am proud to be an original cosponsor of this bill, and I am pleased that this issue is finally getting the attention of the full House of Representatives.

Fort Bliss, which is located in my district, trains all the soldiers who provide air and missile defense for our military. Also, and perhaps most importantly for the purposes of this bill, most of the Patriot batteries are located at Fort Bliss.

As such, the increased funds for PAC–3 technologies will directly affect our soldiers. The Fort Bliss air defenders will be using these technologies to better defend our military and our allies. Our soldiers at Fort Bliss are pleased that we are working to provide the resources necessary to move PAC–3 into the field as effectively and as quickly as possible.

The bill includes $15 million to accelerate completion of the PAC–3 remote launch capability. This technology will allow the Patriot soldiers to place their missiles and launchers further out in front of the radar and the battery, which in turn expands the battle space. This will allow each Patriot unit to defend a larger area.

Second, the bill provides $41 million to allow for an increased rate of production for PAC–3. This will move PAC–3 missiles out into the field more rapidly so that every Patriot unit will have the PAC–3 capability.

At the beginning of the Gulf War conflict, our Patriot soldiers had only three PAC–2 missiles, missiles that were capable of defending against other ballistic missiles. Not only were there few PAC–2 missiles, but PAC–2 could only achieve missile kill against the incoming ballistic missile and not kill the actual warhead. As a result, some diverted incoming missiles caused collateral damage in civilian areas.

PAC–3 will have hit-to-kill capability, eliminating the fear of hitting other areas and destroying offensive missiles and their warheads which could include weapons of mass destruction. The funds we provide today will equip our Patriot units more quickly with this technology.

Third, the bill provides $40 million for tests of PAC–3 and Navy Area. Our air defenders will feel more comfortable knowing that these technologies have been sufficiently tested with live fire tests against longer range missiles.

Madam Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPENCE), the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON), the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. PICKETT) and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) for their bipartisan work to get this bill to the House floor today. I strongly urge all of my colleagues to support this legislation in a bipartisan manner.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. FOWLER), one of the leading advocates for a strong defense in our country.

Mrs. FOWLER. Madam Speaker, I rise to commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON), my good friend, and the other authors of this bill for their hard work in putting together a measure that will help address critical threats that will soon be facing our service personnel in the Persian Gulf.

The Iran Missile Protection Act would authorize the shifting of $147 million in Defense Department funds to proceed with the most promising technologies available for enhancing theater missile defense capabilities. This step is necessary because recent intelligence indicates that Iran, thanks to Russian technology transfers, is much closer to developing a medium-range ballistic missile capable of threatening U.S. forces and regional allies that was previously believed to be the case.

This bill would pursue technologies that are executable in fiscal year 1998 and provide the most immediate return on investment. It received strong support in the House Committee on National Security and merits the approval of the House. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2786.

Mr. PICKETT. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, first of all, let me again thank the leadership of our committee. The gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPENCE) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) are outstanding leaders working in a true bipartisan manner.

Let me also thank Ron Dellums, who was our ranking member up until a few short weeks ago. He, too, lent his support from the time we introduced the original legislation until the time it appears on the floor, and I appreciate his role in that process as well. I also thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. PICKETT) and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) for their tireless effort on the other side.

Madam Speaker, let me also thank the Speaker of the House, who agreed to move this legislation through, and our colleagues in the other body for their commitment to move this legislation off the desk and get it passed in the Senate as well, and to the appropriators for their commitment to fund these priorities.

Madam Speaker, when we look at what is really going to happen in terms of this legislation, I think this chart perhaps sums it up best. We cannot get into actual distances and capabilities because that is classified information.

But if we look at the Patriot system, which all of America knows was the workhorse in Desert Storm, and its capability for knocking down Scuds, the capability of the Patriot system against the kind of threat that Iran will have 1 year from now means the Patriot could not handle this at all. Patriot has no capability against a 1,000 kilometer DBM threat. None whatsoever. If we just had the original Patriot system, we could do nothing. We would be shooting missiles in the air with no real capability of knocking those offensive missiles down.

By enhancing the Patriot system as we have done to improve it to become the PAC–2, this green area shows the approximate area that this missile would be effective, in these two concentric circles. From a distance standpoint, that is the approximate distance that PAC–2 upgrade would give us.

When we implement the provisions of this legislation, we provide for the enhanced radar, the interoperability, the use of existing systems interconnected, the blue area is the result that we get. So my colleagues can see that we are much better able to protect our troops and protect our allies. We have a much greater distance where we can take out that offensive missile while it is still over the country that is shooting at us, and if there is any hostile material in the warhead of that missile, it will rain down on their own citizens and not on our troops or allies.

Madam Speaker, this legislation is critically important. It will give us a short-term capability in fiscal year 1998 to give enhanced protection for our troops and for our allies around the world. I thank my colleagues for their support.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PICKETT. Madam Speaker, I have no further requests for time. I urge passage of the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2786, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read:

''A bill to authorize additional appropriations for the Department of Defense for ballistic missile defenses and other measures to counter the emerging threat posed to the United States and its allies by the accelerated development and deployment of ballistic missiles by nations hostile to United States interests.''.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CAMPAIGN REFORM AND ELECTION INTEGRITY ACT OF 1998

Mr. THOMAS. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3581) to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to reform the financing of campaigns for election for Federal office, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3581

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Campaign Reform and Election Integrity Act of 1998''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

TITLE I—VOLUNTARY CONTRIBUTIONS

Sec. 101. Prohibiting involuntary use of funds of employees of corporations and other employers and members of unions and organizations for political activities.

TITLE II—BANNING NONCITIZEN CONTRIBUTIONS

Sec. 201. Prohibiting noncitizen individuals from making contributions in connection with Federal elections.

Sec. 202. Increase in penalty for violations of ban.

TITLE III—IMPROVING REPORTING AND ENFORCEMENT

Sec. 301. Expediting reporting of information.

Sec. 302. Expansion of type of information reported.

Sec. 303. Promoting effective enforcement by Federal Election Commission.

Sec. 304. Banning acceptance of cash contributions greater than $100.

Sec. 305. Protecting confidentiality of small contributions by employees of corporations and members of labor organizations.

Sec. 306. Disclosure and reports relating to polling by telephone or electronic device.

TITLE IV—EXCESSIVE SPENDING BY CANDIDATES FROM PERSONAL FUNDS

Sec. 401. Modification of limitations on contributions when candidates spend or contribute large amounts of personal funds.

TITLE V—ELECTION INTEGRITY

Subtitle A—Voter Eligibility Verification Pilot Program

Sec. 501. Voter eligibility pilot confirmation program.

Sec. 502. Authorization of appropriations.

Subtitle B—Other Measures to Protect Election Integrity

Sec. 511. Requiring inclusion of citizenship check-off and information with all applications for voter registration.

Sec. 512. Improving administration of voter removal programs.

TITLE VI—REVISION AND INDEXING OF CERTAIN CONTRIBUTION LIMITS AND PENALTIES

Sec. 601. Increase in certain contribution limits.

Sec. 602. Indexing limits on certain contributions.

Sec. 603. Indexing amount of penalties and fines.

TITLE VII—RESTRICTIONS ON SOFT MONEY

Sec. 701. Ban on soft money of national political parties and candidates; ban on use of soft money by State political parties for Federal election activity.

Sec. 702. Ban on disbursements of soft money by foreign nationals

Sec. 703. Enforcement of spending limit on presidential and vice presidential candidates who receive public financing.

Sec. 704. Conspiracy to violate presidential campaign spending limits.

TITLE VIII—DISCLOSURE OF CERTAIN COMMUNICATIONS

Sec. 801. Disclosure of certain communications.

TITLE IX—EFFECTIVE DATE

Sec. 901. Effective date.

TITLE I—VOLUNTARY CONTRIBUTIONS

SEC. 101. PROHIBITING INVOLUNTARY USE OF FUNDS OF EMPLOYEES OF CORPORATIONS AND OTHER EMPLOYERS AND MEMBERS OF UNIONS AND ORGANIZATIONS FOR POLITICAL ACTIVITIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 316 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 441b) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(c)(1)(A) Except with the separate, prior, written, voluntary authorization of the individual involved, it shall be unlawful—

''(i) for any national bank or corporation described in this section to collect from or assess a stockholder or employee any portion of any dues, initiation fee, or other payment made as a condition of employment which will be used for political activity in which the national bank or corporation is engaged; and

''(ii) for any labor organization described in this section to collect from or assess a member or nonmember any portion of any dues, initiation fee, or other payment which will be used for political activity in which the labor organization is engaged.

''(B) An authorization described in subparagraph (A) shall remain in effect until revoked and may be revoked at any time. Each entity collecting from or assessing amounts from an individual with an authorization in effect under such subparagraph shall provide the individual with a statement that the individual may at any time revoke the authorization.

''(2)(A) Prior to the beginning of any 12-month period (as determined by the corporation), each corporation described in this section shall provide each of its shareholders with a notice containing the following:

''(i) The proposed aggregate amount for disbursements for political activities by the corporation for the period.

''(ii) The individual's applicable percentage and applicable pro rata amount for the period.

''(iii) A form that the individual may complete and return to the corporation to indicate the individual's objection to the disbursement of amounts for political activities during the period.

''(B) It shall be unlawful for a corporation to which subparagraph (A) applies to make disbursements for political activities during the 12-month period described in such subparagraph in an amount greater than—

''(i) the proposed aggregate amount for such disbursements for the period, as specified in the notice provided under subparagraph (A); reduced by

''(ii) the sum of the applicable pro rata amounts for such period of all shareholders who return the form described in subparagraph (A)(iii) to the corporation prior to the beginning of the period.

''(C) In this paragraph, the following definitions shall apply:

''(i) The term 'applicable percentage' means, with respect to a shareholder of a corporation, the amount (expressed as a percentage) equal to the number of shares of the corporation (within a particular class or type of stock) owned by the shareholder at the time the notice described in subparagraph (A) is provided, divided by the aggregate number of such shares owned by all shareholders of the corporation at such time.

''(ii) The term 'applicable pro rata amount' means, with respect to a shareholder for a 12-month period, the product of the shareholder's applicable percentage for the period and the proposed aggregate amount for disbursements for political activities by the corporation for the period, as specified in the notice provided under subparagraph (A).

''(3) For purposes of this subsection, the term 'political activity' means any activity carried out for the purpose of influencing (in whole or in part) any election for Federal office, influencing the consideration or outcome of any Federal legislation or the issuance or outcome of any Federal regulations, or educating individuals about candidates for election for Federal office or any Federal legislation, law, or regulations.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to amounts collected or assessed on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

TITLE II—BANNING NONCITIZEN CONTRIBUTIONS

SEC. 201. PROHIBITING NONCITIZEN INDIVIDUALS FROM MAKING CONTRIBUTIONS IN CONNECTION WITH FEDERAL ELECTIONS.

(a) PROHIBITION APPLICABLE TO ALL NONCITIZENS.—Section 319(b)(2) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 441e(b)(2)) is amended by striking ''and who is not lawfully admitted'' and all that follows and inserting a period.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to contributions or expenditures made on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 202. INCREASE IN PENALTY FOR VIOLATIONS OF BAN.

(a) APPLICATION OF PENALTY TO FOREIGN NATIONALS AND CITIZENS WHO SOLICIT OR ACCEPT FOREIGN PAYMENTS.—Section 319 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 441e) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (b) as subsection (c); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (a) the following new subsection:

''(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the amount or duration of any penalty, fine, or sentence imposed on any person who violates subsection (a) shall be 200 percent of the amount or duration which is otherwise provided for under this Act or any other applicable law.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to violations occurring on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

TITLE III—IMPROVING REPORTING AND ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 301. EXPEDITING REPORTING OF INFORMATION.

(a) PERMITTING CANDIDATES TO ELECT TO FILE REPORTS FOR CONTRIBUTIONS AND EXPENDITURES MADE WITHIN 90 DAYS OF ELECTION WITHIN 24 HOURS AND POST ON INTERNET.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 304(a) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 434(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(12)(A) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, any authorized political committee of a candidate may notify the Commission that, with respect to each contribution received or expenditure made by the committee during the period which begins on the 90th day before an election and ends at the time the polls close for such election, the candidate elects to file any information required to be filed with the Commission under this section with respect to such contribution or expenditure within 24 hours after the receipt of the contribution or the making of the expenditure.

''(B) The Commission shall make the information filed under this paragraph available on the Internet immediately upon receipt.''.

(2) INTERNET DEFINED.—Section 301(19) of such Act (2 U.S.C. 431(19)) is amended to read as follows:

''(19) The term 'Internet' means the international computer network of both Federal and non-Federal interoperable packet-switched data networks.''.

(b) REQUIRING REPORTS FOR ALL CONTRIBUTIONS MADE WITHIN 20 Days of Election; Requiring Reports to Be Made Within 24 Hours.—Section 304(a)(6)(A) of such Act (2 U.S.C. 434(a)(6)(A)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''after the 20th day, but more than 48 hours before any election'' and inserting ''during the period which begins on the 20th day before an election and ends at the time the polls close for such election''; and

(2) by striking ''48 hours'' the second place it appears and inserting the following: ''24 hours (or, if earlier, by midnight of the day on which the contribution is deposited)''.

(c) REQUIRING ACTUAL RECEIPT OF CERTAIN INDEPENDENT EXPENDITURE REPORTS WITHIN 24 Hours.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 304(c)(2) of such Act (2 U.S.C. 434(c)(2)) is amended in the matter following subparagraph (C)—

(A) by striking ''shall be reported'' and inserting ''shall be filed''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new sentence: ''Notwithstanding subsection (a)(5), the time at which the statement under this subsection is received by the Secretary, the Commission, or any other recipient to whom the notification is required to be sent shall be considered the time of filing of the statement with the recipient.''.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 304(a)(5) of such Act (2 U.S.C. 434(a)(5)) is amended by striking ''or (4)(A)(ii)'' and inserting ''or (4)(A)(ii), or the second sentence of subsection (c)(2)''.

(d) REQUIRING REPORTS OF CERTAIN FILERS TO BE TRANSMITTED ELECTRONICALLY; CERTIFICATION OF PRIVATE SECTOR SOFTWARE.—Section 304(a)(11)(A) of such Act (2 U.S.C. 434(a)(11)(A)) is amended by striking the period at the end and inserting the following: '', except that in the case of a report submitted by a person who reports an aggregate amount of contributions or expenditures (as the case may be) in all reports filed with respect to the election involved (taking into account the period covered by the report) in an amount equal to or greater than $50,000, the Commission shall require the report to be filed and preserved by such means, format, or method. The Commission shall certify (on an ongoing basis) private sector computer software which may be used for filing reports by such means, format, or method.''.

(e) CHANGE IN CERTAIN REPORTING FROM A CALENDAR YEAR BASIS TO AN ELECTION CYCLE BASIS.—Section 304(b) of such Act (2 U.S.C. 434(b)) is amended by inserting ''(or election cycle, in the case of an authorized committee of a candidate for Federal office)'' after ''calendar year'' each place it appears in paragraphs (2), (3), (4), (6), and (7).

SEC. 302. EXPANSION OF TYPE OF INFORMATION REPORTED.

(a) REQUIRING RECORD KEEPING AND REPORT OF SECONDARY PAYMENTS BY CAMPAIGN COMMITTEES.—

(1) REPORTING.—Section 304(b)(5)(A) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 434(b)(5)(A)) is amended by striking the semicolon at the end and inserting the following: '', and, if such person in turn makes expenditures which aggregate $500 or more in an election cycle to other persons (not including employees) who provide goods or services to the candidate or the candidate's authorized committees, the name and address of such other persons, together with the date, amount, and purpose of such expenditures;''.

(2) RECORD KEEPING.—Section 302 of such Act (2 U.S.C. 432) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(j) A person described in section 304(b)(5)(A) who makes expenditures which aggregate $500 or more in an election cycle to other persons (not including employees) who provide goods or services to a candidate or a candidate's authorized committees shall provide to a political committee the information necessary to enable the committee to report the information described in such section.''.

(3) NO EFFECT ON OTHER REPORTS.—Nothing in the amendments made by this subsection may be construed to affect the terms of any other recordkeeping or reporting requirements applicable to candidates or political committees under title III of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971.

(b) INCLUDING REPORT ON CUMULATIVE CONTRIBUTIONS AND EXPENDITURES IN POST ELECTION REPORTS.—Section 304(a)(7) of such Act (2 U.S.C. 434(a)(7)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''(7)'' and inserting ''(7)(A)''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(B) In the case of any report required to be filed by this subsection which is the first report required to be filed after the date of an election, the report shall include a statement of the total contributions received and expenditures made as of the date of the election.''.

(c) INCLUDING INFORMATION ON AGGREGATE CONTRIBUTIONS IN REPORT ON ITEMIZED CONTRIBUTIONS.—Section 304(b)(3) of such Act (2 U.S.C. 434(b)(3)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by inserting after ''such contribution'' the following: ''and the total amount of all such contributions made by such person with respect to the election involved''; and

(2) in subparagraph (B), by inserting after ''such contribution'' the following: ''and the total amount of all such contributions made by such committee with respect to the election involved''.

SEC. 303. PROMOTING EFFECTIVE ENFORCEMENT BY FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION.

(a) REQUIRING FEC TO PROVIDE WRITTEN RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Title III of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 431 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 308 the following new section:

''OTHER WRITTEN RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS

''SEC. 308A. (a) PERMITTING RESPONSES.—In addition to issuing advisory opinions under section 308, the Commission shall issue written responses pursuant to this section with respect to a written request concerning the application of this Act, chapter 95 or chapter 96 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, a rule or regulation prescribed by the Commission, or an advisory opinion issued by the Commission under section 308, with respect to a specific transaction or activity by the person, if the Commission finds the application of the Act, chapter, rule, regulation, or advisory opinion to the transaction or activity to be clear and unambiguous.

''(b) PROCEDURE FOR RESPONSE.—

''(1) ANALYSIS BY STAFF.—The staff of the Commission shall analyze each request submitted under this section. If the staff believes that the standard described in subsection (a) is met with respect to the request, the staff shall circulate a statement to that effect together with a draft response to the request to the members of the Commission.

''(2) ISSUANCE OF RESPONSE.—Upon the expiration of the 3-day period beginning on the date the statement and draft response is circulated (excluding weekends or holidays), the Commission shall issue the response, unless during such period any member of the Commission objects to issuing the response.

''(c) EFFECT OF RESPONSE.—

''(1) SAFE HARBOR.—Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, any person who relies upon any provision or finding of a written response issued under this section and who acts in good faith in accordance with the provisions and findings of such response shall not, as a result of any such act, be subject to any sanction provided by this Act or by chapter 95 or chapter 96 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

''(2) NO RELIANCE BY OTHER PARTIES.—Any written response issued by the Commission under this section may only be relied upon by the person involved in the specific transaction or activity with respect to which such response is issued, and may not be applied by the Commission with respect to any other person or used by the Commission for enforcement or regulatory purposes.

''(d) PUBLICATION OF REQUESTS AND RESPONSES.—The Commission shall make public any request for a written response made, and the responses issued, under this section. In carrying out this subsection, the Commission may not make public the identity of any person submitting a request for a written response unless the person specifically authorizes to Commission to do so.

''(e) COMPILATION OF INDEX.—The Commission shall compile, publish, and regularly update a complete and detailed index of the responses issued under this section through which responses may be found on the basis of the subjects included in the responses.''.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 307(a)(7) of such Act (2 U.S.C. 437d(a)(7)) is amended by striking ''of this Act'' and inserting ''and other written responses under section 308A''.

(b) STANDARD FOR INITIATION OF ACTIONS BY FEC.—Section 309(a)(2) of such Act (2 U.S.C. 437g(a)(2)) is amended by striking ''it has reason to believe'' and all that follows through ''of 1954,'' and inserting the following: ''it has a reason to investigate a possible violation of this Act or of chapter 95 or chapter 96 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 that has occurred or is about to occur (based on the same criteria applicable under this paragraph prior to the enactment of the Campaign Reform and Election Integrity Act of 1998),''.

(c) STANDARD FORM FOR COMPLAINTS; STRONGER DISCLAIMER LANGUAGE.—

(1) STANDARD FORM.—Section 309(a)(1) of such Act (2 U.S.C. 437g(a)(1)) is amended by inserting after ''shall be notarized,'' the following: ''shall be in a standard form prescribed by the Commission, shall not include (but may refer to) extraneous materials,''.

(2) DISCLAIMER LANGUAGE.—Section 309(a)(1) of such Act (2 U.S.C. 437g(a)(1)) is amended—

(A) by striking ''(a)(1)'' and inserting ''(a)(1)(A)''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(B) The written notice of a complaint provided by the Commission under subparagraph (A) to a person alleged to have committed a violation referred to in the complaint shall include a cover letter (in a form prescribed by the Commission) and the following statement: 'The enclosed complaint has been filed against you with the Federal Election Commission. The Commission has not verified or given official sanction to the complaint. The Commission will make no decision to pursue the complaint for a period of at least 15 days from your receipt of this

complaint. You may, if you wish, submit a written statement to the Commission explaining why the Commission should take no action against you based on this complaint. If the Commission should decide to investigate, you will be notified and be given further opportunity to respond.'''.

SEC. 304. BANNING ACCEPTANCE OF CASH CONTRIBUTIONS GREATER THAN $100.

Section 315 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 441a) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(i) No candidate or political committee may accept any contributions of currency of the United States or currency of any foreign country from any person which, in the aggregate, exceed $100.''.

SEC. 305. PROTECTING CONFIDENTIALITY OF SMALL CONTRIBUTIONS BY EMPLOYEES OF CORPORATIONS AND MEMBERS OF LABOR ORGANIZATIONS.

Section 316(b) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 441b(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(8)(A) Any corporation or labor organization (or separate segregated fund established by such a corporation or such a labor organization) making solicitations of contributions shall make such solicitations in a manner that ensures that the corporation, organization, or fund cannot determine who makes a contribution of $100 or less as a result of such solicitation and who does not make such a contribution.

''(B) Subparagraph (A) shall not apply with respect to any solicitation of contributions of a corporation from its stockholders.''.

SEC. 306. DISCLOSURE AND REPORTS RELATING TO POLLING BY TELEPHONE OR ELECTRONIC DEVICE.

Title III of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 431 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''DISCLOSURE AND REPORTS RELATING TO POLLING BY TELEPHONE OR ELECTRONIC DEVICE

''SEC. 323. (a) DISCLOSURE OF IDENTITY OF PERSON PAYING EXPENSES OF POLL.—Any person who conducts a Federal election poll by telephone or electronic device shall disclose to each respondent the identity of the person paying the expenses of the poll. The disclosure shall be made at the end of the interview involved.

''(b) REPORTING CERTAIN INFORMATION.—In the case of any Federal election poll taken by telephone or electronic device during the 90-day period which ends on the date of the election involved—

''(1) if the results are not to be made public, the person who conducts the poll shall report to the Commission the total cost of the poll and all sources of funds for the poll; and

''(2) the person who conducts the poll shall report to the Commission the total number of households contacted and include with such report a copy of the poll questions.

''(c) FEDERAL ELECTION POLL DEFINED.—As used in this section, the term 'Federal election poll' means a survey—

''(1) in which the respondent is asked to state a preference in a future election for Federal office; and

''(2) in which more than 1,200 households are surveyed.''.

TITLE IV—EXCESSIVE SPENDING BY CANDIDATES FROM PERSONAL FUNDS

SEC. 401. MODIFICATION OF LIMITATIONS ON CONTRIBUTIONS WHEN CANDIDATES SPEND OR CONTRIBUTE LARGE AMOUNTS OF PERSONAL FUNDS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 315 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 441a), as amended by section 304, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(j)(1) Notwithstanding subsection (a), if in a general election a House candidate makes expenditures of personal funds (including contributions by the candidate to the candidate's authorized campaign committee) in an amount in excess of the amount of the limitation established under subsection (a)(1)(A) and less than or equal to $150,000 (as reported under section 304(a)(2)(A)), a political party committee may make contributions to an opponent of the House candidate without regard to any limitation otherwise applicable to such contributions under subsection (a), except that no opponent may accept aggregate contributions under this paragraph in an amount greater than the greatest amount of personal funds expended (including contributions to the candidate's authorized campaign committee) by any House candidate (other than such opponent) with respect to the election, less any personal funds expended by such opponent (as reported in a notification submitted under section 304(a)(6)(B)).

''(2) If a House candidate makes expenditures of personal funds (including contributions by the candidate to the candidate's authorized campaign committee) with respect to an election in an amount greater than $150,000 (as reported under section 304(a)(2)(A)), the following rules shall apply:

''(A) In the case of a general election, the limitations under subsections (a)(1), (a)(2), and (a)(3) (insofar as such limitations apply to political party committees and to individuals, and to other political committees to the extent that the amount contributed does not exceed 10 times the amount of the limitation otherwise applicable under such subsection) shall not apply to contributions to any opponent of the candidate, except that no opponent may accept aggregate contributions under this subparagraph and paragraph (1) in an amount greater than the greatest amount of personal funds (including contributions to the candidate's authorized campaign committee) expended by any House candidate with respect to the election, less any personal funds expended by such opponent (as reported in a notification submitted under section 304(a)(6)(B)).

''(B) In the case of an election other than a general election, the limitations under subsections (a)(1) and (a)(2) (insofar as such limitations apply to individuals and to political committees other than political party committees to the extent that the amount contributed does not exceed 10 times the amount of the limitation otherwise applicable under such subsection) shall not apply to contributions to any opponent of the candidate, except that no opponent may accept aggregate contributions under this subparagraph in an amount greater than the greatest amount of personal funds (including contributions to the candidate's authorized campaign committee) expended by any House candidate with respect to the election, less any personal funds expended by such opponent (as reported in a notification submitted under section 304(a)(6)(B)).

''(3) In this subsection, the term 'House candidate' means a candidate in an election for the office of Representative in, or Delegate or Resident Commissioner to, the Congress.''.

(b) NOTIFICATION OF EXPENDITURES OF PERSONAL FUNDS.—Section 304(a)(6) of such Act (2 U.S.C. 434(a)(6)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraph (B) as subparagraph (C); and

(2) by inserting after subparagraph (A) the following new subparagraph:

''(B)(i) The principal campaign committee of a House candidate (as defined in section 315(j)(3)) shall submit the following notifications relating to expenditures of personal funds by such candidate (including contributions by the candidate to such committee):

''(I) A notification of the first such expenditure (or contribution) by which the aggregate amount of personal funds expended (or contributed) with respect to an election exceeds the amount of the limitation established under section 315(a)(1)(A) for elections in the year involved.

''(II) A notification of each such expenditure (or contribution) which, taken together with all such expenditures (and contributions) in any amount not included in the most recent report under this subparagraph, totals $5,000 or more.

''(III) A notification of the first such expenditure (or contribution) by which the aggregate amount of personal funds expended with respect to the election exceeds the level applicable under section 315(j)(2) for elections in the year involved.

''(ii) Each of the notifications submitted under clause (i)—

''(I) shall be submitted not later than 24 hours after the expenditure or contribution which is the subject of the notification is made;

''(II) shall include the name of the candidate, the office sought by the candidate, and the date of the expenditure or contribution and amount of the expenditure or contribution involved; and

''(III) shall include the total amount of all such expenditures and contributions made with respect to the same election as of the date of expenditure or contribution which is the subject of the notification.''.

TITLE V—ELECTION INTEGRITY

Subtitle A—Voter Eligibility Verification Pilot Program

SEC. 501. VOTER ELIGIBILITY PILOT CONFIRMATION PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General, in consultation with the Commissioner of Social Security, shall establish a pilot program to test a confirmation system through which they—

(1) respond to inquiries, made by State and local officials (including voting registrars) with responsibility for determining an individual's qualification to vote in a Federal, State, or local election, to verify the citizenship of an individual who has submitted a voter registration application, and

(2) maintain such records of the inquiries made and verifications provided as may be necessary for pilot program evaluation.

In order to make an inquiry through the pilot program with respect to an individual, an election official shall provide the name, date of birth, and last 4 digits of the social security account number of the individual.

(b) INITIAL RESPONSE.—The pilot program shall provide for a confirmation or a tentative nonconfirmation of an individual's citizenship by the Commissioner of Social Security as soon as practicable after an initial inquiry to the Commissioner.

(c) SECONDARY VERIFICATION PROCESS IN CASE OF TENTATIVE NONCONFIRMATION.—In cases of tentative nonconfirmation, the Attorney General shall specify, in consultation with the Commissioner of Social Security and the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, an available secondary verification process to confirm the validity of information provided and to provide a final confirmation or nonconfirmation as soon as practicable after the date of the tentative nonconfirmation.

(d) DESIGN AND OPERATION OF PILOT PROGRAM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The pilot program shall be designed and operated—

(A) to apply in, at a minimum, the States of California, New York, Texas, Florida, and Illinois;

(B) to be used on a voluntary basis, as a supplementary information source, by State and local election officials for the purpose of assessing, through citizenship verification, the eligibility of an individual to vote in Federal, State, or local elections;

(C) to respond to an inquiry concerning citizenship only in a case where determining whether an individual is a citizen is—

(i) necessary for determining whether the individual is eligible to vote in an election for Federal, State, or local office; and

(ii) part of a program or activity to protect the integrity of the electoral process that is uniform, nondiscriminatory, and in compliance with the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 1973 et seq.);

(D) to maximize its reliability and ease of use, consistent with insulating and protecting the privacy and security of the underlying information;

(E) to permit inquiries to be made to the pilot program through a toll-free telephone line or other toll-free electronic media;

(F) to respond to all inquiries made by authorized persons and to register all times when the pilot program is not responding to inquiries because of a malfunction;

(G) with appropriate administrative, technical, and physical safeguards to prevent unauthorized disclosure of personal information, including violations of the requirements of section 205(c)(2)(C)(viii) of the Social Security Act; and

(H) to have reasonable safeguards against the pilot program's resulting in unlawful discriminatory practices based on national origin or citizenship status, including the selective or unauthorized use of the pilot program.

(2) USE OF EMPLOYMENT ELIGIBILITY CONFIRMATION SYSTEM.—To the extent practicable, in establishing the confirmation system under this section, the Attorney General, in consultation with the Commissioner of Social Security, shall use the employment eligibility confirmation system established under section 404 of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (Public Law 104–208; 110 Stat. 3009–664).

(e) RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL SECURITY.—As part of the pilot program, the Commissioner of Social Security shall establish a reliable, secure method which compares the name, date of birth, and last 4 digits of the social security account number provided in an inquiry against such information maintained by the Commissioner, in order to confirm (or not confirm) the correspondence of the name, date of birth, and number provided and whether the individual is shown as a citizen of the United States on the records maintained by the Commissioner (including whether such records show that the individual was born in the United States). The Commissioner shall not disclose or release social security information (other than such confirmation or nonconfirmation).

(f) RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE COMMISSIONER OF THE IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE.—As part of the pilot program, the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service shall establish a reliable, secure method which compares the name and date of birth which are provided in an inquiry against information maintained by the Commissioner in order to confirm (or not confirm) the validity of the information provided, the correspondence of the name and date of birth, and whether the individual is a citizen of the United States.

(g) UPDATING INFORMATION.—The Commissioner of Social Security and the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service shall update their information in a manner that promotes the maximum accuracy and shall provide a process for the prompt correction of erroneous information, including instances in which it is brought to their attention in the secondary verification process described in subsection (c) or in any action by an individual to use the process provided under this subsection upon receipt of notification from an election official under subsection (i).

(h) LIMITATION ON USE OF THE PILOT PROGRAM AND ANY RELATED SYSTEMS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, nothing in this section shall be construed to permit or allow any department, bureau, or other agency of the United States Government to utilize any information, data base, or other records assembled under this section for any other purpose other than as provided for under this section.

(2) NO NATIONAL IDENTIFICATION CARD.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to authorize, directly or indirectly, the issuance or use of national identification cards or the establishment of a national identification card.

(3) NO NEW DATA BASES.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to authorize, directly or indirectly, the Attorney General and the Commissioner of Social Security to create any joint computer data base that is not in existence on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(i) ACTIONS BY ELECTION OFFICIALS UNABLE TO CONFIRM CITIZENSHIP.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If an election official receives a notice of final nonconfirmation under subsection (c) with respect to an individual, the official—

(A) shall notify the individual in writing; and

(B) shall inform the individual in writing of the individual's right to use—

(i) the process provided under subsection (g) for the prompt correction of erroneous information in the pilot program; or

(ii) any other process for establishing eligibility to vote provided under State or Federal law.

(2) REGISTRATION APPLICANTS.—In the case of an individual who is an applicant for voter registration, and who receives a notice from an official under paragraph (1), the official may (subject to, and in a manner consistent with, State law) reject the application (subject to the right to reapply), but only if the following conditions have been satisfied:

(A) The 30-day period beginning on the date the notice was mailed or otherwise provided to the individual has elapsed.

(B) During such 30-day period, the official did not receive adequate confirmation of the citizenship of the individual from—

(i) a source other than the pilot program established under this section; or

(ii) such pilot program, pursuant to a new inquiry to the pilot program made by the official upon receipt of information (from the individual or through any other reliable source) that erroneous or incomplete material information previously in the pilot program has been updated, supplemented, or corrected.

(3) INELIGIBLE VOTER REMOVAL PROGRAMS.—In the case of an individual who is registered to vote, and who receives a notice from an official under paragraph (1) in connection with a program to remove the names of ineligible voters from an official list of eligible voters, the official may (subject to, and in a manner consistent with, State law) remove the name of the individual from the list (subject to the right to submit another voter registration application), but only if the following conditions have been satisfied:

(A) The 30-day period beginning on the date the notice was mailed or otherwise provided to the individual has elapsed.

(B) During such 30-day period, the official did not receive adequate confirmation of the citizenship of the individual from a source described in clause (i) or (ii) of paragraph (2)(B).

(j) AUTHORITY TO USE SOCIAL SECURITY ACCOUNT NUMBERS.—Any State (or political subdivision thereof) may, for the purpose of making inquiries under the pilot program in the administration of any voter registration law within its jurisdiction, use the last 4 digits of the social security account numbers issued by the Commissioner of Social Security, and may, for such purpose, require any individual who is or appears to be affected by a voter registration law of such State (or political subdivision thereof) to furnish to such State (or political subdivision thereof) or any agency thereof having administrative responsibility for such law, the last 4 digits of the social security account number (or numbers, if the individual has more than one such number) issued to the individual by the Commissioner. Nothing in this subsection may be construed to prohibit or limit the application of any voter registration program which is in compliance with any applicable Federal or State law.

(k) TERMINATION AND REPORT.—The pilot program shall terminate September 30, 2001. The Attorney General and the Commissioner of Social Security shall each submit to the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and to the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Finance of the Senate reports on the pilot program not later than December 31, 2001. Such reports shall—

(1) assess the degree of fraudulent attesting of United States citizenship in jurisdictions covered by the pilot program;

(2) assess the appropriate staffing and funding levels which would be required for full, permanent, and nationwide implementation of the pilot program, including the estimated total cost for national implementation per individual record;

(3) include an assessment by the Commissioner of Social Security of the advisability and ramifications of disclosure of social security account numbers to the extent provided for under the pilot program and upon full, permanent, and nationwide implementation of the pilot program;

(4) assess the degree to which the records maintained by the Commissioner of Social Security and the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service are able to be used to reliably determine the citizenship of individuals who have submitted voter registration applications;

(5) assess the effectiveness of the pilot program's safeguards against unlawful discriminatory practices;

(6) include recommendations on whether or not the pilot program should be continued or modified; and

(7) include such other information as the Attorney General or the Commissioner of Social Security may determine to be relevant.

SEC. 502. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Justice, for the Immigration and Naturalization Service, for fiscal years beginning on or after October 1, 1998, such sums as are necessary to carry out the provisions of this subtitle.

Subtitle B—Other Measures to Protect Election Integrity

SEC. 511. REQUIRING INCLUSION OF CITIZENSHIP CHECK-OFF AND INFORMATION WITH ALL APPLICATIONS FOR VOTER REGISTRATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 9 of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (42 U.S.C. 1973gg–7) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(c) CITIZENSHIP CHECK-OFF AND OTHER INFORMATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Effective January 1, 2000—

''(A) the mail voter registration form developed under subsection (a)(2) and each application for voter registration of a State shall include 2 boxes for the applicant to indicate whether or not the applicant is a citizen of the United States, and no application for voter registration may be considered to be completed unless the applicant has checked the box indicating that the applicant is a citizen of the United States; and

''(B) such form and each application for voter registration of a State shall require the applicant to provide—

''(i) the city, State or province (if any), and nation of the individual's birth; and

''(ii) if the individual is a naturalized citizen of the United States, the year in which the individual was admitted to citizenship and the location where the admission to citizenship occurred (if applicable).

''(2) STATE OPT-OUT.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply with respect to applications for voter registration of any State which notifies the Federal Election Commission prior to January 1, 2000, that it elects to reject the application of such paragraph to applications for voter registration of the State.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—The National Voter Registration Act of 1993 is amended by striking ''requirement;'' each place it appears in section 5(c)(2)(C)(ii) (42 U.S.C. 1973gg–3(c)(2)(C)(ii)), section 7(a)(6)(A)(i)(II) (42 U.S.C. 1973gg–5(a)(6)(A)(i)(II)), and section 9(b)(2)(B) (42 U.S.C. 1973gg–7(b)(2)(B), and inserting ''requirement (consistent with section 9(c));''.

SEC. 512. IMPROVING ADMINISTRATION OF VOTER REMOVAL PROGRAMS.

(a) PERMITTING STATE TO REQUIRE AFFIRMATION OF ADDRESS OF REGISTRANTS NOT VOTING IN 2 CONSECUTIVE GENERAL FEDERAL ELECTIONS.—Section 8(e) of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (42 U.S.C. 1973gg–6(e)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(4)(A) If a registrant has not voted or appeared to vote in two consecutive general elections for Federal office, a State may send the registrant a notice consisting of—

''(i) a postage prepaid and pre-addressed return card, sent by forwardable mail, on which the registrant may state his or her current address; and

''(ii) a notice that if the card is not returned, oral or written affirmation of the registrant's identification and address may be required before the registrant is permitted to vote in a subsequent Federal election.

''(B) If a registrant to whom a State has sent a notice under subparagraph (A) has not returned the card provided in the notice and appears at a polling place to cast a vote in a Federal election, the State may require the registrant to provide oral or written affirmation of the registrant's identification and address before an election official at the polling place as a condition for casting the vote.''.

(b) PERMITTING STATE TO PLACE REGISTRANTS WITH INAPPLICABLE ADDRESSES ON INACTIVE LIST.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 8(d)(1)(B)(i) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1973gg–6(d)(1)(B)(i)) is amended by striking ''paragraph (2);'' and inserting ''paragraph (2), or has provided a mailing address which the Postal Services indicates is no longer applicable and has provided no other applicable address;''.

(2) REQUIRING CONFIRMATION OF ADDRESS PRIOR TO VOTING.—Section 8(d) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1973gg–6(d)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(4) The second sentence of paragraph (2)(A) shall apply to an individual described in paragraph (1)(B)(i) who has provided a mailing address which the Postal Services indicates is no longer applicable and has provided no other applicable address in the same manner as such sentence applies to an individual who has failed to respond to a notice described in paragraph (2).''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect January 1, 1999, and shall apply with respect to general elections for Federal office held on or after January 1, 1998.

TITLE VI—REVISION AND INDEXING OF CERTAIN CONTRIBUTION LIMITS AND PENALTIES

SEC. 601. INCREASE IN CERTAIN CONTRIBUTION LIMITS.

(a) CONTRIBUTIONS BY INDIVIDUALS.—

(1) CONTRIBUTIONS TO CANDIDATES.—Section 315(a)(1)(A) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 441a(a)(1)(A)) is amended by striking ''$1,000'' and inserting ''$2,000''.

(2) CONTRIBUTIONS TO STATE OR LOCAL POLITICAL PARTIES.—Section 315(a)(1) of such Act (2 U.S.C. 441a(a)(1)) is amended—

(A) by striking ''or'' at the end of subparagraph (B);

(B) by redesignating subparagraph (C) as subparagraph (D); and

(C) by inserting after subparagraph (B) the following new subparagraph:

''(C) to the political committees established and maintained by a State or local political party, which are not the authorized political committees of any candidate, in any calendar year which, in the aggregate, exceed $15,000; or''.

(3) CONTRIBUTIONS TO NATIONAL POLITICAL PARTIES.—Section 315(a)(1)(B) of such Act (2 U.S.C. 441a(a)(1)(B)) is amended by striking ''$20,000'' and inserting ''$60,000''.

(4) AGGREGATE ANNUAL LIMIT ON ALL CONTRIBUTIONS.—Section 315(a)(3) of such Act (2 U.S.C. 441a(a)(3)) is amended by striking ''$25,000'' and inserting ''$75,000''.

(b) CONTRIBUTIONS BY POLITICAL PARTIES.—Section 315(a)(1) of such Act (2 U.S.C. 441a(a)(1)), as amended by subsection (a)(2), is amended—

(1) by striking ''or'' at the end of subparagraph (C);

(2) by redesignating subparagraph (D) as subparagraph (E); and

(3) by inserting after subparagraph (C) the following new subparagraph:

''(D) in the case of contributions made to a candidate and any authorized committee of the candidate by a political committee of a national, State, or local political party which is not the authorized political committee of any candidate, in any calendar year which, in the aggregate, exceed $15,000; or''.

SEC. 602. INDEXING LIMITS ON CERTAIN CONTRIBUTIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 315(c) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 441a(c)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(3)(A) The amount of each limitation established under subsection (a) (other than any limitation under paragraph (1)(E) or (2)) shall be adjusted as follows:

''(i) For calendar year 2001, each such amount shall be equal to the amount described in such subsection, increased (in a compounded manner) by the percentage increase in the price index (as defined in paragraph (2)) for 1999 and 2000.

''(ii) For calendar year 2003 and each second subsequent year, each such amount shall be equal to the amount for the second previous year (as adjusted under this subparagraph), increased (in a compounded manner) by the percentage increase in the price index for the previous year and the second previous year.

''(B) In the case of any amount adjusted under this subparagraph which is not a multiple of $100, the amount shall be rounded to the nearest multiple of $100.''.

(b) APPLICATION OF INDEXING TO SUPPORT OF CANDIDATE'S COMMITTEES.—Section 302(e)(3)(B) of such Act (2 U.S.C. 432(e)(3)(B)) is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: ''The amount described in the previous sentence shall be adjusted (for years beginning with 1999) in the same manner as the amounts of limitations on contributions under section 315(a) are adjusted under section 315(c)(3).''.

SEC. 603. INDEXING AMOUNT OF PENALTIES AND FINES.

(a) INDEXING TO ACCOUNT FOR PAST INFLATION.—

(1) PENALTIES.—Section 309(a) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 437g(a)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (5)(A), by striking ''$5,000'' and inserting ''$15,000'';

(B) in paragraph (5)(B), by striking ''$10,000'' and inserting ''$30,000'';

(C) in paragraph (6)(A), by striking ''$5,000'' and inserting ''$15,000'';

(D) in paragraph (6)(B), by striking ''$5,000'' and inserting ''$15,000''; and

(E) in paragraph (6)(C), by striking ''$10,000'' and inserting ''$30,000''.

(2) FINES.—Section 309 of such Act (2 U.S.C. 437g) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)(12)(B)—

(i) by striking ''$2,000'' and inserting ''$6,000'', and

(ii) by striking ''$5,000'' and inserting ''$15,000''; and

(B) in the second sentence of subsection (d)(1)(A), by striking ''$25,000'' and inserting ''$75,000''.

(b) INDEXING FOR FUTURE YEARS.—Section 309 of such Act (2 U.S.C. 437g) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(13) Each amount referred to in this subsection shall be adjusted (for years beginning with 2001) in the same manner as the amounts of limitations on contributions under section 315(a) are adjusted under section 315(c)(3).''; and

(2) in the second sentence of subsection (d)(1)(A), as amended by subsection (a)(2)(B), by inserting after ''$75,000'' the following: ''(adjusted for years beginning with 2001 in the same manner as the amounts of limitations on contributions under section 315(a) are adjusted under section 315(c)(3))''.

TITLE VII—RESTRICTIONS ON SOFT MONEY

SEC. 701. BAN ON SOFT MONEY OF NATIONAL POLITICAL PARTIES AND CANDIDATES; BAN ON USE OF SOFT MONEY BY STATE POLITICAL PARTIES FOR FEDERAL ELECTION ACTIVITY.

Title III of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 431 et seq.), as amended by section 306, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''RESTRICTIONS ON USE OF SOFT MONEY BY POLITICAL PARTIES AND CANDIDATES

''SEC. 324. (a) BAN ON USE BY NATIONAL PARTIES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—No political committee of a national political party may solicit, receive, or direct any contributions, donations,

or transfers of funds, or spend any funds, which are not subject to the limitations, prohibitions, and reporting requirements of this Act.

''(2) APPLICABILITY.—Paragraph (1) shall apply to any entity which is established, financed, maintained, or controlled (directly or indirectly) by, or which acts on behalf of, a political committee of a national political party, including any national congressional campaign committee of such a party and any officer or agent of such an entity or committee.

''(b) CANDIDATES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—No candidate for Federal office, individual holding Federal office, or any agent of such a candidate or officeholder may solicit, receive, or direct—

''(A) any funds in connection with any Federal election unless the funds are subject to the limitations, prohibitions and reporting requirements of this Act;

''(B) any funds that are to be expended in connection with any election for other than a Federal office unless the funds are not in excess of the applicable amounts permitted with respect to contributions to candidates and political committees under paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 315(a), and are not from sources prohibited from making contributions by this Act with respect to elections for Federal office; or

''(C) any funds on behalf of any person which are not subject to the limitations, prohibitions, and reporting requirements of this Act if such funds are for the purpose of financing any activity on behalf of a candidate for election for Federal office or any communication which refers to a clearly identified candidate for election for Federal office.

''(2) EXCEPTION FOR CERTAIN ACTIVITIES.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to—

''(A) the solicitation, receipt, or direction of funds by an individual who is a candidate for a non-Federal office if such activity is permitted under State law for such individual's non-Federal campaign committee; or

''(B) the attendance by an individual who holds Federal office at a fundraising event for a State or local committee of a political party of the State which the individual represents as a Federal officeholder, if the event is held in such State.

''(c) STATE PARTIES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Any payment by a State committee of a political party for a mixed political activity—

''(A) shall be subject to limitation and reporting under this Act as if such payment were an expenditure; and

''(B) may be paid only from an account that is subject to the requirements of this Act.

''(2) MIXED POLITICAL ACTIVITY DEFINED.—As used in this section, the term 'mixed political activity' means, with respect to a payment by a State committee of a political party, an activity (such as a voter registration program, a get-out-the-vote drive, or general political advertising) that is both for the purpose of influencing an election for Federal office and for any purpose unrelated to influencing an election for Federal office.

''(d) PROHIBITING TRANSFERS OF NON-FEDERAL FUNDS BETWEEN STATE PARTIES.—A State committee of a political party may not transfer any funds to a State committee of a political party of another State unless the funds are subject to the limitations, prohibitions, and reporting requirements of this Act.

''(e) APPLICABILITY TO FUNDS FROM ALL SOURCES.—This section shall apply with respect to funds of any individual, corporation, labor organization, or other person.''.

SEC. 702. BAN ON DISBURSEMENTS OF SOFT MONEY BY FOREIGN NATIONALS.

(a) PROHIBITION ON DISBURSEMENTS BY FOREIGN NATIONALS FOR POLITICAL PARTIES AND INDEPENDENT EXPENDITURES.—Section 319 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 441e) is amended—

(1) in the heading, by striking ''CONTRIBUTIONS'' and inserting ''DISBURSEMENTS'';

(2) in subsection (a), by striking ''contribution'' each place it appears and inserting ''disbursement''; and

(3) in subsection (a), by striking the semicolon and inserting the following: '', including any disbursement to a political committee of a political party and any disbursement for an independent expenditure;''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to disbursements made on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 703. ENFORCEMENT OF SPENDING LIMIT ON PRESIDENTIAL AND VICE PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATES WHO RECEIVE PUBLIC FINANCING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 9003 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (26 U.S.C. 9003) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(f) ILLEGAL SOLICITATION OF SOFT MONEY.—No candidate for election to the office of President or Vice President may receive amounts from the Presidential Election Campaign Fund under this chapter or chapter 96 unless the candidate certifies that the candidate shall not solicit any funds for purposes of influencing (directly or indirectly) such election, including any funds used for an independent expenditure under the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, unless the funds are subject to the limitations, prohibitions, and reporting requirements of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply with respect to elections occurring on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 704. CONSPIRACY TO VIOLATE PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGN SPENDING LIMITS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 9003 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (26 U.S.C. 9003), as amended by section 703, is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(g) PROHIBITING CONSPIRACY TO VIOLATE LIMITS.—

''(1) VIOLATION OF LIMITS DESCRIBED.—If a candidate for election to the office of President or Vice President who receives amounts from the Presidential Election Campaign Fund under chapter 95 or 96 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, or the agent of such a candidate, seeks to avoid the spending limits applicable to the candidate under such chapter or under the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 by soliciting, receiving, transferring, or directing funds from any source other than such Fund for the direct or indirect benefit of such candidate's campaign, such candidate or agent shall be fined not more than $1,000,000, or imprisoned for a term of not more than 3 years, or both.

''(2) CONSPIRACY TO VIOLATE LIMITS DEFINED.—If two or more persons conspire to violate paragraph (1), and one or more of such persons do any act to effect the object of the conspiracy, each shall be fined not more than $1,000,000, or imprisoned for a term of not more than 3 years, or both.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply with respect to elections occurring on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

TITLE VIII—DISCLOSURE OF CERTAIN COMMUNICATIONS

SEC. 801. DISCLOSURE OF CERTAIN COMMUNICATIONS.

Section 304 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 434) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(d)(1) In addition to any other information required to be reported under this Act, any person who makes payments described in paragraph (2) in an aggregate amount or value in excess of $250 during a calendar year shall report such payments and the source of the funds used to make such payments to the Commission in the same manner and under the same terms and conditions as a political committee reporting expenditures and contributions to the Commission under this section, except that if such person makes such payments in an aggregate amount or value of $1,000 or more after the 20th day, but more than 24 hours, before any election, such person shall report such information within 24 hours after such payments are made.

''(2) A payment described in this paragraph is a payment for any communication which is made during the 90-day period ending on the date of an election and which mentions a clearly identified candidate for election for Federal office or the political party of such a candidate, or which contains the likeness of such a candidate, other than a payment which would be described in clause (i), (iii), or (v) of section 301(9)(B) if the payment were an expenditure under such section.''.

TITLE IX—EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 901. EFFECTIVE DATE.

Except as otherwise specifically provided, this Act and the amendments made by this Act shall apply with respect to elections occurring after January 1999.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) and the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS).

Mr. THOMAS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 3581 has a strong resemblance to H.R. 3458 that came out of committee, with a couple of changes based upon information which was provided to us after the committee met. As a matter of fact, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS), indicated that he was concerned that although there was a soft money ban at the national level, there was not a commensurate soft money ban of Federal money at the State level. And so to address that particular concern, the bill was modified to follow the 103rd Congress's Republican campaign reform bill which banned soft money at both the Federal and the State level.

There were a number of other very minor adjustments that were made, so that the bill that is in front of us tonight says, number one, that only American citizens may contribute to political campaigns. Anyone who is a noncitizen may not participate in a political campaign, either in contributions or in spending. No one need go into any detail as to why that is part of a campaign reform bill, based upon what we now know and are continuing

to learn from the 1996 presidential campaign.

In addition, it seems to a number of Members that if someone were compelled to provide money which could be used for political contributions, that it somehow seemed to violate the spirit of voluntary participation, and so we include a provision which requires that if any money from paychecks is spent by organizations in political campaigns, that money would have to have been solicited from individuals. They would have had an opportunity to say, ''Yes, you may utilize that money for that purpose,'' rather than having it removed from their paycheck without their permission.

In addition, there is a very long section which will be offered later as a separate bill on suspension, as well, which has basically pulled together a number of the reforms that the Federal Elections Commission has been advocating for the last several years. They are contained in a number of Members' bills, and what they do is bring up to date the disclosure of campaign spending either through a more detailed reporting procedure or, a shortening of the time line for reporting, given the electronic world that we now live in.

In addition, the Supreme Court has spoken very clearly about the ability of an individual to spend as much money as they so choose when it is their own money, and it is therefore extremely difficult for the average candidate to compete in an election against someone who has millions and millions of dollars to spend. It is quite clearly unconstitutional to not allow an individual to spend that money but we believe it is quite constitutional, based upon a threshold of personal spending by that individual, to allow for a modification of the contribution rules that permit an individual who does not have the wherewithal from their own resources to be able to run a credible and viable campaign.

□ 1845

In addition, all of us have read the headlines about the kind of election activities that have been occurring in various regions of the United States, California, and Texas, for example. Miami, I believe, is one that comes to mind rather vividly in terms of the concern about whether or not the voting rolls contain only those individuals who should be on those rolls, and also whether or not even if individuals are legally on those rolls, it is the individuals on the rolls who are in fact casting their own ballots. So there is a section on voter fraud which is an enabling section. The section does not mandate anything upon the chief election officer of a State or a local election unit. It does, however provide the procedure, so that if that election officer wishes to validate the roll, he or she has the ability to do so. I previously mentioned the soft money ban at both the Federal and the State level.

The other area concerns a number of Members as well in terms of more recent political activities. It deals with the issue of independent expenditures. Once again, the United States Supreme Court has made it clear that unless someone is advocating the election or defeat of a particular candidate, that expenditure of funds in that category is protected by the Constitution. That is, the person has a constitutional right to spend the money.

We believe that the American people need to know fully who is participating in the elections, notwithstanding the court's statement that individual groups have a constitutional right to engage in independent expenditures. What we propose is to designate a so-called election season, that is the last 90 days of a campaign. We choose that period as the election season because here in the House of Representatives, no elected Member is allowed to use taxpayer dollars to send out mass mailings during that period because it is a sensitive period. It is, in essence, the election season. The bill then says anyone who is advocating the election or defeat of a candidate or mentions a candidate or political party, if they do so during the political season, 90 days prior to an election, must report. They must disclose.

That is the basic bill although we borrowed from a number of other Members' particular provisions, and I am sure they will wish to address those particular provisions.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to say to my colleagues that, first, I do not believe that this is a process that the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) himself would have chosen. I am not going to ask him to answer that question but we have a situation on the floor where Members have been denied an opportunity, I think, to even read the legislation, many Members returning from a funeral, that we are about to vote on here tonight. I think we have to start off with the fundamentals.

In China, at one point Mao Tse Tung announced the cultural revolution. The cultural revolution was really about cultural destruction. To call this bill before us campaign finance reform, it should be more properly referred to as campaign finance reform destruction.

It raises the amount of money individuals can give, hard dollars from $25,000 a year to $75,000 a year. This is consistent with what many of the Republicans believe. Speaker GINGRICH himself said that more money was a sign of a healthy debate. Well, the voters have not felt that way. The voters in this country, as spending has gone up, voter participation has shot down. So they are sending us a message.

But not just the substance of this legislation is bad. The process before us is horrific. This is a process the Politburo under Joseph Stalin would have been proud of. Think about what we are doing here today.

We are taking up campaign finance reform after the Senate has definitively shown they can filibuster the bill to death. Strike one.

We have made sure that no alternative from the opposition can be heard here today. Strike two.

And just in case by some faint stretch of the imagination the Republican bill might pass, we have come to the floor with a process where we do not need 51 percent of the vote to win today. We have to have two-thirds of the votes because they know they cannot get them. So we are here.

Let us see what some of our friends are saying about this process not to pass campaign finance reform, not to put in spending limits to try to restrain the amount of money that is in campaigns. We are here as a charade.

Members might say that this is simply my assessment of the situation. Before I go to the New York Times, let me say the Democrats have a record here that we can be proud of.

In 1971, the Democrats in the House and the Senate overrode a veto by President Nixon, overrode that veto to begin the road on campaign finance reform. In 1974, the most substantial bill ever to pass Congress passed by a Democratic House and Senate in 1992. We passed campaign finance reform through the House and Senate. I had the privilege of leading that effort, vetoed by President Bush.

We finally elect a Democratic President. This Congress, under Democratic leadership, passed campaign finance reform that was comprehensive. Even the Senate was able to pass campaign finance reform. But then in sheer horror, the Republicans understood that the President would sign the bill. So they filibustered the bill from going to conference. So we had no reform.

It is not just what I say and others are going to say about this process that has demeaned this House. It is the assessment of almost every major publication in the country.

A plot to bury reform, the New York Times; campaign finance charades, the New York Times; the Washington Post, mocking campaign reform. And it goes on. A cynical sham, a hoax on the American people, a complete travesty, several of the worst campaign ideas rolled into one, repugnant and partisan.

I ask the handful of Members on that side of the aisle, and there is only a handful, I am sorry to say, to join with the Democrats in this House to reject this charade, to give the American people a real debate on real campaign finance reform that would limit spending, that would limit the amount of money in campaigns. At the end of the day we might not win, but at least we would have a straight-up discussion and an honest vote. And what we are doing here today is not honest.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMAS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from

Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON) one of the major forces in reshaping the direction of campaign reform.

(Mr. HUTCHINSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Madam Speaker, I came to Congress with a desire to reduce cynicism and to build confidence in our institutions of government. That is why I have worked with a bipartisan group of freshman Members to accomplish reform and to empower individuals in our political process. Because of those beliefs and work, I rise in support of this legislation sponsored by the chairman, the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS). It is not a perfect bill but it is a good bill. It bans soft money to our national parties, which has been the greatest source of campaign abuse, and I compliment the chairman for his willingness to make adjustments through this process to accomplish substantial reform.

I am pleased to express my support of this bill, but I am deeply disappointed that in the last moments the people's hope for reform was crushed when majority rule became defeat by design.

While the bill is worthy of support, the process today will not produce victory but reflects the dark side of this institution, and both sides of the aisle have contributed to this darkness.

The last minute move to put a few bills on suspension sent a message to the American people that we are afraid of reform, and that we will undermine it at any price, even that highest price, the confidence of the American people.

The public has become cynical in regard to the process of government. Each election we lose more voters. Each year more voters say, what is the point. I do not have enough money to compete with the corporations and unions who really control our government.

When we act with such transparent tactics can we blame the public for giving up hope? Do we really believe that we can go home and tell our constituents that we had an honest debate in voting reform. I do not think so. I came to the United States Congress to change the status quo, not defend it. I will not go home and look my constituents in the eye and tell them Congress made an honest effort to reform a deeply flawed system despite the merits of this bill.

I have not been in Washington that long. In 1994, the Republican Party took Congress by storm. There was enough fire in the belly of those reformers to light up the city of Washington. I hope that we will not let that fire die; that we will vote for this legislation but build on this effort today, and accomplish reform and build confidence in what we are doing in Congress.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN), who has done such a terrific job leading the freshman class.

Mr. ALLEN. Madam Speaker, I feel like I am in wonderland. This is supposedly a debate on campaign reform but the vote is rigged, the process is rigged. And one way my colleagues can tell that is the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON) and I, who spent 6 months working with freshmen on both sides of the aisle to develop a bipartisan approach to this problem, are now on opposite sides.

This bill that is coming to the House today is not a bipartisan bill. The fact is that there are ways to deal with this issue. We can deal with it the way the freshmen did in a bipartisan way over a period of months. We can deal with it the way the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN) have dealt with this bill, in a bipartisan way over a period of years. This is a sham. It is a fraud.

We started our freshman process by agreeing that we have to take the poison pills off the table and this bill has a poison pill. It has the biggest of all. That is a worker gag rule, a rule that is aimed unfairly at the men and women in this country who contribute a few bucks a month. It promotes big money in politics. It continues big money in politics. It is aimed directly at working Americans.

Mr. THOMAS. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Montana (Mr. HILL).

Mr. HILL. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me this time. I would like to invite my colleagues tonight to vote yes on this measure, but I must confess that my vote will be a very reluctant yes. I would far prefer today to be voting on the freshman bipartisan Campaign Integrity Act or the Shays-Meehan bill.

Finding a bipartisan approach to campaign finance reform is not easy. That is because of the abuse of soft money. This bill does work to end the influence of soft money, the money coming from corporations and labor unions, and they oppose these provisions because they benefit from it. From 1992 to 1996, soft money going to our national parties went from 35 million a year to 270 million. It is estimated now that it will go to 500 million in the next cycle. It is overwhelming our system. I am deeply concerned about the process that brought us here today.

I am deeply concerned that the two bipartisan measures, the freshman measure and Shays-Meehan, are not being voted on tonight. I will work for the balance of this Congress to find an opportunity for a serious vote on a bipartisan measure, either the freshman bill or the Shays-Meehan bill, that will ban soft money.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR) who has led efforts in this and previous Congresses on campaign finance reform.

Mr. FARR of California. Madam Speaker, we are here tonight to discuss campaign finance reform. Where is everybody else? Half the Nation is watching basketball games. Half the Congress is attending a funeral. What kind of business are we in?

This House, your side, the House Committee on Government Reform and Oversight spent $5 million, had 13 days of public hearings, 33 witnesses and you bring nothing to the floor that deals with that issue. You try to say you are having campaign finance reform that requires a two-third vote of this House? This is a mockery of democracy. It is a violation of the spirit of Hershey. There is no bipartisan effort here. There is no Democratic bill on the floor. There is no substance to our debate.

We cannot have a debate in 20 minutes on an issue like this. There is no amendment allowed. It increases the limits one can give to campaigns. It triples and doubles the amount of money that can go to campaigns, not caps them out.

The timing tonight, this is a mockery of democracy.

Mr. THOMAS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes and 30 seconds to the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN), one of the cosponsors of the bill, someone who has been involved as long as anyone else in honest, earnest campaign reform.

□ 1900

Mr. HORN. Madam Speaker, I want to congratulate my colleague (Mr. THOMAS) from California. He has spent untold days, hours, and weeks to create a bill with some sense and to bring key issues before the House.

There is no question there are stark and fundamental disagreements between the two parties on the issue of campaign finance reform. There is no question that a lot of us on both sides of the aisle have tried to build a genuine bipartisan effort. If we are ever to achieve real reform, it must be done on a fair, bipartisan basis.

But do not give up hope. The reality is the other body says they want disclosure. We have given them disclosure, the last 90 days of the campaign. We have a bipartisan support for a disclosure bill. One of the ones I put in has as many Democrats as there are Republicans; and the commission bill, there are many from both parties.

But the bill offered by my colleague from California is a truly serious effort to meet the standard of progress. He starts in with banning so-called soft money. Now, our friend on the other side of the aisle knows well that the great abuse of the 1996 presidential campaign was the misuse of soft money at the national and State party level. We ban that.

The gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) requires disclosure of all campaign contributions and expenditures within 90 days of an election. Those are special interest group expenditures. For the first time, we will have progress in this area. The special interests will have to meet the test that we

meet as candidates disclosing money in the last weeks of the election.

Mr. THOMAS also requires members of unions and business corporations to approve of electoral activity. The fact is, that is real progress.

So let is not hear all this rhetoric on the floor, the screaming, arm waving, and shouting. Let us get down to cases.

Do my colleagues want to make progress? This is the bill that makes progress.

We are banning soft money.

We are disclosing all special-interest money in the last 90 days of the campaign.

We are requiring members of unions—and that hurts our friends on the other side of the aisle—and business corporations, which hurts a few on this side of the aisle. We have required membership approval if those in a union or a business corporation use individual dues or funds to engage in electoral activity. That is progress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). The gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON) has 13½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) has 8½ minutes remaining.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Madam Speaker, it is my privilege to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), the Minority Leader and future Speaker of the House.

(Mr. GEPHARDT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEPHARDT. Madam Speaker, since the opening days of this Congress, Democrats have been fighting for a fair and open debate, an open debate on all of the campaign finance bills that have been presented in this Congress. In the last election, the money in politics hit an all-time high of $4 billion, while voter turnout fell 50 percent, a record low for a presidential election.

Average Americans feel that their voice is not being heard and does not count anymore, that they are being drowned out by the wealthy special interests. Democrats believe and know that we need campaign reform to regain the trust of America's families and restore integrity to the electoral process. But every time Democrats have called for a vote on reform, Republicans have refused to take action.

It took the specter, literally the specter, of a discharge petition to spook the Republican leadership into finally scheduling what they called a vote tonight on reform. But the bill Republicans have come up with is anything but reform. The Republican bill would be a bonanza for wealthy special interests and a nightmare for average citizens. The Republican bill would allow wealthy citizens to have even greater influence in the political process by tripling the amount that people could give.

At the same time, it effectively silences the voice of working families by imposing a worker gag rule on union members and others and blocking access to the ballot for Hispanic citizens.

Common Cause has called the Republican bill a cynical sham laced with poison pill amendments. The nonpartisan League of Women Voters called it a complete travesty, a big step in the wrong direction. Public Citizens said, it is the exact opposite of reform. But that, frankly, is only half of the outrage we are witnessing tonight.

Not only have the Republicans put a phoney bill on the floor but they have done it in a way that prevents Democrats and reform-minded Republicans from offering any, any, alternatives for what they wrongly call reform. Instead, we are racing through this debate on these phoney reform bills which, thanks to this trumped-up procedure, will not pass unless they get a supermajority vote.

Imagine, they are saying tonight we cannot have reform, the one thing that people said they wanted in the last election, unless we get a two-thirds vote of the House of Representatives. It is a travesty to put that kind of test on reform. We know the Republican leadership is scared to death of what would happen if the House ever got to vote in a real way on real reform, like the bipartisan McCain-Feingold II, sponsored by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN) on our side and the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) on the Republican side that we wanted voted on tonight.

Finally, we will not give up. Democrats will continue to fight every day for real reform. One of the ways we have kept up the fight is the discharge petition; and just last Friday, our newest Member, newest Democratic Member, the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS), signed the discharge, which will provide for a full and fair debate on these issues. The American people deserve nothing less.

Tonight is a travesty to the American people; and Democrats will continue to fight with like-minded Republicans to have, finally, real reform on the floor with votes on all the plans which the American people deserve tonight. We are going to get that vote before this Congress ends.

Mr. THOMAS. Madam Speaker, how much time is remaining on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) has 8½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON) has 9 minutes remaining.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO), who has done such a great job at all our meetings on campaign finance reform.

Ms. ESHOO. Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 3485, the so-called Campaign Reform and Election Integrity Act. It is not reform, and it bears no integrity relative to elections. It is a grave-side ceremony to bury reform by the Speaker.

We should be having a real debate on real reform, the Shays-Meehan bill. It bans the unregulated, unlimited donations to political parties known as soft money; it establishes exacting disclosure requirements; and it limits the fund-raising of independent groups who run those infamous TV attack ads.

Listen up, America. If you think there is too much money in the system now, the Republican bill will make you fasten your seatbelts. Because the Speaker's bill increases the amount that individuals can give in a yearly cycle up to $75,000 a year. The Speaker has placed a two-thirds approval requirement on the bill so it simply will not pass. This is a charade meant only to cynically produce the sentence to be uttered, ''the House considered campaign finance reform.''

I urge my colleagues to get rid of this bill. The New York Times, the Washington Post, Public Citizens, Common Cause, League of Women Voters, and many of us oppose it. Vote against it.

Mr. THOMAS. Madam Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS).

(Mr. GOSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GOSS. Madam Speaker, a great many Americans think that asking Members of Congress, Republican or Democrat, to reform campaign finance reform is asking the fox to watch the chicken coop. And I agree that, until there is sufficient public outcry and understanding to fully change the inequities and loopholes in our campaign law, politicians, presidents, and the biased media will continue to use this issue as a political football.

Having said that, I do believe that H.R. 3485 makes important improvements in the way we manage our campaigns. I congratulate the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) for his very hard work and this good legislative product. This bill ends the abusive practice of using union, association and corporate mandatory dues for political campaigns. It provides a ban on raising or spending soft money on national political parties and candidates and a ban on disbursements of soft money by foreign nationals, and it makes clear that only American citizens should be able to make political contributions. I am also pleased that this increases accountability and disclosure by expediting and expanding FEC reporting requirements.

Although I strongly support H.R. 3485, I wish to include a significant component of my own campaign finance reform bill requiring that a high percentage of all contributions come from the geographical area a candidate seeks to represent. After all, it only makes sense that the majority of our contributions should come from the folks we represent.

But, as I said, H.R. 3485 is a good bill. It is incremental, the changes are incremental, but they are better than no change at all. No one should be encouraged into thinking that this is the final or total solution to the problems facing

the current campaign system. They are very great problems. Nevertheless, this is a very good beginning; and I urge strong support.

For those of my colleagues who do not get all of the pieces in this that they wanted, such as getting the taxpayers to pay for campaigns or having other limitations, please use the same spirit I did of compromise on this. I did not get everything I wanted either. But it is an awfully good start. And the alternative is going to the American people and saying, we did nothing on campaign reform. Who wants to be among those who voted ''no'' on campaign reform?

Mr. GEJDENSON. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN), who has led on this issue persistently since his first days in the House.

REQUEST TO SUSPEND RULES AND PASS H.R. 3526, BIPARTISAN CAMPAIGN REFORM ACT OF 1998

Mr. MEEHAN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to suspend the rules and ask for consideration of H.R. 3526, the bipartisan campaign finance reform bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair does not recognize the gentleman for that purpose. The gentleman cannot be recognized for that purpose. The gentleman may speak to the issues in his bill but not ask for it to be considered.

Mr. MEEHAN. Madam Speaker, but I cannot ask for unanimous consent to suspend the rules and ask for consideration of the bill?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. There is already one motion to suspend the rules pending.

Mr. MEEHAN. So this amendment cannot be amended to include it?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This motion is not amendable. The gentleman may speak to the issues in his bill in general.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. GEJDENSON. Parliamentary inquiry, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Madam Speaker, I hope that time will not be taken from the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This parliamentary inquiry will not.

Mr. GEJDENSON. So I will ask the Speaker the question, then.

So a Member of Congress is not capable or able to ask the Chair whether or not he could, by unanimous consent, not by any parliamentary motion, by unanimous consent, change the procedures we are operating under? I believe that the gentleman has a right to ask for unanimous consent at any time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair does not recognize the gentleman to make that unanimous consent request.

Mr. MEEHAN. Madam Speaker, that is exactly the point. I have worked with Republican and Democratic Members over the last 5 years working to find a way to find bipartisan campaign finance reform, to level the playing field and treat both Democrats and Republicans fairly. I have worked with the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS), the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. ROUKEMA), the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH), the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA), the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. WAMP), the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. BARRETT), the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN), the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. MINGE), the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY), and the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR) and a number of other Members; and, finally, the day is here.

We had a bill that passed the United States Senate. It got 53 votes in the other body. That is the bill that we wanted to vote on today. But what did the Republican leadership do? Made a mockery of this debate, a sham of this debate by going through a suspension of the rules where a two-thirds vote is required and calling it campaign finance reform.

Shame on them. This is not the way to have campaign finance reform. There are Members who worked too hard, too long trying to pass a campaign finance reform bill that is fair to both political parties, that ends the corrupt system of raising more and more money through soft money contributions. All anyone has to do is look at the contributions of big tobacco in 1997 and how much money they are spending in attempting to try to influence the process as we try to make a decision on tobacco.

This debate is, without question, one of the lowest moments for this House of Representatives. Every conceivable public interest group in America that has been fighting for campaign finance reform has asked for a debate.

□ 1915

Mr. MEEHAN. Madam Speaker, every public interest group that has been fighting for reform over the last decade have worked with a bipartisan group to put real reform before the table.

Members of the press, New York Times, the Washington Post, every credible editorial in America have called on this body to have a vote on real bipartisan campaign finance reform. And what do we have? We have a motion to suspend the rules that requires a two-thirds vote.

Members of the majority party may think that they are fooling the American public, but I have to tell them, the public gets it. They understand what is at work here, and they are just as disgusted at this process as the Democrats are.

Mr. THOMAS. Madam Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE), a member who has been involved for years both at the State and Federal level in campaign reform, a cosponsor of H.R. 3581.

Mr. CASTLE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. Let me start by saying I agree with virtually everybody who spoke tonight, that this process is not what we would have wanted, those of us who are trying to reform campaign finance.

Let me just also say that both parties have had problems. I am not saying whether it is equal or not. Who knows what the circumstances are with respect to campaign finance. I think the whole country knows that.

I also am a supporter of Shays-Meehan. I like the freshman bill. I think there is a lot of good things that have happened over in the Senate as well. Unfortunately, we are not going to be able to get to all of those.

This is what we have before us, and we have to make a decision tonight on whether or not we are going to vote for this, because this may be the only vote we are going to get. So I did something unusual. I read the bill, and I decided to make up a list of reasons as to why we should support it. And after David Letterman, I did this. This is the top 10 reasons to support it.

Let me start with Number 10. This bill removes soft money from the Federal election process. That is extraordinarily important. We have already heard about all the soft money problems. It removes it from the Federal election process.

Number 9, the bill contains the core elements of campaign finance reform that Republican and Democratic reformers have agreed upon.

Number 8, it keeps foreign money outside of the United States elections.

Number 7, it helps States maintain accurate voter registration rolls.

Number 6, it adjusts hard money contributions for inflation.

Number 5, it strengthens FEC reporting requirements.

Number 4, it levels the playing field for candidates running against millionaires.

Number 3, it ensures voluntary contributions for members of corporations and unions.

And Number 2, it strengthens disclosure requirements for interest groups to prevent them from anonymously financing expensive advertising campaigns.

And Number 1, first, a bill that offends Republicans, Democrats, and interest groups alike is worth considering. This bill will cause everyone in the election process some pain, but it is the first step to achieve real campaign finance reform.

Madam Speaker, that is what it truly is all about. Most of the public believes that we will never be able to do this. The bottom line is, if we are going to be able to do it, we are going to have to take on our own political parties, all the outside interest groups, and we are going to have to make it tell.

The way to do that tonight is to cast a ''yes'' vote on this, start the process, get it over to the Senate, debate this in every way we possibly can; hopefully

finish the process so that we, indeed, can be proud at some point with the fact that we have campaign finance reform.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the courageous gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Madam Speaker, there are people of good faith, both Democrats and Republicans, who have some good idea about how to clean up the corrupting influence of big money in our campaign system. But every one of our Republican friends will have to admit that the only reason that those ideas are not being considered tonight is because the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGRICH), and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY) do not want them considered. They know if we had a full and fair debate, as some of us have been demanding since January of 1995, that we would approve real reform and respond to the needs of the American people.

So this year, the Republican leadership, unlike 1996 when they were satisfied with a mere knife in the back of campaign finance, this year they prefer an axe murder. They have chopped this bill up. They want the blood to splatter across this Chamber and let everyone share a little bit of the blame.

The blame is clearly placed in one and only one place: Those who have chosen to deny a fair debate on Republican and Democratic proposals alike. They are the people who said they came here as revolutionaries. But when it comes to campaign finance, there they are only revolting. Some of us say they delayed too long on this, but I think we were wrong. They should have brought this bill up a day later, on April Fool's Day.

Mr. THOMAS. Madam Speaker, we have one remaining speaker, and I believe it is our right to close.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). The gentleman is correct.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER), a senior Member of Congress who has fought for campaign finance reform for many years.

Mr. MILLER of California. Madam Speaker, this weekend, Speaker GINGRICH went home to his district, and he was giving a speech in his district, and he talked about how, under our system, the power rests with the people, and we as elected officials can only borrow that power, because, eventually, we have to do what the people want.

With this rule tonight or with this suspension vote tonight, Speaker GINGRICH has ripped the power away from the people who are represented by the freshman coalition. Millions of Americans who are represented by the freshman bipartisan coalition who had a campaign finance bill they wanted to present, debate, and vote on, they cannot do it under this measure.

With this procedure, Speaker GINGRICH and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY) have ripped the power out of the hands of hundreds of millions of Americans who are represented by a majority of this House who want to vote on Shays-Meehan. Those people do not get to exercise their power because their elected officials are silenced by the suspension process.

As we just heard, there are no amendments in order. There is no way to spread, to broaden the debate. There is no way to bring up those provisions that are supported by people throughout the country. Why? Because Republicans found out last week, if they let it happen, it would pass. So they had to go back to trickery. They had to go to the suspension of the rules. They had to protect their Members and protect themselves from amendments, from democracy, from free and open debate.

That is why we are here tonight. We are here because the Republicans, for the last 15 months, could not stand to trust the people and their elected representatives. So tonight they decided to suspend the rules and give us 20 minutes to debate these measures that are so complicated and so important to the continuation of our democratic institutions, democratic institutions that are being corroded, that are being corrupted by the huge amount of money, tonight the Republicans think the answer is to let wealthy people give more money to campaigns rather than to give the American people a voice in the reform of this system.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I thank the ranking member very much for this time.

Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition. This is campaign finance sham. It increases the amount of money the wealthy can give to candidates.

Madam Speaker, I rise this evening in strong opposition to H.R. 3581, the so-called "Campaign Finance Act of 1998." I am here today to express my commitment to reform of our current campaign finance system and to urge my colleagues to support meaningful and comprehensive campaign finance reform. H.R. 3581, however, is neither. Instead, this bill is a sham—it is the antithesis of genuine campaign finance reform.

Genuine campaign finance reform would empower America's working families—our average citizens—and decrease the disproportionate influence that wealthy special interests now command in our political system. H.R. 3485 acts in exactly the opposite manner to further amplify the already loud political voice of the wealthy. If adopted, this legislation would: inject as much as 3 times more money into federal campaigns and elections than current law permits; impose onerous requirements on groups that have a legitimate right to engage in political activities on behalf of their dues-paying members; and single-out for scrutiny citizens who have a right to vote in this nation's elections.

Let's begin with a discussion of the so-called "Paycheck Protection" provision—more accurately named the "Worker Gag Rule." This provision will prohibit unions from making political expenditures without prior written consent from their members. Proponents of this legislation have dishonestly agreed that it is intended to protect the rights of union members. In reality, it is intended to effectively silence the ability of America's working families to have a voice in the political process by singling out American workers for burdensome restrictions on their right to have their voices heard here in Washington. Although cleverly disguised as campaign finance reform, this legislation is clearly a coordinated effort to silence workers and their families and remove them from the political playing field.

H.R. 3485 also sets up a "pilot" program to verify the citizenship of voters in the five states that contain the majority of our nation's Hispanic and minority voters. Does that sound familiar? It should. This provision is very similar to H.R. 1428, the Voter Eligibility Verification Act, legislation that was overwhelmingly defeated by the House just this past February. This provision will allow local election officials to submit voter's names to the Immigration and Naturalization Service and the Social Security Administration for citizenship verification. However, according to testimony from both the INS and SSA, this is utterly unworkable because neither agency can confirm the citizenship of a majority of Americans. Like the bill, that preceded it, this provision purports to eliminate voter fraud by requiring proof of citizenship for registered voters and applicants for voter registration. In fact, it is nothing more than a thinly veiled tool for suppressing the minority vote.

Finally, H.R. 3485 doubles the contributions for individuals to $2000 and triples the amount that wealthy special interests can give to political parties to $60,000. This will quite obviously result in more money in politics and greater influence by wealthy special interests.

I am honored to have been chosen by the people of the 18th Congressional District of Houston to serve as their representative in this Congress. And I never lose sight of the fact that this body in which I serve is a body of the people. It is the People's house. It belongs to the people of the 18th Congressional District and to all the citizens of this nation. As the People's Congress, the doors of this Congress must be open to all the People. It must be accessible to every man and woman, not just the powerful and wealthy.

It is clear that the American people are disgusted with our current campaign finance system. They believe it to be inaccessible and corrupt. During the 1996 election cycle, an unprecedented amount of money was spent, further heightening public cynicism of how our democracy works.

The American people have voiced their concern and it is our duty to answer those concerns. The American people are calling out to all of us in Congress to restore their confidence in Congress's ability to act for the good of the nation. I believe that we can enact campaign finance reform. We can work together to find a balance between protecting the first amendment rights of individuals and fostering a positive role in reducing the influence of special interests. H.R. 3581, however, is not the right answer and I urge my colleagues to signal their disgust with the partisanship gamesmanship that this legislation represents with a "no" vote.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Madam Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the eloquent gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) to close on our side.

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, this is a 52-page bill. We got it at 4 o'clock this afternoon. Debate started shortly after 6:00. This is a sham.

Now, I could hopefully try to follow the introduction of my friend, the gentleman from Connecticut, of being eloquent, but let me read from the New York Times.

I tell my friend, the gentleman from Delaware, the bills that the gentleman from Georgia, (Mr. GINGRICH) are sponsoring are either anemic, irrelevant, or tied to an antiunion provision repugnant to most Democrats. With a two-thirds approval requirement, they cannot pass.

Of course, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGRICH) does not care if his own fraudulent legislation wins or loses. All he seeks is the chance to say the House considered campaign finance reform and was unable to pass a bill.

They end their editorial with this, ''It is a cynical maneuver that will come back to haunt Mr. GINGRICH and any House Member who supports it.'' I tell my friend, the gentleman from Delaware, for whom I have great respect, he intones that this is the last opportunity.

Why, my friend, is this the last opportunity? Why would the power of the majority that has been exercised so effectively to push through what it wants, why I ask my friend, the gentleman from Delaware, can the Speaker of the House not say to the American public I am going to allow a bill on this floor to be fully debated, to be amended, and to be discussed in the presence of the American public, perhaps I might even suggest for 2 hours. A significant, most significant issue such as this surely deserves at least that much time.

But, no, my colleagues, this bill has been brought to the floor, as the New York times said, as a cynical maneuver to claim that they are doing something to reform campaign finance when they most assuredly know it will inevitably fail.

My friends, campaign finance reform is a critically important issue. We have twiddled our thumbs for the first 3 months of this session, largely at home, not here doing the people's business. But in the last minute, this legislation is brought to us. Let us reject it and demand that real reform be brought to this floor for full and honest debate.

Mr. THOMAS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Madam Speaker, apparently moral outrage is alive and well on the floor. The argument is that reform is owned by only one group. It really is not owned by anyone.

It has been said that only one side plays politics. The other side, as I said, claims the moral high ground. But what is the moral high ground in campaign reform? Quite frankly, if we examine Shays-Meehan, McCain-Feingold, earlier versions, we really come to the conclusion that it is for sure a title that will remain, but the contents will change.

It is kind of interesting that the moral outrage today is that we have to ban soft money. When McCain-Feingold started, it was to ban political action committees. But nowhere in the current bill do they find banning political action committees. Does that mean that they were wrong earlier, and they are right now? Or were they right earlier and they are wrong now?

It seems to me that, if we will examine those earlier bills, we will find that they banned leadership PACs. Members will find no provision in the current bill banning leadership PACs. At one time, they banned leadership PACs. Was it wrong earlier to ban leadership PACs and right now to exclude them?

So I think, when we are talking about looking for the moral high ground, one of the things we ought to do is what the gentleman from Delaware did, and that is read the bills. Because I think, notwithstanding the rhetoric on the other side of the aisle, Members will be surprised, indeed some Members might be shocked, to find out what H.R. 3581 holds and what Shays-Meehan does not hold.

I mentioned earlier, at the beginning of the debate, millionaire candidates. Although the court has said, constitutionally, that candidates are allowed to spend their money, we are trying to create a level playing field. Guess what? When we read Shays-Meehan, they exclude the primary. When we read H.R. 3581, the primary is included. On their moral high ground bill, millionaires can still buy primaries. In our bill, they cannot.

They say the bane of this system is soft money. What would we do to a Presidential candidate who promised to take only public financing but went ahead and raised soft money? What H.R. 3581 does is ban the ability of candidates taking public money if they take soft money. What does Shays-Meehan do? It is silent.

Let us go to the heart of banning money both at the Federal and the State level. Guess what? H.R. 3581 is a hard ban on soft money both at the Federal and the State level. If Members actually read Shays-Meehan, they will find that, in fact, there are a number of loopholes on soft money at the State level. It is not a hard ban on soft money. We can use it for a number of overhead costs. We can use it for staff if it is less than the majority of the time.

Of course one of the glaring neglects in Shays-Meehan is the whole question of voter fraud that has gained the headlines all across the country, it contains not one provision to guarantee that only people who are supposed to vote can actually participate in the election.

□ 1930

Let me indicate another area where, if my colleagues are honestly for reform, they might be somewhat shocked. Today one of the dirtiest campaign tricks is what we call push polling. It is where they poll but then they say, ''If candidate X had done 1, 2 or 3, what would you think about that candidate?'' Guess what? We require disclosure if it is not in the public domain. What does Shays-Meehan do? Absolutely nothing, no addressing of push polling.

And then of course when we take a look at the way in which the Federal Election Commission requires us to report, we can put down $10,000 to campaign committee X, and we do not have to itemize. Shays-Meehan allows this block registration of money; it is wrong. We require that campaigns break down to secondary givers.

It is amazing that when we look at real reform, we find far more specific real reforms in H.R. 3581 than we do in the bill that will be changed tomorrow, the day after tomorrow, just as it was changed yesterday and the day before yesterday, but they retain moral outrage.

I would ask for an ''aye'' vote on 3581.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 3485. Although this legislation addresses some important reform components, it is flawed in many ways. The biggest travesty, however, is the process by which this legislation is being considered. There is no opportunity to debate or vote on real campaign finance reform. The American people deserve better than what we are offering today.

Regrettably, we are considering four pieces of legislation to change our campaign financing system under the suspension calendar, a process that is reserved for non-controversial legislation, precluding an honest debate over one of the most complicated, pressing national issues before us. I am deeply troubled that this process does not allow any Member to offer amendments to this legislation, and we do not even have the opportunity to consider H.R. 3526, Congressmen SHAYS and MEEHAN'S companion bill to McCain-Feingold.

Through my service on the Government Reform and Oversight Committee, it has become obvious that we need real reform. Clearly, the Federal Election Campaign Act prohibits contributions by foreign nationals in connection with any election. But, it has become increasingly difficult to distinguish which campaign practices are legal and which are not—and most important, which campaign practices should be illegal.

Soft money began to fill campaign coffers following the Federal Election Campaign Act Amendments of 1979, which allowed a greater role for state and local parties by exempting certain grassroots and generic party-building activities from FECA coverage. Although they are legal, soft money contributions have led to questionable fundraising practices and to the escalating costs of elections. Shays-Meehan truly closes the soft money loophole. It is not clear that the soft-money ban in H.R. 3485 would prevent unlimited and unregulated soft money to be laundered through state parties to influance federal elections.

Title I of H.R. 3485 would unduly burden unions and the nonprofit community. H.R.

3485 requires unions to get ''prior, written, separate permission'' to use dues for political activities. This goes beyond the Beck decision, which applies only to mandatory union dues-paying, non-members. It also requires corporations to annually notify shareholders of its intended political spending, and the shareholder's pro rata share of such spending. However, the burden of proof is inconsistent. Union members' consent is not presumed and unions must affirmatively obtain members' consent. For corporations, shareholders' consent is presumed unless they affirmatively object. Furthermore, the definition of political activity goes far beyond electioneering and would hinder the ability of unions and nonprofits to communicate directly with federal agencies and the Congress to discuss public policy issues.

H.R. 3485 also contains provisions that would allow states to disciminate against voters. Mr. Speaker, all Americans are concerned with maintaining and improving the integrity of our nation's elections. We know that, in some recent cases, illegal immigrants and others not legally qualified to vote have registered and cast ballots. A number of bills have been introduced in this Congress to deal with this problem.

Another bill to be considered under suspension, H.R. 1428, while attempting to restore electoral integrity, actually threatens to return us to a darker era in our nation's history, when people's voting rights were frequently challenger or harrassed and their rights to cast ballots shall.

H.R. 1428 would allow local officials to check the eligiblility of registered voters by submitting names from the voting rolls to the Immigration and Nationalization Service or the Social Security Administration. But how will the names be chosen? Will the Smiths, the Johnsons, and the Andersons be scrutinized, or will the effort of local officals be more focused on the Singhs, the Martinezes, and the Nguyens? Unfortunately, the historical record would indicate the latter.

In addition, the bill presumes that the INS and the SSA will have their records available and updated for use by local officials, which we know is not likely to be the case. And should local election officials not be able to confirm citizenship, they can drop voters from the rolls without having proven that they are not qualified to vote.

Mr. Speaker, rightly or wrongly, Hispanic-Americans and other immigrants to our country feel a growing bias against them. U.S. citizens living in my district who were born in Latin America have expressed their growing frustration and fear with harassing INS raids which treat all immigrants as suspects; they are being denied the presumption of innocence. A Salvadoran-American woman living in my district, who have been a resident and a citizen for more than 20 years, never leaves her house without her U.S. passport, for fear that she may be harassed or detained by immigration or other law enforcement authorities.

H.R. 1428 threatens to intensify the growing feeling of alienation among immigrants U.S. citizens, without assuring that it can easily, reasonably, or fairly accomplish its objective of ballot integrity. For these reasons, I must oppose H.R. 1428

Mr. Speaker, it's not too late to bring real reforms to the floor. After the defeat of today's measures under suspension, let's work to bring about an honest debate and real campaign reform—what the American people deserve.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). The time of the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) has expired.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3581.

The question was taken.

Mr. THOMAS. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

ILLEGAL FOREIGN CONTRIBUTIONS ACT OF 1998

Mr. THOMAS. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 34) to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to prohibit individuals who are not citizens of the United States from making contributions or expenditures in connection with an election for Federal office, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 34

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Illegal Foreign Contributions Act of 1998''.

SEC. 2. PROHIBITING NON-CITIZEN INDIVIDUALS FROM MAKING CONTRIBUTIONS OR EXPENDITURES IN CONNECTION WITH FEDERAL ELECTIONS.

(a) PROHIBITION APPLICABLE TO ALL NON-CITIZENS.—Section 319(b)(2) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 441e(b)(2)) is amended by striking ''and who is not lawfully admitted'' and all that follows and inserting a period.

(b) PROHIBITION APPLICABLE TO EXPENDITURES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 319(a) of such Act (2 U.S.C. 441e(a)) is amended by inserting ''or expenditure'' after ''contribution'' each place it appears.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 319 of such Act (2 U.S.C. 441e) is amended in the heading by inserting ''AND EXPENDITURES'' after ''CONTRIBUTIONS''.

SEC. 3. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendments made by this Act shall apply with respect to contributions or expenditures made on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) and the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS).

Mr. THOMAS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, this is a bill by our colleague from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER). It was introduced on January 7, 1997, and in yielding myself such time as I may consume, let me read what the bill does in sum and substance:

It is to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to prohibit individuals who are not citizens of the United States from making contributions or expenditures in connection with an election for Federal office.

Rarely have we had a bill in front of us that is so plain, simple to understand, and so necessary.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I would just like to say, having taken this opportunity to yield myself as much time as I may consume, the gentleman from California, who I believe in my heart would have not moved forward with a process like this that denied Members a real opportunity to debate and discuss these issues, his point argues for an end to this insane process. Yes, amendments are needed; yes, changes are needed, and Members ought not be able to be restricted in the manner they are as we deal with this legislation on the floor.

It is his party that chose to set up a process that sets a standard that we need two-thirds to move forward. They waited until after the Senate had already filibustered campaign finance reform to death. Our party has a record of moving forward on campaign finance reform, and today the Republican Party again paints itself with a brush against reform.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK).

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 34, cynically misnamed the Illegal Foreign Contributions Act. The title of this bill is there to lure Members into thinking that it deals with illegal foreign contributions. That is simply not the case.

What this bill does is to prohibit legal residents who are living here in the United States legally, working, paying their taxes, fighting in the military, giving up their lives, denying them the right to participate in the political process in this country. That is absolutely unconstitutional; it is a denial of the First Amendment rights of free speech. The Supreme Court has repeatedly said political voice can be done in many ways, and contributions of money constitutes free speech.

Madam Speaker, therefore I concur with the 100 law professors who have submitted a letter to all the Members of this body decrying this bill, denouncing it as unconstitutional, and certainly if this Congress should pass it and it should become law, it will be contested and it will be found unconstitutional.

Mr. THOMAS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG) who also had legislation dealing with this area as well.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding