

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 deprecations during the 1950s McCarthyism 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 exist 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.