in my home state of Kentucky who have played a role in all stages of the production of the new, 5th generation Corvette. I offer my congratulations to all those who work for Chevrolet in Bowling Green, whose innovative thinking and diligence has resulted in the Corvette winning this prestigious award.●

TRIBUTE TO THE TOYOTA CAMRY: AMERICA'S No. 1 SELLING CAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize the employees at the Erlanger, Kentucky, headquarters of Toyota's North American manufacturing operations as well as those at the Georgetown Toyota assembly plant whose dedication and hard work have resulted in the Toyota Camry becoming the number one selling car in the United States for 1997.

By recording its best-ever sales month in December, the Camry edged past traditional favorites—the Honda Accord and the Ford Taurus—to become the best selling car in the United States—the first time a Toyota automobile has been so recognized.

Because dealers had a hard time keeping both the Accord and the Camry in stock this year, the primary factor in determining which model sold best was which company could get the most out of its assembly line. I am proud to report that, because of the industriousness of those men and women who work in the Georgetown plant, there were enough Camrys on dealer's lots to outsell both the Accord and the Taurus. And by the way, 80% of all Camrys sold in the U.S. have been assembled in Georgetown.

This past year, the Camry plant in Georgetown increased production by 12% over the previous year, mostly by improving efficiency on the assembly line and pressing suppliers to keep up with their demand for raw materials.

Despite the tremendous growth this year, officials at the Georgetown plant say that they intend to build even more Camrys next year, as they improve the speed of the assembly line and further improve the plant's efficiency.

Mr. President, again, I would like to congratulate all those men and women associated with Toyota Motor Sales, USA, particularly those in Erlanger and Georgetown, whose dedication and hard work made the Camry 1997's top selling car.

SUBMISSION OF SENATE RESOLUTION

Mr. SPECTER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

(The remarks of Mr. SPECTER pertaining to the submission of S. Res. 179 are located in today's RECORD under ''Submissions of Concurrent and Senate Resolutions.'')

Mr. MURKOWSKI addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, the debate that we begin today on campaign finance reform must be prefaced with one question: To what extent, if any, should the Federal Government regulate political speech in our country?

The President has endorsed Senator MCCAIN and Senator FEINGOLD's campaign finance reform legislation. However, I cannot.

Campaign finance reform debate is not just about politicians and their campaigns. At the core of this issue is the First Amendment. The government must tread lightly in attempts to place limitations on speech. The government can no more dictate how many words a newspaper can print than it can limit a political candidate's ability to communicate with his or her constituents

The McCain-Feingold legislation bristles with over a dozen different restrictions on speech—provisions that, I believe, flagrantly violate the First Amendment as interpreted by the Supreme Court.

I cannot overemphasize this point. George F. Will, in a Washington Post editorial stated of the McCain Feingold bill:

> Nothing in American history—not the left's recent campus speech codes,' not the right's depredations during the 1950s McCarthysim or the 1920s 'red scare,' not the Alien and Sedition Acts of the 1790s—matches the menace to the First Amendment posed by campaign 'reforms' advancing under the protective coloration of political hygiene.'

Mr. President, I would point out that the 1996 presidential system of campaign finance clearly reveals that two significant problems exists with our current election process:

1. Too much money is spent on campaigns; and 2. Current laws are not enforced.

Unfortunately, McCain-Feingold would do little to end the vicious cycle of fundraising. In fact, if anything, it would only prolong the campaign calendar. Since McCain-Feingold contains restrictions on express advocacy'' financed by soft money only 60 days before an election—that will mean that money will simply be raised earlier in the calendar year, and the election season will seem virtually unending.

And what is ''express advocacy?'' If this proposal ever becomes law, we can change the name of the Federal Election Commission to the Federal Campaign Speech Police. Every single issue advertisement will be taped, reviewed, analyzed and litigated over. The Speech police will set up their offices in all 50 states to ensure the integrity of political advertising. Is that what we in this chamber really want? I don't think so. But that is what will inevitably happen if we adopt McCain-Feingold.

Mr. President, the political tactics and schemes of the 1996 Presidential election campaign reveal the abuses involved in our current system. Bottom-line, our current election laws are not being enforced.

It's interesting to note that where the lack of law enforcement has become the most apparent is in the one area that receives guaranteed federal funding via a tax subsidy—federal presidential elections.

As grand jury indictments amass with regard to Democratic fundraising violations in the 1996 Presidential election, we learn more and more about President Clinton's use of the perquisites of the Presidency as a fundraising tool. It's important to recall some of those abuses as we begin our debate on campaign reform. And please keep in mind my point here is existing campaign laws are not being enforced.

First, the Lincoln bedroom. During the five years that President Clinton has resided in the White House, an astonishing 938 guests have spent the night in the Lincoln bedroom, and generated at least $6 million to the Democrat National Committee.

Presidential historian, Richard Norton Smith, stated that there has ''never been anything of the magnitude of President Clinton's use of the White House for fundraising purposes. . .it's the selling of the White House.''

Presidential Coffees. President Clinton hosted 103 ''presidential coffees.'' Guests at these coffees, which included a convicted felon and a Chinese businessman who heads an arms-trading company, donated $27 million to the Democrat National Committee.

President Clinton's Chief of Staff, Harold Ickes, recently turned over a large number of documents that show figures for both expected and actual donations from nearly every White House coffee. Mr. Ickes gave the President weekly memorandums which included projected monies he expected each ''Clinton coffee'' would raise. He projected each would raise no less than $400,000.

Here's a comparison: President Bush hosted one ''presidential coffee.'' No money was raised. The cost was $6.24.

Foreign Contributions. Investigations by both the Senate Government Affairs Committee and the Department of Justice into campaign abuses in the 1996 presidential campaign have revealed that the Democrats recklessly accepted illegal foreign donations in exchange for presidential access and other favors. A few examples:

First John Huang. John Huang, raised millions of dollars in illegal foreign contributions for the Democratic National Committee (DNC), which the DNC has already returned.

Huang, despite being wholly unqualified according to his immediate boss, received an appointment to the Department of Commerce, where he improperly accessed numerous classified documents on China.

Huang made at least 67 visits to the White House, often meeting with senior officials on US trade policy.

Senator SPECTER stated that the activities of Mr. Huang at the Commerce Department had ''all the earmarks of. . .espionage.''

Second Charlie Trie.

Longtime friend of Bill Clinton, raised and contributed at least $640,000 contributions to Clinton, GORE and the DNC.

Shortly thereafter, Clinton signed an executive order to increase the size of the US Commission on Pacific Trade and appointed Trie to the Commission.

On January 29th of this year, the Department of Justice indicted Trie on charges that he funneled illegal foreign contributions to the 1996 Clinton-Gore reelection campaign in order to buy access to top Democratic Party and Clinton Administration officials.

MONEY LAUNDERING

Vice President GORE was present at an event at a Buddhist Temple where $80,000 in contributions to the DNC were laundered through penniless nuns and monks.

Vice President GORE offered differing characterizations of the Buddhist Temple event. First, the vice-president described the event as a ''community outreach.'' He later characterized it as a ''donor-maintenance'' event where ''no money was offered or collected or raised at the event.''

However, last week, the Department of Justice determined otherwise. On February 18, veteran Democratic fundraiser Maria Hsia was charged in a six-count indictment by the Justice Department for her part in raising the illegal contributions for the Democrat National Committee at the Buddhist Temple event.

These abhorrent abuses in our current campaign laws must end. Healthy reform can begin with this debate. So my point is that current laws are not being enforced.

Mr. President, there is clearly one area where reform is certainly needed. During the 1996 election, the AFL–CIO spent $35 million to defeat Republican candidates. Where did the AFL–CIO get the resources to fund this campaign? From the dues of both union and non-union members.

Were these hard-working Americans asked by their unions how those dues should be spent? We all know the answer—No. The leaders of the AFL–CIO, headquartered here in Washington, just sat down and decided they would use their members' dues to target Republicans, whether those due-paying workers liked it or not.

I believe this practice should end. I applaud Senator LOTT for offering a sensible alternative. The Lott Substitute requires full public disclosure. Just as someone cannot donate money to a campaign in someone else's name under existing law, the Lott Amendment would close the loophole for labor unions by requiring that members approve of ads that their dues are spent on.

Mr. President, it is my intention to offer amendments to this bill that will address several issues related to campaign finance reform. One of those amendments will address what I believe is a fundamental inequity in the rules governing Senatorial activities.

The amendment I will offer will conform the rules that we have for transportation and lodging in connection with a charitable event with the rules that exist for transportation and lodging in connection with a political event, such as a political fundraiser something we all know.

Under rules we adopted in 1995, private entities cannot reimburse Members for the cost of transportation and lodging to a charitable event. But, members are still permitted to be privately reimbursed if they travel to a fundraising event for another member. In other words, lobbyists and PAC Committee contributions can be used to reimburse members for taking a night off and flying to Hollywood for political fundraisers.

Under the Senate Ethics Committee's Interpretative Ruling No. 193, a Senator may accept travel expenses from an official of a district's political party organization in return for his appearance at a rally sponsored by the organization.

Now, Mr. President, every Member of this body has at one time or another made a campaign appearance for his or her party or for a candidate of his party. Often, that means flying to another Member's home state, attending a party function; maybe making a speech and sharing a meal; maybe attending an entertainment or sports function. And the entire cost is almost always covered by lobbyists and other political contributors.

So we have a situation where a Senator can travel all over the country attending political fundraisers and have lodging and transportation reimbursed, but a Senator can't attend charity events—events that raise money for very worthwhile causes such as breast cancer detection—and have those costs reimbursed. Does that make sense?

Why is it all right for a political action committee to host a $500 a plate political fundraiser, or give a campaign check for $5,000 to an elected official, but there can be no solicitation of corporations and other individuals to participate in a charitable event that only benefits a small community or state? I believe this whole notion of preventing Senators and corporations from sharing in raising money for a worthy cause outside the Beltway, but allowing $5,000 and $10,000 political gifts smacks of sheer hypocrisy.

Since we adopted this change in our rules, it has become far more difficult for Senators to participate in charitable events. A recent article in Roll Call pointed out that charitable golf and ski events have dried up as a result of our rule change. But as Roll Call notes: ''But Members and their staff can still flock to sports tournaments or wine and dine with lobbyists—as long as it's part of a fundraiser.''

Mr. President, the amendment I intend to offer will end this hypocrisy.

My amendment simply provides that Senators would be permitted to be privately reimbursed for the costs of lodging and transportation in connection with charitable fund-raising events in the same manner they can be reimbursed for political travel.

This is a very simple amendment. It merely conforms the charitable travel rules with the political travel rules.

Mr. President, I believe one of the most important responsibilities of a public official is to promote worthwhile charitable causes. Not everything that can be done for the public good derives from government. Private charities play a vital role in servicing many of the needs of our citizens.

In my own case, for the past 4 years, my wife Nancy and I have been the honorary chairs of a fishing tournament in Alaska which has raised $830,000 for a mammogram machine for the Fairbanks Breast Cancer Detection Center and a mobile detection van.

And as a result, the center has been was able to provide free breast cancer examinations and mammograms for 25,000 women who from 81 villages in Alaska.

The units we've been able to finance have been vital in helping preserve the health of Alaska's women, especially the women in the small villages.

The State's cancer mortality is the third highest in the nation—one in eight Alaska women will develop breast cancer. Breast cancer screening can reduce these amounts by 30 percent.

I believe that without the money raised from these two fundraisers, the health of Alaska's women would be severely marginalized. I am proud of the work that my wife Nancy has done to get these units operating. If we change the rules on charitable events, I am convinced that neither of these units would have become a reality.

What we have here is a situation that discriminates against distant States.

Mr. President, even though Senators are permitted to attend charitable events, the rules relating to transportation and lodging clearly discriminate against charitable events in distant States.

Large national charitable organizations have the clout and resources to hold events in Washington, D.C. where Members can easily attend.

But if you are a small organization, like the Fairbanks Breast Cancer Detection Center or you are not going to have the resources or the capability to have your event held in the Nation's Capital. And if Senators cannot receive transportation and lodging reimbursement, events like mine and events sponsored by other Senators in their home states are just going to disappear because it costs too much to get to Alaska and other small States.

Mr. President, I think we have a very clear choice here. Do we want to establish the same lodging and transportation rules for charitable fund raisers

as we have for political fundraising? Or do we want to make it harder to raise money for worthy charities, while at the same time continuing the unlimited reimbursement for political fundraising.

Mr. President, I hope my colleagues will support my amendment when it is offered. And I want to assure my colleagues that should my amendment fail, I will offer an amendment to conform the transportation and lodging rules with the charitable rules so that Members will have to pay out of their own pockets to participate in fund raisers for other political candidates.

Mr. President, I am hopeful that sensible campaign reform will come forth during this debate—reform that:

does not violate free speech rights; provides greater enforcement for current laws; and ends loopholes that circumvent the intent of campaign laws.

Any reform taken by this Body must not infringe upon individual liberties. Reform should limit the elected official—not the electorate. The American public deserves no less.

I defer to my good friend from Iowa.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. GRASSLEY pertaining to the introduction of S. 1667 are located in today's RECORD under ''Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.'')

Mr. GRASSLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

CONGRATULATING SECRETARY GENERAL KOFI ANNAN

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, the last 48 hours have been a very important moment in our diplomatic efforts to achieve Iraqi compliance with U.N. Security Council resolutions. I want to congratulate Secretary-General Kofi Annan of the United Nations for his remarkable mission to Iraq. Obviously, many of us still look forward to being briefed on all of the details of the agreement between U.N. and Iraqi officials. But I think it is fair to say we have made great progress over the course of the last several days in large measure because of his effort.

Just before the February congressional recess, Senator LOTT and I came to the floor to impress upon the world community and our country the Senate's unity with regard to dealing with Saddam Hussein's lack of cooperation.

I believe that unity exists today as well. With this unity we express to Saddam Hussein that his pattern of intransigence is unacceptable; that his willingness now to agree once more to open up his facilities for complete inspection is commendable.

The question we now face is, when and under what circumstances will UNSCOM now be allowed to reenter the country to carry on its mission. But I believe that the willingness on the part of Saddam Hussein to negotiate with the U.N. leadership and to reach this agreement is a direct result of this administration's willingness to demonstrate to him that we will use force if necessary to accomplish our goals.

I commend President Clinton and his administration for their efforts, while facing criticism in some circles, to make it abundantly clear to Saddam Hussein, that with or without successful negotiations, we will open up those facilities, we will inspect every questionable location to our satisfaction.

This message of our determination to see Iraqi compliance and the unity we demonstrated in showing our determination to use force, along with the successful diplomatic efforts of Kofi Annan, have brought us the results today.

We are not there yet. U.N. weapons inspectors still have to reenter the country and be permitted to go to each location. We still have to be confident that whatever questions we have regarding Iraq's intentions on the manufacture of weapons of mass destruction will be completely answered.

I hope that until and unless we have all of those questions answered, our forces will be kept in the Persian Gulf to demonstrate our willingness to use force, if necessary, to accomplish our mission.

So, again, Mr. President, I commend the administration, I commend Mr. Annan, I commend all of those who have had so much to do with our success today. We will watch with interest, we will watch with the expectation of complete success, but we will also watch with the knowledge that if we need to use force, that force will be every bit as available in the future as it has been for the last 2 weeks. I yield the floor.

Mr. GRASSLEY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 24, 1998

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 9:30 a.m. on Tuesday, February 24, and that immediately following the prayer, the routine requests through the morning hour be granted. I further ask unanimous consent that the Senate then begin a period for the transaction of morning business until 10:30 a.m., with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each, with the following exceptions: Senator BROWNBACK, 10 minutes; Senator HUTCHISON, 15 minutes; Senator BOND, 5 minutes; Senator CONRAD, 30 minutes.

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

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that at 10:30 a.m., the Senate resume consideration of S. 1663, the campaign finance reform bill.

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

Mr. GRASSLEY. I further ask unanimous consent that the Senate recess from 12:30 p.m. until 2:15 p.m. for the weekly policy conferences to meet.

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

PROGRAM

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, tomorrow, the Senate will be in a period for morning business from 9:30 a.m. to 10:30 a.m. As under a previous consent agreement, at 10:30 a.m., the Senate will resume consideration of S. 1663, the campaign finance reform bill, and as under the consent agreement, the time from 10:30 a.m. to 12:30 p.m. will be equally divided between the opponents and proponents of the legislation. In addition, by consent, from 12:30 p.m. to 2:15 p.m., the Senate will recess for the weekly policy luncheons to meet. Following the policy luncheons at 2:15 p.m., the Senate will resume consideration of the campaign finance reform bill, with the time until 4 p.m. being equally divided between the opponents and proponents. Following that debate, at 4 p.m., the Senate will proceed to a vote in relation to the pending McCain-Feingold amendment. Therefore, the first rollcall vote tomorrow will occur at that time at 4 p.m. Senators can also anticipate additional votes following the vote in relation to the McCain-Feingold amendment to the campaign finance reform bill.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TOMORROW AT 9:30 A.M.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in adjournment under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:15 p.m., adjourned until Tuesday, February 24, 1998, at 9:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 23, 1998:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

PATRICK A. MULLOY, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF COMMERCE, VICE CHARLES F. MEISSNER.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

RAYMOND L. BRAMUCCI, OF NEW JERSEY, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF LABOR, VICE TIMOTHY M. BARNICLE, RESIGNED.

SETH D. HARRIS, OF NEW YORK, TO BE ADMINISTRATOR OF THE WAGE AND HOUR DIVISION, DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, VICE MARIA ECHAVESTE, RESIGNED.