

should go down, or whether we should fence off one part of the bill—that discussion, and a fairly close vote tomorrow, will come about because people know the Wellstone amendment is unconstitutional. If it weren't so, we would not be having that debate. That is going to be the thing that is unspoken tomorrow when we get to that debate.

I want to talk for a moment about my colleague from North Carolina, who is a very good lawyer. He and I had the opportunity, during the impeachment hearings, to work together, along with Senator LEAHY and others. I saw how good he is. My colleague came to the floor this evening and talked about the constitutionality of Snowe-Jeffords. I respect what he has to say. Again, I point out, though, that this is the same Member of the Senate—not much more than 24 hours ago—who came to the floor and basically said the Wellstone amendment was unconstitutional. I understand that his comments tonight were about Snowe-Jeffords; but the problem is that title II is no longer Snowe-Jeffords, it is Snowe-Jeffords-Wellstone, and it contains that provision which Senator EDWARDS said is unconstitutional, or certainly implied it. I read it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

My colleague from North Carolina went through the tests that have been laid down by the Supreme Court. There are tests as to whether or not you can basically infringe on the first amendment. The courts will look at any restriction on the first amendment from a strict scrutiny point of view. One of the tests is, is there a compelling State interest? In other words, the burden upon someone asserting that it is constitutional to prohibit speech. That person has to prove to a court's satisfaction that there is a compelling State interest to do that, to restrict that speech, because the presumption is you can't restrict speech. I talked this afternoon about that.

There were some areas where the courts have acknowledged that it is constitutional to restrict speech, but they are very narrow. They have held that it has to be a compelling State interest, and the burden of proof is on those who assert the constitutionality. It also has to be narrowly tailored. In other words, when the language is written to restrict speech, it has to be narrowly tailored.

I have failed to hear any discussion of any convincing nature of what the compelling State interest is. What is the compelling State interest that permits the U.S. Congress to say that within 60 days before an election we will stifle—shut off—free speech? What compelling State interest is there, and how is it narrowly drawn for Congress to say no speech within 60 days that mentions a candidate's name? How is that narrow? That is a sledgehammer that comes down on the first amendment and shatters it. It is certainly not narrowly tailored. And certainly

the proponents of the constitutionality of this provision have not shown there is any compelling State interest.

Now, the Court talked, in Buckley, about the appearance of corruption. Proponents of this constitutionality provision have made the flat assumption and assertion that there is an appearance of corruption. Yet that is all they say. I don't know what the evidence is of that appearance of corruption. They made the flat out assertion that there is corruption, or there is the appearance of corruption, and that gives them authority to write this type of legislation. I think they have failed in their burden of proof. Again, I state what the law is. The law is that they have a burden of proof.

Again, in conclusion, my amendment will strike article II of the bill. Article II prohibits what I believe is constitutionally protected free speech on TV, within the last 60 days of an election, by labor unions, corporations and, most importantly, by all outside interest groups, by all groups of U.S. citizens who have come together to talk in the one way that is the most effective; that is, on television. It bans that. There is no compelling State interest to do it. It is clearly unconstitutional.

My friend and colleague from Maine also made another interesting comment. She said, "I want to control my own campaign." I am sure the Presiding Officer thinks the same way. I can tell you I think the same way. I want to run my own campaign. I have had a lot of experience doing it. I have won some and lost some. I want to run my own campaign. She also said that this debate should be between the candidates themselves. Debate goes back and forth on TV.

I sort of agree with that, too. At least I understand what she means by that. You run against someone and you want to have that debate between the two of you. You start to get nervous when someone else gets involved in the debate. They may be trying to help you or your opponent. You do not know what they are doing. Sometimes they do not know what they are doing. I understand where she is coming from.

This is not an exclusive club we are talking about. There should be no walls built up in the political arena to keep people out. This is America. This is the United States. We do have a first amendment.

One of the basic beliefs of our founders was that public discussion of issues is essential to democracy. They did not have TV in those days, obviously. They did not have radio. The main method of communication was the printed press, posters being put up, or speeches directly given and directly heard, but the principle is the same. The more people you can involve in political discussion, the better it is.

There can be no walls built around the political arena where we say no one else can enter except the candidates. No one can participate except the candidates. No one can talk about issues

in relationship to candidates, except the candidates.

That is just not what we do in the United States. That is not what this country is about. That is not how our political debates should take place. In essence, in a very revealing comment, my friend and my colleague from Maine certainly implied that. That is part of the problem with the way this bill is currently crafted.

This is the United States. I know many times when our campaigns drag on and on and they get pretty messy, and they get pretty rough, a lot of people say: Gee, why don't we do it the way this country does or that country, such and such a country. They do not mess around. They call an election in 6 weeks. They were strict when you could be on TV. They have their election, and it is over. Much as we might long for that sometimes when our campaigns drag on, or when Presidential campaigns start basically a couple months after one Presidential election is over and Senate races start several years in advance and House races seem to never stop, much as we long for that tranquility and the order, if we really thought about it, I do not think we would really want it.

As long as the Wellstone amendment stays in the bill, clearly this bill is going to be held to be unconstitutional.

What is different about us and other countries is our first amendment. It is our first amendment that is at issue. Many countries do not have the equivalent of our first amendment that protects political speech, that protects free speech. We do and we are much better for it. Our political discussion is much better for it and it is more informed.

We are different. I hope when Members of the Senate think about this tonight and prepare to vote tomorrow, they will remember the importance of the first amendment. They will vote for the DeWine amendment. They will vote to make this a better bill. They will vote to give this bill a much better chance of being held to be constitutional.

It is not just a question of the Constitution; it is also a question of public policy. Putting aside the constitutional issue, I do not think we want to be in a position where this Congress says, basically as the thought police in this country, political speech police, that within 60 days of the election we are going to dramatically restrict who can speak in the only way that is effective in many States, and that is to be on TV. I do not think we want to do that, Mr. President.

I thank my colleagues, and I thank the Chair.

CAMPAIGN TAX CREDIT

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, as chairman of the Rules Committee during the 105th Congress, I presided over numerous hearings on campaign finance reform and I filed two comprehensive bills on this subject. And,

just like my colleagues over the years in the course of my four Senate races, I have gained a firsthand familiarity with campaign finance issues. The Senate can take pride in this debate, while issues regarding the first amendment have been center stage, it seems to me there is another fundamental issue we should consider.

One of our aims during this great debate should be to encourage greater citizen participation in elections. Citizens are the backbone of our democracy and should be given encouragement to participate in every way in the elective process.

What are the means by which we can encourage a greater role for the average citizen? I believe one method is a \$100 tax credit for contributions made to House and Senate candidates. I propose this tax credit be available only to single persons with an adjusted gross income at or below \$50,000. For married couples, in order to avoid exacting a "marriage penalty," a married couple filing jointly could claim a total of \$200 in tax credits.

For various reasons, the wealthy are already involved in politics, but there has been a declining interest in campaigns for those at the other end of the spectrum. This credit would encourage broader participation by moderate and lower income voters to balance the greater ability of special interests to participate in the process.

There is precedent for such a tax credit. Until 1986, there was a \$50 tax credit for contributions to political campaigns. According to IRS data, when Congress repealed the political contributions tax credit, "a significant percentage of persons claiming the credit have sufficiently high incomes to make contributions in after tax dollars, without the benefit of the tax credit."

My proposal would contrast with the previous tax credit because it would cap the eligible income levels to ensure it is not exclusively the wealthy who take advantage of it.

I think this is an issue that should be addressed in this campaign finance bill. However, because of the constitutional prerogatives of the House of Representatives, I merely bring this issue to your attention now, with the expectation I will raise it again in the context of a reconciliation bill that may be forthcoming.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, during yesterday's campaign finance debate, I referred to a number of businesses that support a campaign finance reform proposal. I meant to say that top executives or chief executive officers of those businesses support the reform proposal.

OIL EXPLORATION IN THE ARCTIC NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, my colleague from Alaska, Senator MURKOWSKI, and I just attended a press conference concerning exploration in the

coastal plain of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge.

In attendance were: James P. Hoffa, International Brotherhood of Teamsters; Michael Sacco, Maritime Trade Department, AFL-CIO; Terry O'Sullivan, Building Trades Department; Martin J. Maddaloni, United Association of Journeymen and Apprentices of the Plumbing and Pipe Fitting Industry; Joseph Hunt, International Association of Bridge, Structural, Ornamental and Reinforcing Iron Workers; Frank Hanley, International Union of Operating Engineers; Larry O'Toole, Marine Engineers' Beneficial Association; James Henry, Transportation Institute; and Michael McKay, American Maritime Officers Service.

I ask unanimous consent that the statement made by Michael Sacco of the Maritime Trades Department of the AFL-CIO be printed in the RECORD for my colleagues to read. It offers great insight into the reasons why working men and women throughout the country support oil and gas exploration in the coastal plain.

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

STATEMENT OF MICHAEL SACCO, MTD PRESIDENT

With increasing energy problems throughout the United States, Americans are looking for new ways to meet the growing demand for energy products and ensure the continued economic expansion we have enjoyed over the past decade.

Only one location promises to help America meet its energy needs while providing good-paying jobs to American workers—the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge.

By opening ANWR, the United States can increase domestic oil production, reduce our reliance on foreign sources of oil, and create hundreds of thousands of new jobs for American workers.

ANWR will be explored and drilled by American workers—the oil transported through U.S.-built pipelines—refined and distributed by domestic facilities—and its by-products used by U.S. energy producers and U.S. consumers.

These jobs will help keep the economic engine of this country running.

Many of our brothers and sisters in maritime labor will crew the growing fleet of environmentally safe, double-hulled, U.S.-flagged tankers that will carry the oil from Alaska.

These vessels will be American-owned—built by Americans in American shipyards—and serviced and repaired in American yards.

In times of national emergency, the U.S. Merchant Marine is the first to enter the war zone to deliver supplies. America's military depends on the ability to project its power anywhere in the world.

That means we need sealift which is capable of quickly transporting fuel and supplies across thousands of miles.

As we learned in Operation Desert Shield/Desert Storm, U.S.-flag ships, American seafarers employed on those ships, and the American shipyard workers that build the vessels, are vital parts of our sealift capability.

Opening ANWR to development also will enable our U.S.-flag Merchant Marine to grow and help expand our shipyard industrial base—both of which serve valuable military purposes.

We've shown that opening ANWR will be done in a responsible, environmentally sound way.

Since the opening of Alaska's North Slope, nature and development have safely co-existed. And today's technology makes it possible to produce oil in a less-invasive and more environmentally friendly manner.

The Maritime Trades Department stands with the Building Trades, major oil producers, the business community and all the members of JobPower in calling on Congress to open ANWR.

America will benefit for years to come.

TRIBUTE TO ROWLAND EVANS

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, today in our Nation's Capital funeral services were held for Rowland Evans, a lifetime journalist of international acclaim. This magnificently conducted service, attend by an extraordinary gathering of family, friends, and peers, preserved forever the man's extraordinary love of family, journalism, and service to country in the uniform of the U.S. Marines in combat operations in the Pacific during World War II.

The Commandant of the Marine Corps, General Jones, officiated in presenting the American Flag to the family to conclude this deeply moving service.

Rowland Evans was an astute observer of the values of our federal system of government, but his great fascination was with the political arena—the centerpiece being those who competed for and won or lost elective offices.

His partner—his close friend—for over a quarter of a century, Robert Novak, rose to the challenge of chronicling with sensitivity, humor and insight his many lifetime achievements.

Senator KENNEDY, Senator SNOWE, and I were privileged to be in attendance at the services at Christ's Church, Georgetown. We join in asking unanimous consent to have printed in today's RECORD the proceedings of the U.S. Senate, a complex institution, which Rowland Evans keenly understood, the eulogy by Robert Novak.

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

EULOGY BY MR. ROBERT NOVAK

Having spend his life in journalism writing thousands of columns and literally millions of words, Rowland Evans well knew how hard it was to get things exactly right. So it was with his well-meaning obituaries last Saturday.

The AP report said he had been in poor health for years. In truth, until diagnosed with cancer last summer, it could be said he was the healthiest 79-year-old on the planet. Even for the past nine months, he was no invalid.

His oncologist said he had never quite seen a cancer patient like Rowly Evans. Two weeks before he died he was playing squash, appearing on television, climbing the mountain at his place in Culpepper, even making a deal to finally achieve his long-time desire to buy the top of the mountain and complete ownership of it. As he entered the hospital with two days of life remaining and the bleak options were laid before him, he interrupted the doctor to talk about his chances