

those limited to his First Presbyterian Church. He was pastor of the First Presbyterian Church in Winston-Salem for over 25 years, but his ministry went far beyond the church in which he was the assigned minister. He was literally Forsyth County's minister.

He is widely respected in North Carolina, and it is a distinct honor for me to welcome him to the Senate and it is an honor for all of us to have him here. Dr. Burr, we thank you for all you have meant to North Carolina. Thank you.

Mr. HELMS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I join Senator FAIRCLOTH in extending our welcome and our appreciation to our distinguished guest Chaplain. I congratulate his son, Congressman BURR, for choosing such a fine father. I congratulate you, Dr. Burr, for having lucked out in having such a fine son. It is a pleasure to have you with us, and I hope you will come again, soon.

Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. NICKLES addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I join my colleagues and friends from North Carolina to not only congratulate the guest Chaplain but also his son, who is an outstanding leader in the House of Representatives.

VOLUNTARY CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, as I mentioned earlier, we are going to have two votes at 11 o'clock on campaign finance. One will be on the so-called McCain-Feingold amendment, as amended by the Snowe amendment yesterday, and the other one will be on the underlying bill that is called the Paycheck Protection Act. That is my bill. Maybe I misnamed the bill. Maybe I should have called it voluntary campaign contributions. I am going to speak on that just for a moment.

Mr. President, we are talking about campaign reform. I see there are charts on the floor—money is exploding, we need to ban soft money, we need to have more regulations of campaigns. I will tell my colleagues, I am willing to support campaign reforms, and maybe we can come up with different things we might be able to agree on, but I think a fundamental principle should be agreed upon at the outset, and that principle is this: No American should be compelled to contribute to a campaign against their will. No American. It is a fundamental principle.

We want to encourage people to contribute to campaigns, we want to encourage people to participate in the election process, but no one should be compelled to give. No one should have money taken out of their paycheck every month—against their will—to fund candidates who they don't agree with or to fund a philosophy that they are opposed to. Unfortunately, that

happens today, and it happens today to the tune of hundreds of millions of dollars.

Some of my colleagues have irritated me and almost impugned the integrity of Senators—in violation of the rules of the Senate that, incidentally, go all the way back to Thomas Jefferson. They said the purpose of this bill is a killer bill because anybody who supports that bill wants to kill campaign reform.

I am the author of that bill, and I take very strong exception to that statement. Granted, the New York Times said it, but the New York Times doesn't know this Senator. I am the author of that bill, and I sponsored this bill because a union member came to a town meeting in Owasso, OK, raised his hand and said, "I don't like my money being taken from me every month and being used for political purposes of which I totally disagree. I want to have a voice, I want to have a vote, and if they ask me, I would say no."

I told that person at that town meeting that I was going to work to make sure that his campaign contributions would be voluntary, and that is the purpose of this bill. It was not designed to kill McCain-Feingold. It was not designed to kill campaign reform.

I have stated time and time again, I am willing to try and work out a decent campaign reform bill, but it must be premised on voluntary contributions. That is fundamental. It is a basic American freedom, no one should be compelled or coerced to contribute to a campaign against their will. No one.

No one should be compelled to contribute to a campaign, period. It should be against the law. All we say in our bill is that all campaign contributions must be voluntary. Before money is taken out of a person's paycheck, he or she has to say yes. If they say no, it means no. After all, it is their money. It is not the union's money or somebody else's money; it is the individual's money.

Unfortunately, that is the situation today for millions of Americans. We are talking about hundreds of millions of dollars. There is a movement growing out in the States, and there is going to be a vote on an initiative in California to protect workers paychecks and ensure all contributions are voluntary. It is also happening in many other States. It should happen all across the country. Frankly, we should do it on the Federal level, because we regulate Federal elections; we protect the freedoms of all Americans. This is supposed to be the body that protects the United States Constitution.

How in the world did we even allow a system to start where someone can be compelled to contribute to a political campaign or cause against their will? That is wrong, we ought to fix it, and the way to fix it is to support the underlying bill.

I say vote against the McCain-Feingold amendment. Why? Because McCain-Feingold did not say in addi-

tion to the underlying bill they want to add the following. It said strike the voluntary contribution language, strike that language, and replace it with McCain-Feingold. McCain-Feingold eliminates soft money. Soft money is at least done voluntarily. They want to end soft money contributions but they want to continue to have forced campaign contributions from union members.

The language we drafted in this bill said it would be voluntary for employees of banks, it would be voluntary for employees of corporations, it would be voluntary for all employees—all employees. McCain-Feingold doesn't say, "Well, we'll take that language and we'll add to it." No, it says strike that language. McCain-Feingold is the killer. It says, "We don't want voluntary contributions but we will try and micromanage campaigns and what people can say in elections."

Some of those things in McCain-Feingold are pretty debatable on constitutional grounds. The Senator from Kentucky has done a good job in handling that debate. I want to say that all campaign contributions should be voluntary.

This is not an anti-union member provision. There is nothing further from the truth. This is a proworker bill. This allows every single member of a union to say yes or no to campaign contributions. It gives them a voice. There are millions of union members who get up every day and work hard, pay their taxes and union dues, and are rewarded with a gag order over how those dues—their wages—are spent on politics. That is not right.

If you go to a union hall and ask a bunch of union members, "Hey, do you think you should have the choice to be able to say whether or not your money goes for campaign contributions or not?" they will say, "Yes, I want that right."

Let's give them that right. That is not anti-union, it is prounion worker.

Unfortunately, some people say, "Oh, no, that's wrong; that's a killer bill; that is going to stop campaign reform." Why? Why is that a killer bill? Because organized labor bosses don't like it? Since when do they have a veto over this body? Since when do organized labor bosses say, "Wait a minute, we don't think campaign contributions should be voluntary. So if you adopt the Nickles-Lott bill for paycheck protection—voluntary campaign contributions—we don't have a bill." Why? Because President Clinton says he will veto it? Why? Because a few leaders in organized labor don't like it? Why? Because organized labor bosses put in hundreds of millions of dollars in campaigns for the Democratic Party? Do they have a blank check veto over this body, over this Congress? Why, I should hope not. I would hope that one group cannot just say, "Well, we don't like that bill. Therefore, if you add to that bill, no deal." And that is basically what is happening.

I strongly disagree with that position. I strongly believe that all Americans should have the right to contribute to campaigns; no one should be compelled against their will to contribute to political causes and campaigns.

So, Mr. President, at 11 o'clock, we are going to vote on McCain-Feingold, which is a substitute amendment, which strikes the underlying voluntary campaign contribution language. I hope that we will defeat McCain-Feingold. Then I hope that we will pass—regardless of what happens to McCain-Feingold, the underlying bill, the Paycheck Protection Act, the voluntary contributions act.

I hope that my colleagues, regardless of what happens on McCain-Feingold, will vote for voluntary campaign contributions for all Americans. That is what the second vote is about. I hope that we will vote for it and we can get cloture.

I yield the floor.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. FEINGOLD. I yield myself such time as I require.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

PAYCHECK PROTECTION ACT

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, we are reaching another stage in the campaign finance reform debate today. I certainly sympathize with the Senator from Oklahoma when he is concerned about some ways in which his bill has been characterized. I have had the experience here on the floor this week of having the McCain-Feingold bill compared, first, to a human rights violation and, also, as very similar to the Alien and Sedition Acts.

So, clearly, sometimes the rhetoric gets a little carried away. But what is really going on here today in the U.S. Senate just has to make the American people shake their heads. How can they look at this and not wonder what is going on? They can see a clear bipartisan majority in favor of campaign finance reform; and the bipartisan majority isn't for the majority leader's antilabor bill.

The majority support that has been demonstrated over and over again this week is for the McCain-Feingold bill. I think people in Wisconsin, in particular, have to be shaking their heads, because the one thing I have learned in 15 years of representing the people of Wisconsin is that they really dislike partisanship.

They understand the need for a two-party system. They like the two-party system. They understand the fact that you talk as Republicans and Democrats at election time, because you have to have parties and you have to have an election, but they really, really do not like it when you keep talking and acting like the whole issue is Republican versus Democrat after the election.

What they want is for us to work together. What they like best is when we can come together as Republicans and Democrats in bipartisan coalitions.

Mr. President, as I have gone to every county in Wisconsin every year I've been in the Senate and have held town meetings, and when I just mention the fact that I am working with a Republican, the Senator from Arizona, before they even know what the topic is, people applaud, because they crave bipartisan cooperation in this country.

Mr. President, the American people are shaking their heads because they know this is a very unusual bipartisan coalition. The Senators involved in this issue know the details of the bill in a way that maybe many Americans do not know. So they did not just applaud when they heard the title; they have looked at it very carefully and they have considered it and shown this week that the majority of the U.S. Senate wants this change in our campaign finance laws, and they want it now.

So, Mr. President, what we have is a bipartisan majority and a partisan minority. We have Republicans and Democrats together, at least 52 of them, in favor of the bill and a smaller group from one party opposing the bill. Mr. President, we have a bipartisan agreement on the merits of the bill, and we have a partisan desire to kill it.

Mr. President, we have a bipartisan majority of the Senate that understands that this issue obviously isn't just about union dues. This is the most absurd proposition. The entire range of things we have seen about the campaigns—the soft money, the coffees, the foreign contributions, the labor unions, the independent groups, the corporations—the majority of this body knows all of these things are part of the big money problem. The partisan minority says the whole problem is unions, and not even unions, just how they obtain their dues.

The fact is, the bill that the majority leader brought forth is nothing but a poison pill. Now, maybe that was not his intent. You know, if you give somebody a poison pill by accident, it still kills them. So, I am not suggesting this was the intent. It is the fact. If that provision becomes the heart of this bill, it kills the bill. I am happy to say it is almost irrelevant, because a majority of this body has made it clear this week that it does not support having that be a part of the McCain-Feingold bill. That is one thing we achieved this week.

So, Mr. President, what we have here today is a bipartisan desire, a passion for reform and for change, and a partisan insistence that we do absolutely nothing, that we do nothing.

Now, one argument that has been made, Mr. President, is that, even though there are obviously some Republicans in support of the bill, it really isn't a bipartisan bill, that somehow, because of the nature of the Republican cosponsors, it isn't a biparti-

san bill. This has been said over and over again.

It was said when they said we only had two Republicans; then they said it when we only had three Republicans; and then they said it when we only had four Republicans—it is not really a bipartisan bill. Now, with seven Republicans and all the Democrats in unanimity, they still say this is really not a bipartisan bill.

Well, who are these Republicans? Are they renegades? Are they coconspirators with the Democratic Party? Are they secret allies of organized labor? Who are these seven Republicans?

Well, one, the lead author, is the chairman of the Commerce Committee, somebody who is often mentioned as a Presidential candidate. Another is the chairman of the Governmental Affairs Committee, who is also mentioned as a Presidential candidate. There is a Senator from Pennsylvania from the majority party who supports this, a distinguished member of the Judiciary Committee and a former chairman of the Intelligence Committee who supports this bill.

There is the chairman of the Environment and Public Works Committee, the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island, one of the most distinguished Members of this body. He has indicated, by his votes this week, that he supports change. The chairman of the Labor Committee supports this bill. And, finally, two individuals who are not yet chairmen but who are the two Senators from the leading reform State in this Nation, the State of Maine, Senator COLLINS and Senator SNOWE, Republicans, but people who care about this country enough to join together with the Democrats to try to pass campaign finance reform.

So let me just return to the first name—JOHN MCCAIN. JOHN MCCAIN's name on this bill alone obviously makes it a bipartisan bill. But, more importantly, the senior Senator from Arizona knows that, even though this obviously must cause him partisan heartburn, he always does what is best for this country. So, he has taken enormous heat on this issue.

This is surely a bipartisan effort and a strong one. Mr. President, what we have shown this week is that we have a working majority, not just on paper, but a group that will vote together as a block for reform. We won vote after vote this week. The majority leader of the U.S. Senate tried to table our bill once, twice, and three times, and he lost every time.

How often does the majority leader of the U.S. Senate lose with 55 Members in his caucus? I do not think we have had this few Democrats in decades in this body. How does the majority leader not win on any of those votes unless there is a clear bipartisan majority in favor of change? So my point, Mr. President, is we are winning and the opposition is losing. To be sure, it is a long, hard road. The senior Senator from Arizona has warned me about that time and again.