening action or debate.

Mr. McCONNELL. Reserving the right to object, and I will object, let me

say to the distinguished majority leader and to all Members of the Senate, since he last propounded this consent agreement, the senior Senator from Arizona and I have had an opportunity to sit down three times in private discussion about some technical changes to the bill that I thought would not do violence to the underlying concept. We have reached agreement in principle on 6 of the 13 suggestions I made.

Today, he and I both had an opportunity to brief our colleagues in the Republican conference on the 13 suggestions I proposed. They have now been distributed. I would like for the majority leader and the Democrats to look at them as well. I am hoping we can continue to discuss the changes in the next few days.

I remind our colleagues that this bill, which certainly will become law sometime soon, doesn't take effect until November 6. So I think to take a little more time to look at it very carefully and consider technical changes that will benefit both sides is a good idea. I encourage all Senators to take a look at the suggestions I have made. I believe virtually all of them are reasonable. I know Senator MCCAIN believes that at least some of them are reasonable. Therefore, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

Mr. MCCAIN. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. DASCHLE. I am happy to yield.

Mr. MCCAIN. I thank the majority leader for propounding this unanimous consent agreement, and I thank my colleague from Kentucky for entering into good-faith discussions on this issue. We have had important discussions, and I think they have been something that Senator MCCONNELL deserves to have had, given the long involvement we have had in this issue.

I must tell my colleagues, we are at an impasse. We are at a situation where we need to move the process forward because the seven areas of "disagreement" that we have are substantive in nature, could never be viewed by me and Senator FEINGOLD, with whom I have consulted constantly during this issue, my partner—could not be construed as anything but substantive amendments.

That is why I requested that the Senator from Kentucky bring up these 7 amendments, we vote them up or down, 51 votes carries, and we agree to move to final passage on the bill.

I cannot continue to discuss the amendments on the bill when we cannot agree to process on the bill. My position—and it remains my position, as propounded by the majority leader—is that we move to the bill with a consent the amendments the Senator from Kentucky or others may have been voted up or down, with an agreement on those amendments, with final passage.

As to the technical amendments, many of which are still up for discussion and would have to also be agreed to by our colleagues on the other side of the Capitol, those we would agree to

by unanimous consent agreement, as far as the Senate is concerned, and if we, the majority leader, the Republican leader, Senator MCCONNELL, Senator DODD, Senator MCCAIN, and Senator FEINGOLD are in agreement, we would take up and pass those technical amendments to the bill. I think that is a fair disposition of this legislation.

As Senator MCCONNELL is going to distribute his proposals, I will also distribute our responses. To any objective observer, a majority of those are not technical in nature, they are controversial. They need to be debated and voted on within a reasonable length of time.

Finally, I appreciate the patience of the majority leader. He is committed to the energy bill. I understand that commitment. But I also appreciate the fact that the majority leader wants this issue dispensed with. It was March a year ago that we passed this legislation. It went over to the other body with assurance of a fair rule. It was an unfair rule. They had to get 218 votes. They passed this legislation with 10 amendments. We had 3 weeks of debate—3 weeks with amendment after amendment.

This issue has been ventilated. It is time to move forward. I say with great respect and appreciation for this honorable opponent, it is time we move forward. If we have to, the majority leader needs to go through the cloture motion process. I regret that, but we cannot discuss further technical amendments that are not technical amendments unless there is an agreement on the process, and that process has to be consideration of amendments and agreement of final passage, or anticipation of a filibuster, to which one of our colleagues has already committed, no matter what.

One of our colleagues is already committed to filibuster, I say to my colleagues, no matter what happens in the discussions that Senator MCCONNELL and I may have. It is time we plan for that and move forward with cloture motions. If the Senate decides not to get 60 votes, then we will wait until the next scandal. We will wait until the next scandal, I say to the Senator from Kentucky. I don't know if it is Buddhist Temple fundraising, I don't know if it is Enron, I don't know who it is, but this system awash in money creates scandals because it makes good people do bad things. It is time we fixed it.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I am happy to briefly yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DAYTON). The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I have been quiet the last few days about this because I have a lot of respect for the Senator from Kentucky, and I admire the patience of my partner, Senator MCCAIN, to go through these proposals with the Senator from Kentucky. But I have to say, in my mind, the time has run out.

The proposals the Senator from Kentucky is talking about, as he indicated, in some cases are technical. In those instances, we can simply deal with these matters in a separate piece of legislation. But the Senator from Arizona is right. The other matters are substantive; they are controversial. But I add, they do not go to the core issues of the McCain-Feingold bill.

A broad consensus in both Houses, a bipartisan consensus, has voted strongly to pass those items. That has to happen now. And given the fact that one of the Members on the other side of the aisle has indicated—not the Senator from Kentucky, but another Member—that there will be a filibuster, in any event, the time has come not to be quiet anymore but to support the majority leader, who has come out here diligently and tried to move us forward. Consistent with the other commitments he has made, consistent with all the pressures he has, he has been here and tried again today to get us to the final process.

It is regrettable, but I think we have to go now to the final stage: to represent the will of this body, the will of the House, and to finally clean up this system. I don't think any more delay is merited.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I have said publicly, and I will say for purposes of the Record, it is my intention to back up from the final day of this particular work period for whatever length of time may be required to go through the procedural hurdles to accomplish our goal of completing our work on this bill prior to the time we go into the Easter recess. So we will do that. I just put my colleagues on notice.

I also simply note that had we been able to get unanimous consent, I would also have asked unanimous consent on behalf of Senator HOLLINGS that the constitutional amendment regarding campaign finance reform also be considered. But since that agreement could not be reached, I did not propound the other request.

I am happy to yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. MCCONNELL. If the Senator will yield for a question, I hope the majority leader might be willing to share the information now with the balance of his colleagues so that others might take a look at whether or not these suggestions are reasonable and don't go to the heart of the bill. Even Senator MCCAIN and Senator FEINGOLD have indicated that six of them we can probably reach agreement on in principle.

You are the majority leader, not I, but let me suggest on the ones that we can agree with in principle, it might be appropriate to pass a separate technical corrections bill, if it needs to be in a separate bill, in order to avoid going back to the House. Pass the technical corrections bill simultaneously; it goes back to the House, the other bill goes on down to the President.

I am a little worried about there not being much interest in the technical

corrections bill after the main bill leaves the Senate.

If we can reach agreement on at least some of these, as appears possible, I hope the majority leader might consider taking up the technical corrections package simultaneously, sending it out of here and back over to the House side. It is just a suggestion.

Mr. DASCHLE. I say to the Senator from Kentucky, I know he has put a lot of time and thought into this. I am not averse to considering that approach. I think it is certainly worth our while to consider what proposals the Senator and others have suggested. We will take a look at that and entertain that possibility at such time as we take up the bill.

I yield the floor.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, briefly, I ask unanimous consent the package I just referred to in my remarks be printed in the RECORD.

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

SENATOR MCCONNELL'S 6 TECHNICAL CHANGES  
PROPOSED—AGREEMENT IN PRINCIPAL

1. Transfer of Excess Campaign Funds—Shays-Meehan inadvertently eliminated unlimited transfers of excess campaign funds to party committees.

Solution: Include "without limitation" for transfers of excess funds so transfer will not be a "personal use" of campaign funds.

2. Not Impact 2002 Run-Offs—Effective date is before run-off elections are held.

Solution: Allow parties to operate under the current system for any 2002 run-off elections.

3. Defined Solicitation—Federal candidates and officeholders are heavily restricted in fundraising for state candidates and party committees. For example, federal candidates and officeholders could be banned from attending fundraising events for state candidates.

Solution: Clearly define what we can and cannot do.

4. Time Limit for Special Judicial Review Procedures—Plaintiffs around the country should not be forced to sue only in D.C. District Court forever, with no circuit court review (only option is discretionary appeal to the Supreme Court—practically foreclosing appellate review).

Solution: Provide a time limit for exclusive jurisdiction in D.C. District Court and lack of circuit court review.

5. Authorize Member Challenges—Shays-Meehan specifically authorizes member intervention in a suit but does not specifically authorize a member to challenge the new law.

Solution: Specifically authorize member challenges—parity for challenging and intervening.

6. State Party Building Funds—State parties will have to use hard dollars to pay for their buildings.

Solution: Clarify that state party building funds are governed exclusively by state law.

SENATOR MCCONNELL'S 7 TECHNICAL CHANGES  
PROPOSED—NOT AGREED TO

1. Outside groups/State Party Parity  
Shays-Meehan Empowers Outside Groups and Weakens State Parties

Federal candidates and officeholders can raise soft money for outside groups: unlimited for 501(c)s whose primary purpose is not grassroots voter activities (could be used for issue ads and voter activities) and \$20,000 per

individual for any entity specifically for grassroots voter activities. (Not in McCain-Feingold.)

But state party grassroots voter activities are restricted: no party transfers, no joint fundraising, federal candidates and officeholders can only raise hard money and state parties can't use broadcast media for those activities. (Not in McCain-Feingold.)

Solution: Return to McCain-Feingold language and raise soft money limit to state parties from \$10,000 to \$20,000 to achieve parity with fundraising for outside groups.

2. Coordination Prosecution—If a candidate raises money for or meets with an outside group and that group engages in voter registration or simply discusses legislation in the candidate's state, the candidate may be civilly or even criminally prosecuted.

Solution: Require a more precise coordination standard.

3. Index Contribution Limit To State Party. The limit is increased but not indexed.

Solution: Index the hard dollar limit—critical to compete with outside groups.

4. Permit Party Coordinated And Independent Expenditures. Shays-Meehan treats all party committees (from national to local parties) as a single committee. Prohibits all committees from doing both coordinated expenditures and independent expenditures after nomination by party (contrary to S. Ct. ruling in Colorado I).

Solution: Do not treat all party committees as a single committee and do not prohibit them from doing both independent and coordinated party expenditures.

5. Do Not "Federalize" State Candidates—State candidates may not mention federal candidates in an advertisement unless they use hard dollars; state candidates doing GOTV activities together must use hard dollars, and federal candidates and officeholders are subject to the hard dollar limits and restrictions in fundraising for state candidates.

Solution: Do not "federalize" state candidates.

6. Index PAC limit—The limit is not increased or indexed.

Solution: Index, but do not increase, hard dollar contribution limits to and from PACs.

7. National Party Building Fund—Will be eliminated on 11/06.

Solution: Allow parties to spend, not raise, building funds until funds are depleted.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent an analysis of changes proposed by Senator MCCONNELL be printed in the RECORD.

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

ANALYSIS OF CHANGES PROPOSED BY SENATOR  
MCCONNELL TO PENDING CAMPAIGN FINANCE  
REFORM LEGISLATION

Twelve specific changes to the McCain-Feingold/Shays-Meehan bill have been proposed to Senator McCain. Incorporation of any of these changes in the bill itself would kill the bill by sending it to conference or back to the House.

Many of these changes are unacceptable substantive revisions of the bill. Some of these changes would upset bipartisan compromises made during floor consideration in the Senate or decisions made on the House floor. Still others would undermine central components of the reform effort, particularly the soft money ban.

Some of the suggested changes are technical corrections that are not necessary, but that could be addressed in a separate technical corrections bill as long as it does not

interfere with the prompt enactment of the pending campaign finance reform legislation.

Each of the amendments is discussed below. The headings for the amendments are taken from the proposal given to Senator McCain.

1. State Party/Outside Group Parity—This is a proposed substantive change to the pending CFR legislation. It would eliminate the changes made in the House that clarified Senator Levin's amendment in order to prevent the amendment from becoming a major loophole in the soft money ban.

Under the Levin amendment, state and local parties could use up to \$10,000 per year of a contribution from a corporation, union, or individual, for generic get out the vote activities (GOTV); GOTV for state and local candidates; and voter registration within 120 days of an election involving a federal candidate, so long as these activities do not refer to a clearly identified candidate for federal office. As passed by the Senate, the Levin amendment could have been interpreted to allow federal officeholders to raise these soft money funds, and to allow state parties to use these soft money funds to finance broadcast ads.

Senator Levin was very clear on the Senate floor, however, that he did not intend this soft money to be raised by federal candidates or officeholders, and the House bill clarifies this. Senator Levin also intended that the money be used for grassroots activities, and the House bill clarifies this as well. On the Senate floor, Senator Levin explained that his amendment:

"These are dollars not raised through any effort on the part of Federal officeholders, Federal candidates, or national parties. These are non-Federal dollars allowed by state law.

Senator Levin further said:

"[This provision] will allow the use of some non-Federal dollars by state parties for voter registration and get out the vote, where the contributions are allowed by state law, where there is no reference to federal candidates, where limited to \$10,000 of the contribution which is allowed by state law, and where the allocation between federal and non-Federal dollars is set by the federal election commission."

The proposed revision would eliminate these clarifying provisions.

The House bill also added restrictions on joint fund-raising to prevent solicitations of large sums from a single donor, and restrictions on transfers of monies for Levin activities to state and local party committees to help prevent the federal soft money system from being shifted to the state level. The proposed revision would eliminate these protections.

The proposed revision would also double the amount of soft money that state parties can use from contributions provided by corporations, unions, or individuals for the authorized GOTV and voter registration activities. This would increase the \$10,000 per year limit contained in both the House and Senate-passed bills to \$20,000 per year. The \$10,000 limit is the same as the limit that applies to hard money donations by individuals to state parties under the bill. Thus, under the bill, an individual donor can already give a total of \$20,000 per year to a state party that can be used for voter activities, the same amount that federal candidates can solicit for outside groups for use on these activities.

2. Contribution Limit to State Parties—The proposal suggests indexing the amount that individuals can contribute to state parties. The decision not to index this amount was part of difficult bipartisan negotiations during Senate consideration of the bill that led to a package of increases in contribution

limits approved by the Senate. The only change in this provision made by the House was to increase the aggregate limits.

3. *Hard Dollar Candidate Support by Parties*—This is a proposed substantive change to the pending CFR legislation. The proposal would allow parties to make both independent and coordinated expenditures in individual races.

The requirement that the parties choose between these expenditures was contained in both the Senate and House-passed bills and is not inconsistent with the Colorado I decision. For purposes of this provision only, national and state party committees are treated as a single entity. Otherwise, the provision would not be effective because, for example, a national party could choose to make coordinated expenditures, and then transfer additional funds to a local party to use for independent expenditures.

Parties should not be able to claim that they are independent of one of their candidates if, during the general election period, they are making coordinated expenditures with that same candidate under section 441a(d) of the FECA. Permitting both coordinated and independent expenditures by a party makes meaningless the coordinated spending limits recently upheld by the Supreme Court in Colorado II. Furthermore, since the bill provides that the choice between making independent or coordinated expenditures is made by the party only after a candidate is nominated, the national party will be able to control the decision of which kind of spending to undertake. In addition, contrary to the claim made in the proposal, there is no general restriction on transferring hard money between national and state parties.

4. *Excess Campaign Funds*—This is a proposed technical clarification. The proposal seeks to add the words “without limitation” to the portion of the personal use provision of the bill that deals with transfers of excess campaign funds by candidates to political parties.

There was no intention to change longstanding federal election law that permits candidates to transfer excess campaign funds without limitation to their parties. This can be clarified in a colloquy or in a technical corrections bill if there is one.

5. *PAC Contribution Limit*—This is a proposed substantive change. The proposal would index the limits on how much can be contributed to and from PACs.

Increasing or indexing PAC contribution limits was considered and rejected in bipartisan negotiations on contribution limits during Senate consideration of the bill. The decision represents a position that the role of PACs in financing elections should not be increased. The Senate agreement was not changed in the House.

6. *2002 Run-off Elections Unfairly Impacted*—This is a proposed substantive change to the pending CFR legislation. The proposed revision suggests changing the effective date with respect to runoff elections. This would allow soft money to be raised after November 5, 2002.

In deciding to delay the effective date of the bill so that it would not apply to the 2002 elections, a very clear decision was made that no soft money should be raised after election day. With respect to other provisions of the bill, such as the spending of excess soft money and electioneering communications, the suggestion that the bill not apply to runoff elections related to the 2002 elections can be dealt with in a floor colloquy or in a technical corrections bill if there is one.

7. *Building Fund*—The proposal has two parts. One is a substantive change, the other is not. The substantive change would allow

the national parties to spend their excess soft money on buildings without any time limitation. The non-substantive portion of the proposal would make clear that state party building funds are governed solely by state law.

A provision allowing the national parties to spend their excess soft money on buildings was included in the House bill that went to the floor. It was vigorously attacked by the Republican leadership in the House, which claimed that it was a special advantage for the DNC. The provision was stripped from the bill by an amendment on the House floor that was overwhelmingly supported by Republicans. The Senate bill contained no special exemptions for national party buildings.

There is nothing in the House-passed bill that regulates state party building funds. This concern can be addressed in a floor colloquy, or a separate technical corrections bill if there is one.

8. *Ensure Unintended Litigation Does Not Result*—This is a substantive proposal that has two parts. The first part suggests defining “solicitation.” Separately, the proposal would eliminate the increase in the statute of limitations from three to five years that was added to the bill by the Thompson-Lieberman amendment.

Like many other terms in the bill, “solicitation” will be subject to definition by the FEC in regulations. A statutory definition could also be included in a separate technical corrections bill if there is one and if agreement on the definition of the term can be reached.

The increase in the statute of limitations from three to five years resulted from Senators Thompson and Lieberman’s concern that wrongdoing in the 1996 election was not being effectively pursued by the Justice Department. A five year statute of limitations is common in the federal criminal law. Both the House and Senate bills lengthened the statute of limitations and did not contain a definition of solicitation. No question about either of these issues was raised during floor consideration in either body.

9. *Coordination*—This is a substantive proposal. The proposal claims to offer “modest changes”, but in fact would make significant changes to coordination language that was passed by the Senate, and included in the House bill.

Contrary to the proposal’s claim, the bill does not provide a new definition of “coordination.” The bill repeals recently adopted FEC regulations on coordination and directs the FEC to issue new regulations. It requires the FEC to address certain topics in the rule-making, but does not dictate what the FEC should decide. The bill also specifies that “agreement” or “formal collaboration” are not required for coordination to exist.

This direction is given because the current regulations allow blatant coordination to occur between candidates and outside groups in issue ads and other campaign-related activities simply by never entering into an “agreement” or “formal collaboration.”

Contrary to the suggestion in the proposal, nothing in the bill even remotely suggests that a candidate’s raising money for a group would alone trigger a finding that the group’s spending on voter registration activity is coordinated with the candidate.

10. *Effect on State Candidates*—The proposal suggests a non-substantive, but unnecessary change. The proposal seeks to clarify that state candidates may “align themselves” with federal candidates in their solicitations and campaign activities, including advertisements.

The bill already permits state candidates to publicize endorsements from federal candidates or align themselves with a federal candidate’s views. However, the bill pro-

hibits state candidates from spending soft money to promote or attack federal candidates through general public political advertising.

11. *Time Limit For Expedited Judicial Review*—The proposal seeks to limit the expedited judicial review provision of the bill to suits brought shortly after enactment.

The expedited review provisions in the Senate and House-passed bills were not limited in this way. The expedited review provisions assure that decisions that could affect ongoing campaigns will be made promptly. These provisions will be useful even years after enactment.

By requiring all suits challenging the constitutionality of the bill to be brought in the District of Columbia, the bill avoids the conflicts between the circuit courts that have created uncertainty in current law. The provision also requires these cases to be heard by three-judge panels. Given the importance of the election law to campaigns, there is no reason to force suits to be brought within a specific time period after enactment in order to qualify for expedited treatment. The Supreme Court can summarily affirm the lower court’s decision if it chooses, so this provision need not be a burden on the Court’s docket.

If agreement can be reached on revised judicial review procedures, it can be included in a technical corrections bill if there is one.

12. *Court Challenges*—The proposal would give Members of Congress a statutory right to challenge the campaign finance reform law directly.

The existing intervention provisions of the bill give Members of Congress on both sides of the issue the ability to participate equally in litigation concerning the constitutionality of the Act. Members of Congress may already have standing to challenge the Act in court, and Congress cannot grant constitutional standing where it does not already exist. Issues relating to standing by members could be addressed in a separate technical corrections bill if there is one, as long as members on both sides of the issue are treated similarly.

## NATIONAL LABORATORIES PARTNERSHIP IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2002—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, when the Senator from Montana referred to me as a producer, he was referring to the State of Oklahoma which is a production State. I don’t think inadvertently he also referred to me as a producer. And I was.

I started out at the age of 17 in the oil fields. At that time, I was a tool dresser. Not many people know what a cable tool rig is. I was a tool dresser on a cable tool rig. There is no harder work in the world than being a tool dresser on a cable tool rig. That was before rotaries. Mostly, they were marginal wells—shallow wells.

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. INHOFE. Certainly.

Mr. BURNS. The Senator must have been pretty good at it. He still has all of his fingers and thumbs.

Mr. INHOFE. I suggest to the Senator that he is one of the few Senators who know what I am talking about. When you picked up a cable tool—it