

an Outstanding Natural Area and as a unit of the National Landscape System, and for other purposes.

S. 1161

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1161, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to authorize the expansion of medicare coverage of medical nutrition therapy services.

S. 1287

At the request of Mr. SMITH, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1287, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow an offset against income tax refunds to pay for State judicial debts that are past-due.

S. 1386

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1386, a bill to amend the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968, to provide better assistance to low- and moderate-income families, and for other purposes.

S. 1460

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1460, a bill to amend the Farm Security and Rural Development Act of 2002 to support beginning farmers and ranchers, and for other purposes.

S. 1556

At the request of Mr. SMITH, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1556, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the exclusion from gross income for employer-provided health coverage to designated plan beneficiaries of employees, and for other purposes.

S. 1577

At the request of Mr. KOHL, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. COLEMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1577, a bill to amend titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act to require screening, including national criminal history background checks, of direct patient access employees of skilled nursing facilities, nursing facilities, and other long-term care facilities and providers, and to provide for nationwide expansion of the pilot program for national and State background checks on direct patient access employees of long-term care facilities or providers.

S. 1677

At the request of Mr. DODD, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. MARTINEZ) were added as cosponsors of S. 1677, a bill to amend the Exchange Rates and International Economic Coordination Act of 1988 and for other purposes.

S. 1678

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a co-

sponsor of S. 1678, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure more timely access to home health services for Medicare beneficiaries under the Medicare program.

S. 1730

At the request of Mr. SMITH, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1730, a bill to amend part A of title IV of the Social Security Act, to reward States for engaging individuals with disabilities in work activities, and for other purposes.

S. 1755

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1755, a bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to make permanent the summer food service pilot project for rural areas of Pennsylvania and apply the program to rural areas of every State.

S. 1793

At the request of Mrs. CLINTON, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1793, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a tax credit for property owners who remove lead-based paint hazards.

S. 1817

At the request of Mr. OBAMA, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1817, a bill to ensure proper administration of the discharge of members of the Armed Forces for personality disorder, and for other purposes.

S. 1825

At the request of Mr. WEBB, the names of the Senator from New York (Mrs. CLINTON) and the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. BYRD) were added as cosponsors of S. 1825, a bill to provide for the study and investigation of wartime contracts and contracting processes in Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom, and for other purposes.

S. 1885

At the request of Mr. OBAMA, the names of the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1885, a bill to provide certain employment protections for family members who are caring for members of the Armed Forces recovering from illnesses and injuries incurred on active duty.

S. 1894

At the request of Mr. DODD, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1894, a bill to amend the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993 to provide family and medical leave to primary caregivers of servicemembers with combat-related injuries.

S. RES. 104

At the request of Mrs. HUTCHISON, the name of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. BUNNING) was added as a cosponsor

of S. Res. 104, a resolution commending the national explosives detection canine team program for 35 years of service to the safety and security of the transportation systems within the United States.

S. RES. 252

At the request of Mr. BOND, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 252, a resolution recognizing the increasingly mutually beneficial relationship between the United States of America and the Republic of Indonesia.

S. RES. 276

At the request of Mr. BIDEN, the names of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. HAGEL) and the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 276, a resolution calling for the urgent deployment of a robust and effective multinational peacekeeping mission with sufficient size, resources, leadership, and mandate to protect civilians in Darfur, Sudan, and for efforts to strengthen the renewal of a just and inclusive peace process.

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 276, *supra*.

At the request of Mr. NELSON of Florida, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 276, *supra*.

S. RES. 278

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 278, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding the announcement of the Russian Federation of its suspension of implementation of the Conventional Armed Forces in Europe Treaty.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mr. LIEBERMAN):

S. 1905. A bill to provide for a rotating schedule for regional selection of delegates to a national Presidential nominating convention, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, today I joined Senators KLOBUCHAR and LIEBERMAN in introducing the Regional Presidential Primary and Caucus Act. Our legislation would establish a rotating schedule of regional presidential primaries and caucuses.

We introduced this legislation because we agree that the Presidential nomination system is broken. The American dream that "any boy or girl can grow up to be President" has become a nightmare.

Crowded schedules and government restraints on contributions close primaries to worthy competitors. States racing to schedule early contests have made the nomination process too long and expensive. As a result, media and money make decisions voters should make.

The National Football League schedules 16 contests over 5 months to determine its champions. The Presidential nominating process uses the equivalent of two preseason contests in Iowa and New Hampshire to narrow the field to two or three and sometimes pick the winner.

If professional football were Presidential politics, SportsCenter would pick the Super Bowl teams after two preseason games.

The problem is not Iowa and New Hampshire. The problem is what comes after Iowa and New Hampshire. At least 18 States will choose delegates in a 1-day traffic jam on February 5 next year.

The legislation we introduced today requires States to spread out the primaries and caucuses into a series of regional contests over four months. Beginning in 2012, States could only schedule primaries and caucuses during the first weeks of March, April, May, and June of Presidential years.

The traditional warm up contests in Iowa and New Hampshire would still come first, but they would return to their proper role as "off-Broadway" opportunities for lesser known candidates to become well-enough known to compete on the 4-month-long big stage.

In addition, at the appropriate time I will offer an amendment to this legislation that would allow Presidential candidates to raise up to \$20 million in individual contribution amounts of up to \$10,000, indexed for inflation. The current limit of \$2,300 makes it too hard for many worthy but unknown candidates to raise enough early money to be taken seriously—leaving the field to the rich—who constitutionally can spend their own funds—and famous.

Together, these two reforms—spreading out the primaries and allowing a "start-up" fund for candidates—will increase the pool of good candidates willing to run for the White House and give more Americans the opportunity to hear their ideas and to cast a meaningful vote.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the following documents printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD: a David Broder column, "No Way to Choose a President," that ran in the May 10, 2007 issue of *The Washington Post*; Remarks that I delivered on the floor of the Senate on February 2, 2004 titled "Two Super Bowls"; and a lecture I delivered at the Heritage Foundation on May 23, 1996 titled "Off With the Limits: What I Learned About Money and Politics When I Ran for President."

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

[From *washingtonpost.com*, May 10, 2007]

NO WAY TO CHOOSE A PRESIDENT

(By David S. Broder)

The true insanity of the altered presidential primary schedule does not become apparent until you actually lay out the proposed dates on a 2008 calendar.

The mad rush of states to advance their nominating contests in hopes of gaining more influence has produced something so contrary to the national interest that it cries out for action.

The process is not over. Just last week, Florida jumped the line by moving its primary up to Jan. 29, a week ahead of the Feb. 5 date when—unbelievably—22 states may hold delegate selection contests, either primaries or caucuses.

Florida's move crowds the traditional lead-off primary in New Hampshire, which had been set for Jan. 22. And New Hampshire is unhappy about the competition from two caucuses planned even earlier in January, in Iowa and Nevada. So its secretary of state, William M. Gardner, who has unilateral authority to set the New Hampshire voting date, is threatening to jump the rivals, even if it means voting before New Year's Day.

This way lies madness.

Instead of there being a steady progression of contests, challenging and whittling the field of contenders in the wide-open races to select a successor to George W. Bush, it is going to be a herky-jerky, feast-or-famine exercise that looks more like Russian roulette than anything that tests who can best fill the most powerful secular office on Earth.

As things stand, the earliest contests in Iowa, Nevada, New Hampshire, South Carolina and Florida will be followed by that indigestible glut of races on Feb. 5.

On that day, voters in the mega-states of California, Illinois, Michigan, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania and Texas will all be called upon to judge the fields of contenders. And so will voters of 17 smaller states, ranging from Alabama to Oregon and from Delaware to Utah.

Most of those voters will never have had an opportunity to get even a glance at the candidates. All they will know is what the ads tell them—and what the media can supply, when reporters are exhausting themselves dashing after the race from state to state.

Assuming everyone is not burned out, the survivors of this ordeal will find things slowing to a crawl—and then screeching to a halt.

Maryland and Virginia hold primaries on Feb. 12, and Wisconsin a week later. Then there's a two-week gap, with only the Hawaii and Idaho caucuses, until Massachusetts, Minnesota, Ohio and Vermont vote on March 4.

At that point, presidential politics effectively stops for more than two months. Between March 4 and the May 6 contests in Indiana and North Carolina, the only scheduled events are a primary in Mississippi and the Maine Republican caucuses.

This crazy calendar sets up one of two scenarios—both scary. If one candidate in each party wraps up the nomination by gaining momentum in the January contests and amassing delegates on Feb. 5, we will be looking at the longest, most-dragged-out general election ever. The conventions are late in 2008; the Democrats' the last week in August, the Republicans' the first week in September. The time from February to Labor Day will be boring beyond belief.

But if nothing is decided by the night of Feb. 5, the chance of a quirky result from the oddity of the political geography of the remaining states will be greatly increased. Democrats will have to compete in Indiana and North Carolina, where they rarely win in November. Republicans will be judged in Massachusetts and Vermont, where their party membership is minuscule.

None of this helps the country get the best-qualified candidates, and none of it helps either party put forward its best candidate.

The situation screams for repair. In my view, the parties would be well advised to

make the necessary fixes themselves, rather than wait for Congress to devise remedial legislation.

The mandate for the next pair of national party chairmen should be to agree on a sensible national agenda for the primaries—either a rotating regional system that gives all states a turn at being early or a plan that allows a random mix of states to vote, but only on dates fixed in advance by the parties, and separated at intervals that allow voters to consider seriously their choices.

It would be close to criminal to allow a repeat of this coming year's folly in 2012.

TWO SUPER BOWLS

MR. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I rise to propose that we turn the Presidential nominating process over to the National Football League, except for Super Bowl half-time shows. Then maybe we can have a second Super Bowl, where anything is possible and everyone can participate.

Take the example of our colleague Senator Kerry's team—I am sure the Senator from Vermont will be quick to point out it is the team of many Senators from New England—the New England Patriots. Last night, they became the Super Bowl champions.

On September 12, in the season's first game, the Buffalo Bills trounced the Patriots 31 to 0. If this had been the first-in-the-Nation Presidential nominating caucus, the Patriots would have been toast. You know the pundits' rule: Only three tickets out of Iowa. The Patriots certainly didn't look like one of the three best professional football teams. Then, the Washington Redskins defeated the Patriots, as unlikely as it would have been for Dennis Kucinich to upend Senator Kerry in New Hampshire. But in the National Football League, upsets don't end the season. The Patriots played 14 more games. They won them all. Yesterday, they beat the Carolina Panthers in the Super Bowl for their 15th consecutive win.

The National Football League schedules 20 weeks of contests over 5 months to determine its champion. The Presidential nominating process, on the other hand, uses the equivalent of two preseason games in Iowa and New Hampshire to narrow the field to two or three—and sometimes they effectively I pick the winner.

The NFL wasn't always so wise. In the 1930s, league owners rearranged schedules after the first few games so that teams that were doing well could play one another. This was good for the Chicago Bears, for example, but not for the league. Fans in other cities quit going to the games—just as voters in most States have quit voting in Presidential primaries.

Bears owner George Halas and others created today's competitive system in which almost any one of 32 teams can hope to make the playoffs. Green Bay can make it because the league makes sure that even smalltown teams have enough revenue. Prime-time television opportunities are rotated. Each Monday, senior officials in the league's New York office grade every call and no call to second-guess even the instant replays.

Professional football has become America's game because it symbolizes the most important aspect of the American character: If you work hard and play by the rules, anything is possible. As a result, 8 of 10 of the most watched network television shows have been Super Bowls; 98 of the 100 best watched cable television games have been NFL games.

Every September, the NFL fields 32 teams, almost all with a shot at the playoffs. Every 4 years, the Presidential nominating process does well to attract a half dozen credible candidates for the biggest job in the world.

All but half are effectively eliminated after two contests. If professional football were Presidential politics, Sportscenter would pick the Super Bowl teams after 3 or 4 preseason games.

These two steps would fix the Presidential nominating process:

No. 1, spread out the primaries. Twenty-eight primaries are crammed into 5 weeks after New Hampshire. Congress should assume the role of Paul Tagliabue. Create a window between February and May during which primaries may be held every 2 weeks. Iowa and New Hampshire could still come first, but they would become off-Broadway warmups and not the whole show.

The second step that would fix the process would be to allow more money—to raise their first \$10 million, let candidates collect individual “start-up contributions” of up to \$10,000. Today’s \$2,000 limit makes it impossible for most potential candidates to imagine how to raise, say, \$40 million. During 1995, when I was a candidate and the individual limit on contributions was \$1,000, I fattened 250 fundraisers in that 1 year to collect \$10 million. The combination of the new \$2,000 limit, the increased coverage of new cable channels, and the growth of the Internet have made it easier to raise money.

Still all but Senator Kerry was short of cash after New Hampshire. Put it this way: The Packers would never make it to the playoffs under the revenue rules of Presidential primaries.

Mr. President, 45,000 Iowans voted for John Kerry in the first caucus. About 83,000 New Hampshire voters voted for him in the first primary. More Americans actually attended last night’s Super Bowl game in Houston, TX, than voted in either Iowa or New Hampshire. Ninety million others watched the Super Bowl game on television.

Perhaps we should learn something from America’s game about how to pick a President. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

[Heritage Lecture #568, May 23, 1996.]

OFF WITH THE LIMITS: WHAT I LEARNED ABOUT MONEY AND POLITICS WHEN I RAN FOR PRESIDENT

(By Lamar Alexander)

On March 3, one day after the disastrous—for me—South Carolina primary and three days before I withdrew from the presidential race, I attended Sunday services at the Peachtree Presbyterian Church in Atlanta. The Rev. Frank Harrington preached about how Joshua, after a great victory at the Battle of Jericho, had been surprised and humiliated in the battle of Ai—so humiliated that Joshua renamed Ai the “Valley of Calamity.” He wanted his warriors always to remember the lessons of what had happened there.

Walking out after the service, I asked Rev. Harrington, “Was the point that I should rename South Carolina the ‘Valley of Calamity?’”

“No,” he said, “the point is, you must learn lessons from your defeat—and then pick yourself up and go on.”

The voters, in their wisdom, have given me a defeat, and now several weeks to reflect upon its lessons. The Heritage Foundation has invited me today to talk about one of

those lessons: the influence of money on the race for the presidency. While my wounds are fresh, here is my view: The so-called campaign reformers are selling the American people a real bill of goods on this one. They are saying that limits on what individuals can give to presidential campaigns and on what candidates can spend will reduce the influence of money and create a better democracy.

In fact, such limits do precisely the reverse. We now have 22 years of experience with them. Limits have increased the influence of money and are dangerous to democracy. It is the law of unintended consequences operating in all of its glory. Instead of adding more limits, we should take the limits off and rely on full disclosure to discourage corruption.

The limits on giving and spending for a presidential campaign were well-intentioned, placed into federal law after Watergate. Corporations can’t give at all; political action committees may give up to \$5,000; and individuals may give up to \$1,000 during the primaries (the government pays for the general election). In addition, there are limits on what a candidate may spend in each state primary and a ceiling on spending for the entire primary. The Federal Election Commission enforces all of this.

The limits were designed to make things better for you, the average voter, so let’s look at what they have done. As a result of these limits:

You are more likely to see a comet than meet a presidential candidate, unless you have \$1,000—or live in Iowa or New Hampshire;

You have fewer choices of candidates;

The primary campaigns start before you care and end before you have a chance to vote;

You are less likely to hear the candidates’ messages;

Your nominee is more likely to be someone already holding office, rather than an insurgent;

More of your choices are among candidates who are rich enough to spend their own money; and

Washington, DC., has more to say about who the nominee is and you have less. In short, the federal limits on giving and spending during elections are turning presidential races into playgrounds for the rich, the already famous, and the Washington-based, and are helping to deprive most Americans of the opportunity to cast a meaningful vote.

When we create a system for picking Presidents, I believe our objectives should be these:

We should want the largest number of good candidates.

We should want a good opportunity to hear what they have to say.

All of us, if possible, want the opportunity to cast a meaningful vote. If this is also your set of objectives, then here is my remedy: Off with the limits. Off with the limits on individual contributions. Off with the spending limits. Require maximum disclosure. Open up the system. Let the candidates speak. Let us vote.

Three Disclaimers—Before you think it, let me say it:

First, I am not here to wallow in gloom. In fact, I come away from the campaign more optimistic, not less. I would do it again in a minute. I believe even more that there is very little wrong with our country that more jobs, better schools, and stronger families won’t fix.

Second, I believe I can make these remarks in the spirit of a gracious loser. That is made easier because our process produced a nominee whom I respect, who is my friend, and who I will be proud to call my President.

Under any process, Bob Dole was our party’s most likely nominee this year. (I will confess that my determination to be a gracious loser is tested about once a week when I remember what another defeated Tennessean, Davy Crockett, once said. Congressman Crockett strode to the courthouse steps, faced the voters who had just turned him out of office, and said what every defeated candidate has always wanted to say to such voters: “I’m going to Texas and you can go to hell!”)

Finally, I am not here to complain because Steve Forbes spent \$33 million of his own wealth on his presidential campaign. I believe the First Amendment to our Constitution gives Mr. Forbes the right to spend his money to advance his views. The Rockefeller and Perot and Forbeses and du Ponts all have made valuable contributions to our public life. I hope they continue to do so. What I object to, as I will discuss, is letting them spend all they want and then putting limits on the rest of us. What I am arguing—that it is wrong to put limits on giving and spending—runs smack in the face of what we have been hearing ever since Watergate. So let me take my points one by one. What I have to contribute is a view from the inside. I will stick to my impressions and stories from the road and let scholars here at Heritage and elsewhere compile the statistics and perform the analysis.

Because of the limits, you’re more likely to see a comet than meet a presidential candidate, unless you have \$1,000—or live in Iowa and New Hampshire.

Of course, not everybody wants to meet a presidential candidate. Walking across New Hampshire, I met a woman taking a work break outside a shoe factory in Manchester. I stuck out my hand and said, “I’m Lamar Alexander. I’d like to be your next President.” She looked at me, and at my red and black shirt, and said with disgust, “That’s all we need. Another President!” Congressman Mo Udall used to tell about walking into a barber shop. “I’m Mo Udall, running for President,” he said. “Yeah, I know,” the barber replied. “We were just laughing about that yesterday.”

But if you are one of those persons who would actually like to meet and size up someone who might be your President, get your wallet ready because the \$1,000 limit on giving forces candidates to spend most of their time with people who can give \$1,000. As with many federal laws, these limits have done just exactly the opposite of what they were intended to do. Limits have increased the influence of money on the candidates.

For example, to raise \$10 million in 1995 for the Alexander for President campaign, I traveled to 250 fund-raising events. Now, think about this. This is about one event per campaign day. This took 70 percent of all my time. As a result, I became unusually well acquainted with a great many good Americans capable of giving \$1,000 (who probably represent a cross section of about one percent of all the people in the country). Wouldn’t I have been a better candidate, and the country better off had I been elected, if I had spent more time traveling around America and visiting allies abroad? (I actually did this during 1994, driving 8,800 miles across America and spending two months overseas. This was when I was not spending most of my time meeting nice people who could give me \$1,000.)

Because of the limits, you have fewer choices for President.

This is because, in the real world, a \$1,000 limit on gifts makes fund-raising so difficult that it discourages most candidates. I will now wave my own red flag: It is important not to get carried away with this argument. The difficulty of raising money is sometimes just an excuse. There are other more compelling reasons not to run for President.

For example, I recall in November of 1995, when Colin Powell was on the cover of the news magazines and his approval rating in the polls was, literally, higher than the Pope's—and I was struggling to secure a paragraph in the *Keokuk, Iowa, daily*—I was driving to the airport after a New York fundraiser with a former associate of General Powell's. The unavoidable question arose, "Will Colin run?" The former associate answered, "I don't know. But I can tell you two things about General Powell. One is, he makes rational decisions. Two is, he doesn't like uncertainty." I knew from that moment that, if that were true, there was no chance whatsoever Colin would be a candidate. Running for President is not a rational decision. It is instinctive. It is a passion with a purpose. And it is most surely a symphony in uncertainty. That is why I am so surprised that so many have such a hard time taking Colin Powell at his word, that he simply doesn't want to do it. Most people don't. They don't want the job, or they are afraid they can't win, or more and more they are unwilling to expose themselves and their families to the scrutiny that comes with the candidacy.

Having said all of that, it is still true that the prospect of trying to raise \$20 million from contributions of \$1,000 or less makes the race much less attractive and often impossible for many good candidates. In 1995, Bill Bennett told me he didn't know how to raise that kind of money. Jack Kemp said he knew how but didn't want to. Dan Quayle and Dick Cheney discovered it would have been very hard even for a former Vice President and a former Defense Secretary; they both decided not to become candidates.

You might have wondered this year, where have all the governors gone? I don't think I have ever met a governor who didn't think he or she would make an excellent President. Seventeen of our Presidents have been governors. There are today 32 Republican governors. One might argue (and I will confess that I tried out this argument a few hundred times during 1995) that the natural presidential partner for our strong Republican congressional leaders would have been the best of our Republican governors.

But at the end of 1995, not one sitting Republican governor was in the race. Carroll Campbell, Tommy Thompson, and Bill Weld, perhaps others, had considered it and drawn back, privately saying, "I can't raise the money." Even the governor of California, Pete Wilson, who by my calculation is governor of 5 percent of all the money in the world, could not raise enough money. So, for Republicans, 1995 turned out to be the year of the "money primary."

This is how it worked. There were, in the end, only four of us who could find a way to raise enough money to run for President. We all had certain advantages. For example, a contribution to Bob Dole was also a contribution to the respected Senate majority leader. Phil Gramm had worked relentlessly for six years as chairman of the Senate Republican Campaign Committee to build a list of 83,000 names and a \$5 million campaign kitty, which he then transferred to his presidential account—a perfectly legal loophole, but one which was unavailable to the governors or others not holding office. Pat Buchanan was able to depend on direct mail for smaller contributions because it was his second race, he had been on network television for 15 years, and he took, shall we say, especially noisy positions.

The Alexander campaign had some advantages, too: exceptional national leadership and strong support at home. Six of the last seven Republican national finance chairs chaired our fund-raising. We began with a \$2 million dinner in Nashville on March 6, 1995,

and raised \$5.2 million in 21 events during the next six weeks. At the end of 1995, the three zip codes in America which had contributed the most to presidential campaigns were all in Nashville. By the time I withdrew, we had raised nearly \$13 million from 26,000 contributors, 8,800 of whom had given \$1,000. (We received another \$4 million from federal matching funds.)

But after the initial \$5.2 million spurt, it became much harder for us. I was traveling to 20 events per month to raise \$500,000. This created logistical adventures of Desert Storm proportions. On one day, I flew from Nashville to Colorado Springs to Denver for fundraisers and then on to Phoenix to be ready for an early morning breakfast. To collect \$20,000 during the crucial week before the Iowa caucus, I "dropped by" Knoxville, Tennessee, on the way from New Hampshire to Iowa. To raise another \$30,000, I flew from Sioux City, Iowa, to San Juan, Puerto Rico, one Sunday in December. By the last four days of the New Hampshire primary, we were running on empty except for the money set aside for debts, audit, and winding down.

Then, when I placed a strong third in the Iowa caucus on February 12, the money dam broke. Beginning three days after Iowa, five days before the New Hampshire primary, contributions started rolling in to our Nashville headquarters at the rate of \$1,000,000 a day without events. This continued for every day except Sunday, until I withdrew on March 6. Our once-a-week telephone conference calls sometimes included more than 200 volunteer fund-raisers. But it came too late, for New Hampshire ads had to be purchased the Friday before the primary on Tuesday. I failed (by 7,000 votes) to overtake Senator Dole. The Republican nomination was decided in the first primary.

Partly because of the limits, the campaign starts before you care and ends before you have a chance to vote.

Not only did the campaign end early; it started ridiculously early because, it seemed at the time, starting early was the only way to raise the necessary amount of money. In early 1995, Senator Gramm of Texas, flush with his 83,000 names and \$5 million kitty, declared that it would take \$20 million to run for President, that he could raise it and that he doubted many others could, and then sponsored a \$4 million kick-off dinner in Dallas and announced, "Ready cash is a candidate's best friend."

None of the rest of us were about to be left behind. I held my \$2 million dinner in Nashville. Senator Dole jumped in, as did others. Off we went, pounding the streets in 1995 trying to raise money for a race in 1996. It was like trying to stir up a conversation about football in the middle of the NBA playoffs. For me, by mid-summer 1995, it was going something like this interview:

From Washington, D.C., "Inside Politics," Wolf Blitzer (already bored with the long "money primary"): "Governor Alexander, why do the polls show Senator Dole ahead of you 54 to 4 in Iowa?"

From Vermont, in my red and black shirt, Me (already tired of being asked the same question for the 50th time): "Wolf, that's the dumbest question I've ever heard. The reason Senator Dole is ahead of me is that everyone knows him and nobody knows me."

Now, add to the cost of creating such a long campaign the usual costs of fund-raising. A rule of thumb is that it costs 30 cents to raise a dollar. That meant that of the \$10 million we raised in 1995, about \$3.5 million went for fund-raising. Then there is the cost of complying with federal regulations. Another \$1 million of the \$10 million we raised during 1995 went for that. We set aside still another \$500,000 for the campaign audit, which usually takes years. I think you can see where I am heading.

Add the costs of the long campaign to the usual costs of fund-raising and complying with federal rules and, by the time the 1995 money primary was over and the real primary in 1996 was here, the handful of us still standing (except for Mr. Forbes) were running out of money. The Alexander campaign spent \$10 million during 1995, everything we raised, which left us about \$3 million in the bank (counting federal matching funds) at the beginning of 1996. And, by comparison, we were running a bare-bones effort. Senator Gramm had spent \$28 million when he dropped out just before the first primary in mid-February. Senator Dole had spent more than \$30 million by March 1 and, with 39 primaries yet to go, was coming uncomfortably close to the federally imposed primary spending ceiling. Steve Forbes spent \$33 million before he dropped out. I'm not sure whether my friend Pat has dropped out yet or not!

The reason why the Republican nomination was decided in the first primary is not only because limits on giving and spending forced the campaigns to start early. It is also because so many states moved their primaries to an earlier date in an attempt to give their citizens the same privilege Iowa and New Hampshire citizens have: the opportunity to cast a meaningful vote to pick the first President of the new century. This bunching of primaries created a wild roller coaster ride through 38 states in the 25 days after New Hampshire. Ironically, this made New Hampshire even more important. Here was the law of unintended consequences mischievously at work once again. The money primary became so long and expensive that we all arrived financially exhausted at the real starting line: New Hampshire, which turned out to be the finish line as well. About the time the voters had returned from the refrigerator to settle in and watch the presidential campaign unfold and perhaps even to vote in it the campaign had ended.

Because of the limits, you are less likely to hear the candidates' message.

This is because limits on giving and spending prevent most candidates from raising enough money to get across their messages, especially if the candidate is relatively unknown at the beginning. Let me offer an example. Yesterday's *Newsweek* contains a column by Meg Greenfield which says this: "The doomed Presidential campaign of Lamar Alexander should tell the Republicans something. It was the quintessential antigovernment pitch—complete with an implicit—and often explicit—denial and disavowal of Alexander's career as a government guy. He bombed."

Well, now, this is the stuff of a pretty good debate. Of course, I disagree with Ms. Greenfield. I think my campaign nearly succeeded because I understand that the next President must lead us to expect less from Washington and ask more of ourselves, including our local governmental institutions. Ms. Greenfield's and President Clinton's solution is more from Washington. So let the debate begin.

Ms. Greenfield has her page in *Newsweek*. She is also editorial director for the Washington Post. President Clinton has the best forum of all. Their "more from Washington" side of the argument will get plenty of exposure. But what about my "more from us" argument? I made my case in Iowa during 80 visits and walked 100 miles across New Hampshire. I found that in those small meetings I could be persuasive. I also found that nothing much happened in the public opinion polls until I was on television. "Free TV"—the network news—was not of much help (although some local stations were very aggressive). To begin with, the national networks didn't arrive until mid-January when the campaign was nearly over.

The Center for Media and Public Affairs watched all the network newscasts in January and February, ten-and-one-half hours of campaign coverage. The Center found that we nine Republican candidates were allotted 79 minutes total. We were allowed to present our views in seven-second sound bites. The journalists covering us received five times as many minutes of coverage on those same newscasts. What the journalists said about us and our campaigns was more negative than what we candidates said about each other. And more than half the journalists' comments were about the horse race, not the issues. The Freedom Forum, in a remarkable survey of the journalists covering the presidential campaign, found that in 1992, 89 percent had voted for Bill Clinton. A candidate cannot rely on "Free TV" to get his message across. That is why, in our media-drenched society, where things are not important unless they are on TV, a candidate must have money for television to get a message across, and the limits on giving and spending make it difficult for candidates to do that.

This is not just one candidate's lament. Limits on giving and spending are an affront to the First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution. The whole idea of the framers of the Bill of Rights was to keep the government from attempting to limit political debate and criticism: "Congress shall make no law abridging the freedom of speech." In *Buckley v. Valeo*, the Supreme Court acknowledged this and struck down most congressional limits of this sort, but left standing the current provisions because of its worry about "corruption." I believe the better antidote to corruption is disclosure. To correct something bad, we have created something worse.

Because of limits, your nominee is more likely to be an incumbent than an insurgent.

In the real world, insurgents not only need more money than incumbents; they need it early. The New York Times reported that two-thirds of voters in New Hampshire made their minds up during the last week before the primary, after the Iowa caucuses. Among those voters, I won with 31 percent. Among the one-third who voted before Iowa, I received six percent. More money, earlier, might have helped get my message across to those early deciders.

Candidates for President who already hold public office have government-paid staffs of policy advisers, PR people, and political administrators. They have name recognition and franking privileges. They have a fund-raising advantage because of their positions of power. If they are in Washington, they have a huge media advantage because that is where the media are. So putting a limit on what all candidates can raise and spend turns out to be a protection policy for some candidates: the ones who already enjoy the perquisites of public office.

This is not just true in federal races. My home state, Tennessee, has just limited contributions to governors' races to \$500. This is an enormous advantage for our incumbent Republican governor, Don Sundquist. And it virtually guarantees that the only effective candidate against Governor Sundquist when he runs for re-election will be someone who is so rich that he can spend his or her own money—which brings us to the most important point.

Because of the limits, more of your choices are likely to be rich candidates willing to spend their own money.

This brings us to the major problem with limits on campaign giving and spending: The limits apply to some candidates but not to others. This is because the U.S. Supreme Court has said that the First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution prohibits Congress from preventing anyone from spending his or

her own money on our own campaigns. So the limits apply only to people who aren't rich enough to spend money on their own campaign.

This creates an absurd advantage for wealthy candidates and a distorted contest for the voter. The first advantage is the obvious: The wealthy candidate has more money to spend. For example, Mr. Forbes spent \$33 million of (mostly) his own money; I spent, with matching funds, about \$16 million of other peoples' money.

There are two other less obvious advantages. The candidate with his own money spends no time raising it. On the other hand, the candidate raising it is careening from event to event, repeating speeches, meeting nice people who can give \$1,000, wearing himself ragged, and using up 70 percent of his time. By the time you reach the finals the week between Iowa and New Hampshire, you are a candidate for a fitness center, not the presidency.

Finally, there are the state-by-state spending limits, which also help the rich. The federal government has decreed, for example, that a campaign may not spend more than \$1 million in Iowa and \$618,000 in New Hampshire during the presidential primaries. Mr. Forbes, unaffected by these limits, spent \$5 million in Iowa on television. The Alexander campaign spent \$930,000. The AP reported that on the third week before the New Hampshire primary, Mr. Forbes bought 700 ads on one Boston television station (which covers southern New Hampshire). That week, Senator Dole bought 200 ads on that station. The Alexander campaign: none. Mr. Forbes must have spent \$5 million in Arizona, by my estimates. Local newspapers said it was more than any advertiser had ever spent on local television to introduce a new product. (It must be pointed out that having your own money doesn't automatically mean you win. Mr. Perot is not President. Mr. Forbes came in fourth in both Iowa and New Hampshire. I recall my race for governor in 1978 against a candidate who must have spent \$8 million. I spent \$2 million, enough to win, although I could never have raised \$2 million if there had been limits of \$500 or \$1,000 per contribution.)

What kind of contest is this, having different rules for different contestants? This is like watching the Magic play the Bulls with one team wearing handcuffs. It is certainly not the game the voters paid to see. Think of it this way: Say the fifth grade teacher organizes a contest for class president with water pistols as the weapon of choice; then some kid arrives with a garden hose. Either take away the new kid's garden hose (Bill Bradley suggests a constitutional amendment to limit what individuals can spend on their own campaigns) or give the rest of the fifth graders the freedom to raise and spend enough money to buy their own garden hoses. And if the New Hampshire primary is most of the ball game in presidential primaries, why should state-by-state spending limits keep candidates from defending themselves, even if they use up all their money?

Because of the limits, Washington has more to say about who the nominee is and you have less.

Talking about Washington these days has gotten to be a sticky business. The rest of the country is tired of Washington, and Washington is tired of hearing about Washington. The rest of the country is becoming more offensive about its feelings, and Washington is becoming more defensive. "Cut their pay and send them home" still makes sense in Sioux City, but they call it nonsense here. One of Washington's most senior journalists told me sadly last year that "This town has grown too big for its britches." I have been coming and going from Wash-

ington off and on for 30 years and I believe that is true as well; but to come from outside Washington and say it, and to really believe it, is asking for trouble.

I believe our President must lead us to expect less from Washington and to ask more of ourselves. That is a message less frequently heard in Washington and more difficult to launch from outside Washington. For one thing, this is a media-drenched society, and the message-launchers—the media—are increasingly concentrated here. That will be more true in 2000 and 2004 than it was in 1996. The party fund-raising apparatus is here. The party leadership is here. The think tanks, if you will excuse me, are here. To receive maximum attention to my speech today, I am here. There are all sorts of good people here in Washington, but we of necessity, when we are here, talk mostly with each other.

REFORMING THE PROCESS

Limits on giving and spending make it less likely that a candidate based outside Washington can succeed. Such candidates, by their experience and skills, may be able to help make Washington more like the rest of America, rather than the rest of America more like Washington. I believe Washington will always be a better place if it is constantly refreshed by the strength of the country outside Washington. The way we pick Presidents today makes that more difficult. Limits are not all that is wrong.

The process should be deregulated. We should sunset the existing regulations and start over. Fewer rules and full disclosure should be the byword.

Spread out the primaries. Let Iowa and New Hampshire go first, in February or March, and then arrange all the other primaries on the second Tuesday of the next three months. This would give winners a chance to capitalize on success, voters a chance to digest new faces, and candidates a chance to actually meet voters.

The candidates should be given the opportunity to speak on television more often for themselves. My even mentioning this runs the same risks Dennis Rodman would take if he suggested some rule changes to a convention of NBA officials. So let me begin with some praise. Some print reporters sat through New Hampshire Lincoln Day dinners in the early stages of the money primary, in 1994 and 1995. C-SPAN and CNN labored valiantly and early. In January and February of 1996, the New York Times began printing some long excerpts of the candidates' speeches, and the networks began showing unedited stump speeches. But most of the coverage came late, or was about the horse race, or about candidates who were never going to run. Seventy-nine minutes of network exposure in seven-second sound bites for nine Republican candidates is pathetically little.

There are dangers to early voting. In a growing number of states, voters may vote a month or two before the election day. According to the Edison exit poll of 1996 New Hampshire primary voters, 40 percent of the voters made their minds up during the last three days before the primary. Those who cast their votes a month earlier were voting in quite a different race.

OTHER OPTIONS FOR REFORM

The first option is suggested by Senator Bill Bradley, whose sporting background must make him especially allergic to contests with one rule for some participants and another rule for others. Senator Bradley would try to create a level playing field by putting limits on everyone, in effect making Mr. Forbes live by the same rules I do.

This takes care of Mr. Forbes and me. But the AFL-CIO will still be able to run \$35 million worth of TV ads attacking particular Republican candidates. The National Association of Wholesaler-Distributors will still

be able to run ads slamming President Clinton's product liability veto. The National Restaurant Association will advertise that President Clinton is wrong about the minimum wage. The National Education Association will say I am wrong about school choice. The national political parties will raise tens of millions in "soft money." The President is the one person in America who is able to advocate the best interests of the country as a whole. Why should we limit the speech only of those who seek to speak for the country as a whole?

Senator Bradley should leave the First Amendment alone. The First Amendment is correct. It stands in the way of preventing ill-advised efforts by the government to limit a candidate's right to speak. And if there cannot be limits on most of us, why should there be limits on any of us?

A second option is public financing which we now have with the presidential general elections. But such taxpayer-funded campaigns still leave Mr. Perot and the AFL-CIO and other committees free to spend millions creating an unlevel playing field. Also, public financing leaves the media with more horsepower than the candidates themselves have. And I cannot fathom how public financing would work in a primary situation. Would the government have funded everyone who showed up at the Republican debates this season? If so, such funding would have produced countless more candidates. I am opposed to public financing. It is incestuous. It is an unnecessary use of taxpayers' money. It invites government regulations. It creates an unlevel playing field by favoring incumbents.

Finally, there are various proposals to require the media to give away TV time. (Such proposals would never work in a primary for the same reasons public financing could not work: How would you choose to whom to give it?) The lack of an opportunity for voters to consider the messages of candidates—especially insurgent candidates—is at the heart of the problem with our presidential process. But I am afraid these well-meaning proposals will drown in their own complexity and the law of unintended consequences will somehow rear its head again. Isn't the best solution for the media simply to cover the races and present the serious candidates on network news and in the newspapers more often on appropriate occasions, speaking for themselves?

FIND THE GOOD AND PRAISE IT

I mentioned at the beginning of my remarks that I came away from the campaign with a good feeling, not a bad feeling. My friend Alex Haley used to say, "Find the good and praise it," and I can easily do that about this process, even with its flaws. During the last year, I walked across New Hampshire, meeting several hundred people a day, spent 80 days in Iowa in maybe 200 meetings that ranged from 20 to 300 people, and had at least 50 meetings in Florida with the delegates to the Presidency III straw poll. During most of these meetings I was little known and unencumbered by the news media, so there was no disruption to the flow of the session.

I remember wishing time after time that anybody who had any sense of cynicism about our presidential selection process could be with me, like a fly on the wall, because they could not be cynical after hearing and seeing and feeling what I saw. The groups with whom I met always listened carefully. Most often, they wanted to talk about our jobs, our schools and our neighborhoods, and our families. In meeting after meeting, I came away certain that this is a

nation hungry for a vision contest, not one willing to tolerate a trivial presidential election. I believe there is a great market in the American electorate for a full-fledged discussion about what kind of country we can have in the year 2000 and beyond.

As the song says, it is a long, long time from May 'til September when the presidential race really begins. One way to help fill this time usefully would be to review the way we pick Presidents and make certain that next time, in the new century, we have a process that attracts the largest number of good candidates, that gives them an opportunity to say and us to hear their messages, and gives as many of us as possible a chance to cast a meaningful vote.

One lesson I learned when I ran for President is that step one toward those objectives would be these four words: Off with the limits.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I rise to state my support for the legislation Senators KLOBUCHAR, ALEXANDER, and I are introducing today to create a regional Presidential primary system effective in 2012.

The goal of this legislation is to transform what has become a tired, arbitrary, and exclusive presidential primary system that simply does not give enough voters the opportunity to weigh the ideas of candidates and choose the one they think would best represent their future.

Given the significance of choosing the most powerful officeholder in the world, our Presidential selection process must be a fair and deliberate one that tests the strength of the ideas and character of all the candidates and exposes them to the maximum number of voters.

Instead, what we have now is a confusing process that, with each passing Presidential election season, becomes more and more compressed, forcing States to move their primaries up earlier in the calendar year in order to give their citizens a chance to participate, and granting disproportionate influence to the early States.

Where 50 States once scattered their primaries throughout the first half of the election year—from January through June—this year, we have a system in which 39 caucuses or primaries will be held in January and February alone, up from 19 in 2004, with enough delegates at stake potentially to decide the nominee. Almost half the States of the Union will be excluded from that process.

There is another insidious effect of this increasingly condensed schedule: The more compressed the primary schedule is the more reliant candidates become on large campaign donations and the people who give them. The fundraising primary this year has already eliminated candidates who simply could not raise sufficient funds quickly enough to be competitive in the first 2 months of the Presidential year.

This is no way for the world's greatest democracy to choose its President.

Our legislation offers a commonsense alternative that would transform the

primary season into what it should be: a contest between candidates who take their cases to the broadest possible slice of the electorate.

I was honored to cosponsor proposals to bring reason to the Presidential primary system twice in the past—in 1996 and 1999—with former Senator Slade Gorton. What we are introducing today is very similar in that it calls for a regional, rotating primary system that divides the 50 States into four regions that would take turns holding primaries in the months of March, April, May, and June of the Presidential election year.

Specifically, the bill would assign all States to one of four regions—corresponding roughly to the Northeast, South, Midwest, and Western regions of the country. A lottery would determine which region goes first, and the regions would rotate in subsequent election years. Each State within a region must hold its primary or caucus during the period assigned to that region.

New Hampshire and Iowa would be permitted to continue holding the first primary and caucus, respectively, before any of the regional primaries would take place. I personally would have preferred to omit this provision in the bill. If we are going to change to a regional system, there should be no exceptions, and I am concerned that these two States will continue to have a disproportionate impact on the outcome of the nominating process. But Iowa and New Hampshire hold iconic status in the Presidential primary system and so they remain the first caucus and primary States in this bill.

The new system would take effect for the 2012 Presidential election.

By creating a series of regional primaries, we will make it more likely that all areas of the country have input into the nominee selection process, and that the candidates and their treasuries will not be stretched so thin by primaries all over the country on the same day. By spreading out the primaries over a 4-month period, we would provide the electorate with a better opportunity to evaluate the candidates over time. And with our bill, we hope that voters—not just financial contributors—will have the lion's share of influence over who the parties' nominees will be.

The guiding principle of our democracy is that every citizen has the opportunity to choose his or her leaders. But the sad truth is this principle no longer bears a resemblance to the reality of an increasingly squashed and arbitrary primary system.

We need to change our presidential primary system to make it more reasonable, more inclusive, and better structured so that it properly reflects the significance it holds—not only every 4 years but as a founding principle of our great Nation.