work because employers would rather hire and exploit their sons and daughters; and

Whereas, children as young as 6 years of age work 15 hours a day, 7 days a week, scrambling for food, drugged to enable them to work longer and faster and often bent, cowed and crippled from overwork, accidents and starvation; and

Whereas, at a time when new technologies allow monetary investments to cross national borders with a keystroke on a computer and where capital can shop the world for the least expensive and most vulnerable workers, citizens of the United States must ensure that human values such as the dignity of working men and women and the dreams for their children continue to be honored; and

Whereas, international economic competition must not be allowed to degenerate into a race to the bottom where standards under which most people live are sacrificed for the private profit of a privileged few; and

Whereas, companies in the United States must be held accountable for the actions of their contractors at home and abroad; and

Whereas, persons in business, labor and government in our country need to do more by taking action against sweatshops and child labor in our own country as well as in other countries in the world; now, therefore,

The People of the State of Nevada, represented in Senate and Assembly, do enact as follows:

Section 1. 1. The Nevada Legislature hereby urges:

(a) Congress to address the problem of child labor, both in the United States and abroad;

(b) Congress to support the adoption of the International Labor Organization convention on the elimination of child labor resulting from the 86th and 87th congressional sessions of the International Labor Organization in 1998 and 1999, respectively; and

(c) Businesses in the State of Nevada not to sell products made through the labor of children.

2. The Secretary of the Senate shall prepare and transmit a copy of this act to the Vice President of the United States as the presiding officer of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives and each member of the Nevada Congressional Delegation.

SEC. 2. This act becomes effective upon passage and approval.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. ROTH, from the Committee on Finance, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 1093. A bill to extend nondiscriminatory treatment (most-favored-nation treatment) to the products of the Lao People's Democratic Republic, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 105–83).

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second time by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BUMPERS, Mr. DEWINE, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. REED, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. WELLSTONE, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 1183. A bill to repeal the provision crediting increased excise taxes on certain tobacco products against payments made pursuant to the tobacco industry settlement legislation; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HATCH (for himself, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. DEWINE, and Mr. BIDEN):

S. 1184. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to waive nonimmigrant visa fees for aliens seeking to enter the United States to engage in certain charitable activities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself and Mr. BREAUX):

S. 1185. A bill to provide employees with more access to information concerning their pension plans and with additional mechanisms to enforce their rights under such plans; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

By Mr. DEWINE (for himself Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. WELLSTONE):

S. 1186. A bill to provide for education and training, and for other purposes: to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

By Mr. LAUTENBERG (for himself, Mr. HOLLINGS, and Mr. THURMOND):

S. 1187. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on ferroboron; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. KOHL:

S. 1188. A bill to amend chapters 83 and 85 of title 28, United States Code, relating to the jurisdiction of the District Court for the District of Columbia, and the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Oregon (for himself and Mr. HATCH):

S. 1189. A bill to increase the criminal penalties for assaulting or threatening Federal judges, their family members, and other public servants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALLARD:

S. 1190. A bill to reform the financing of Federal elections; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. HATCH (for himself, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. DEWINE and Mr. BIDEN):

S. 1184. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to waive nonimmigrant visa fees for aliens seeking to enter the United States to engage in certain charitable activities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

THE MOTHER TERESA FEE WAIVER ACT OF 1997

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President. I am proud today to introduce—along with my colleagues Senators KENNEDY, ABRAHAM, LEAHY, and DEWINE—the Mother Teresa fee waiver bill of 1997.

While daily newscasts focus our attention on the scourge of senseless crime and deadly drugs in our country and around the world, Mother Teresa's death last week focused the world's attention on the simple good works that are all too often overlooked.

As the flag of India was draped over Mother Teresa, an observer commented ''She now belongs to the State.'' I think it is more accurate to say that Mother Teresa has and will always belong to the world. In an era where the phrase ''global economy'' has become commonplace, Mother Teresa represented a ''global morality.'' Her good works, and those of so many other religious organizations around the world are not, and should not be, confined by national borders and boundaries.

Shortly before her death, Mother Teresa personally sought a waiver of the fees charged to her missionaries seeking to enter this country on a temporary basis to help the poorest of the poor and the sickest of the sick in our own cities. Of course, she was absolutely right. We should give thanks to these kind and giving persons who travel to foreign lands for no other purpose than to give of themselves to help the neediest in those lands. Instead, we've been charging them. It is an absurd situation that needs to be remedied.

I am, therefore, pleased today to stand with my colleagues in introducing a simple and straightforward bill that would waive the fees for persons coming here temporarily for the purpose of engaging in charitable activities to help the needy. This bill is but one small but fitting and timely tribute to Mother Teresa who stood under 5 feet but whose goodness and righteousness made her tower among us.

I look forward to the Senate's swift action on this measure.

Mr. KENNEDY. I am pleased to join with Senator HATCH in sponsoring legislation requested by Mother Teresa to waive visa application fees for religious workers coming to the United States to perform charitable work for temporary periods.

During her visits to the United States, Mother Teresa asked President Clinton to take this step to waive visa fees for her missionaries coming to work in this country. Her Missionaries of Charity come to America to help the poor in our communities and to minister to the sick and the elderly. Each time they travel here, they are required to pay a $120 visa fee to the U.S. Government.

It makes no sense to require these religious workers to pay a fee to the Federal Government in order to come here to help our communities. The legislation we introduce today would waive the fee in these instances.

This past weekend, while attending Mother Teresa's funeral in India, the First Lady met with Sister Nirmala, Mother Teresa's successor at the Missionaries of Charity Order in Calcutta. Sister Nirmala asked once again for a waiver of the visa fee and was delighted to learn that the U.S. Senate would be considering legislation this week to accomplish this goal as Mother Teresa had requested.

This is an important step that Congress can take to honor the memory of Mother Theresa and the compassionate work that her order brings to America. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President. I am pleased to be a cosponsor of legislation

authored by Senators HATCH and KENNEDY to waive the visa fees for religious workers who enter to perform charitable functions.

It is not in the U.S. interest to impose fees that inhibit or otherwise burden individuals who seek to help our communities. Mother Teresa spoke specifically of eliminating these fees for members of her mission coming to the United States to serve the poor, so as to make the money available for more good works. I applaud Senators HATCH and KENNEDY for introducing this important legislation.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself and Mr. BREAUX):

S. 1185. A bill to provide employees with more access to information concerning their pension plans and with additional mechanisms to enforce their rights under such plans; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

THE PENSION TOOLS ACT

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, today I rise to introduce the Pension Tools Act of 1997. Why pension tools? Because this legislation contains the components, or tools that will assist pension participants and retirees to understand the fundamentals of their pension plans, get them to think about their retirement for the long term, and when problems arise—help put in place a cost-effective conflicts resolution process.

This legislation is very important to today's retirees and workers. In June, the Senate Aging Committee, which I chair, convened a hearing which highlighted the growing problem of pension mistakes. That's right, Mr. President. A pension mistake. The problem addressed at the hearing did not target intentional wrongdoing—but honest mistakes by employers which can lead to a cut in a monthly pension payment or a lump-sum payment a worker takes when leaving a job.

It's impossible to determine how big the problem is, but it is a growing concern. To try to document how big the problem could be, I asked the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation [PBGC] to provide me with data about a program they administer called the standard termination audit program. The program audits a sample of plans which have terminated—these are not plans which have gone bankrupt. The PBGC released a letter to my committee which showed that certain pension payouts have errors in the range of 8 percent. That number has increased since the program started back in 1986 when it was 2 percent. Many of these errors involve substantial sums of money. In fact, one in three people who were shortchanged, were shortchanged by at least $1,000.

Other pension experts and advocates would put the number of mistakes at a higher rate—in the range of 15 to 20 percent. But we just can't say what the number is because none of the agencies who regulate pensions audit whether or not the pensions and lump-sum payments that are made to the majority of workers and retirees are usually accurate. Most employers are doing their best to pay the right amount but mistakes do happen. The problem is that people are not aware that they really need to verify that their pension payouts are the right amount.

The hearing called attention to that very problem. Too many workers lack a full understanding of how their pension works and how much their benefit will be until just before retirement.

It is my hope that this legislation will be a vital part of our effort to educate people about the need to prepare for retirement. One of the components of good retirement preparation is tracking your employer-provided pension and knowing your pension rights.

Specifically, this legislation will give employees the opportunity to have benefit statements sent to them on a regular basis. In addition, the legislation clarifies that pension plan participants and beneficiaries should have access to plan documents which show how their pension benefit was calculated. That way, they can check the math and verify that their benefit is correct.

My bill will also address two other problems raised at the hearing. First, one problem faced by pension participants and beneficiaries is that employers are slow to respond to their requests for information. To address that problem, we will authorize the Secretary of Labor to assess a fine if an employer fails or refuses to provide information in a timely manner. The other problem that this bill will address is to clarify that a person who has been cashed out of a plan can still get information from the plan administrator if a problem arises after the person separates from employment.

Senator BREAUX and I are also including a directive to the Secretary of Labor to draft model procedures for alternative dispute resolution. The enforcement option open to pension participants now—a lawsuit—is simply too costly for many people who are living on a fixed income.

Part of the problem we see is that pensions are very complex. It is hard for employers to administer pensions even with the expert advice of paid pension consultants. I am continuing to seek ways to alleviate some of the pressure on employers. We have already taken the first step of asking the General Accounting Office to review the changes in the law since the passage of GATT—this had an impact on interest rates—one of the areas where we see the most problems in pension errors. We are also looking into the usefulness of mandating that employers provide a summary annual report of the pension plan to participants every year. These summary reports are not user-friendly and do not provide the participants with information in an accessible way. Benefit statements and the use of education and outreach may provide a substitute for the annual mailing of summary annual reports to pension participants.

I am also submitting for the RECORD two letters of support for the legislation. The first letter is from the Pension Rights Center here in Washington, DC. The center has a long history as an effective advocate for participant rights. The second letter was submitted by the American Society of Pension Actuaries. This group strongly supports the idea of automatic benefit statements and we will certainly work with them to clarify language in the legislation.

While great strides have been made since the act went into effect, participants and beneficiaries still lack access to basic but vital information and tools to enforce their rights. Having a pension can make all the difference to people once they retire. The Pension Tools Act strikes the right balance to get people useful information about their pensions and help them enforce basic rights to that information. I urge my colleagues to support the efforts of Senator BREAUX and myself to ensure that retirees and workers get every penny they have earned when the time comes to retire.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that additional material be printed in the RECORD.

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

AMERICAN SOCIETY OF PENSION ACTUARIES,
Arlington, VA, September 16, 1997.

Hon. CHARLES E. GRASSLEY,
Special Committee on Aging, U.S. Senate, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN GRASSLEY: The American Society of Pension Actuaries appreciates your efforts to ensure that plan participants and beneficiaries have sufficient information about their plan benefits. ASPA believes that better informed participants will become more active participants. Particularly, ASPA strongly supports your proposals to provide for participant benefit statements and benefit calculations. This invaluable information will allow plan participants to more accurately plan for retirement.

We agree conceptually with the other proposals outlined in the ''Summary of Pension Tools Act of 1997,'' which was provided to us by your staff. However, we are unable to more fully endorse the entire bill until we have had an opportunity to review the detailed legislative language. Further, we would like to alert you about two general concerns we have pertaining to two of the proposals outlined.

First, one of the proposals would treat participants who have been ''cashed out'' of the plan as ''active'' participants for purposes of obtaining information about the plan as allowed under the Employee Retirement Income Security Act. Although we appreciate the general objective underlying this proposal, we are concerned if the proposal would allow, for instance, a former participant to request a benefit calculation after ten years. Such a request would be a tremendous hardship on the plan sponsor or plan administrator since in most cases such records are not retained for a long period of time. We would suggest giving participants a fixed period of time—such as 18 months after they have received their benefits—to request this information.

Second, another proposal would require the Secretary of Labor to develop model alternative dispute resolution procedures. We agree that such procedures can often be a more efficient means for resolving disputes, and we also agree with your conclusion to give plans the option of choosing to adopt such procedures. The summary further indicates that the Secretary of Labor would formulate a list of neutral experts to serve as mediators. We are concerned that such a list would become politicized. Consequently, we would suggest as an alternative that the Secretary of Labor be tasked with simply maintaining the list and that any pension professional meeting objective qualification requirements be permitted to be listed.

We hope these comments are helpful and we look forward to working with you and your staff toward passage of this legislation.

Respectfully,

BRIAN H. GRAFF, Esq.,
Executive Director.

PENSION RIGHTS CENTER,
Washington, DC, September 11, 1997.

Hon. CHARLES GRASSLEY,
Chairman, Special Committee on Aging, Senate Dirksen Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR GRASSLEY: I am writing to express the Pension Rights Center's strong support for the Pension Tools Act of 1997. Your proposed legislation will help assure that employees will receive accurate and timely information about their future pension benefits. It will also give retirees the opportunity to check the accuracy of plan calculations, and develop an inexpensive forum where they can challenge improper benefit denials.

Sincerely your,

KAREN W. FERGUSON,
Director.

By Mr. DEWINE (for himself, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. WELLSTONE):

S. 1186. A bill to provide for education and training, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

THE WORKFORCE INVESTMENT PARTNERSHIP ACT

Mr. DEWINE. Madam President, as a member of the Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee and chairman of the Subcommittee on Employment and Training, I have spent the last few years examining our Federal job training programs. During this examination, it has become clear to me as well as many others, that these programs are in dire need of reform. The status quo is just plain unacceptable.

What we are faced with today is a fragmented and duplicative maze of narrowly focused programs administered by numerous Federal agencies that lack coordination, a coherent strategy to provide training assistance, and the confidence of the two key consumers who utilize these services—those seeking the training, and those businesses seeking to hire them. Despite spending billions of tax dollars each year on job training programs, most Federal agencies do not know how their programs work and if their programs are really helping people find jobs.

Here is what we do know. Today's job training system is no system at all—it is a complex patchwork of numerous rules, regulations, requirements, and overlapping bureaucratic responsibilities. As a result, programs are largely ineffective. Frustration and confusion is widespread throughout the system—by program administrators and employers, and most important, by those seeking assistance. People have difficulty knowing where to begin to look for training assistance because there are no clear points of entry and no clear paths from one program to another.

This is frustration at the breaking point.

Frustration to the point that business community participation, which is absolutely necessary for success, is waning.

Frustration to the point that community activists, again whose participation is absolutely necessary for success, are becoming disenchanted.

Frustration to the point that we have begun to question our commitment to job training.

Fragmentation, duplication, ineffectiveness, and frustration—these are the words that describe the current Federal job training apparatus. That is the status quo. That is unacceptable. That is largely why reform is needed now.

There are other important reasons why reform is necessary. The economic future of our country depends on a well-trained work force. I have heard from employers at every level who find it increasingly difficult to attract and find qualified employees for high-skilled, high-paying jobs as well as qualified entry level employees. If we are going to remain economically competitive, we must address this growing shortage of workers.

Reform also is needed if the welfare reform bill Congress passed last year is going to have any chance of succeeding. We need to provide States with the tools necessary to develop a comprehensive system to assist people make work, not welfare, their way of life.

To achieve all of these goals, job training is the key.

The bill that I introduce today with Senators JEFFORDS, KENNEDY, and WELLSTONE represents a bipartisan belief that we can do better and we can achieve these goals. We can replace the current system of frustration and provide a framework for success.

By removing or reforming outdated rules and regulations, we can remove the barriers that have stymied reform in the past. We can empower States to boldly move forward, transforming the current patchwork of programs into a comprehensive system to make it easier for all consumers seeking assistance to receive assistance.

Just like we did with welfare reform, job training reform is about recognizing the leadership of States that have shown innovation and initiative over the last few years, even in the midst of numerous Federal barriers and obstacles. It is about allowing them and encouraging them to continue with the innovations they have implemented without Federal reform legislation.

We can establish a framework for a system that provides consumer choice. Individuals seeking assistance should have a say in where, how, and what training they will receive. At the same time, the Federal bureaucracy should not engage in micro-management by mandating vouchers or any other specific local delivery system. This is a decision that belongs to the States and localities. This bill takes the opposite approach—it provides States and localities the flexibility to develop training programs that meet the real needs of those seeking training. It is to the consumer that these programs should be tailored to, not Washington.

We can establish an accountable system. Training programs must demonstrate their effectiveness to be certified as eligible programs. This means proving that training leads to meaningful, unsubsidized employment—showing how many people were placed, at what cost, and how many people remained employed 6 months to a year later. We owe this to the individuals seeking assistance and to the American taxpayers who pays for these programs.

We can establish a framework that not only allows for business community involvement, but business community leadership. The private sector must outline their employment needs and assist in the design of training programs.

The Workforce Investment Partnership Act incorporates all of these principles. The programs incorporated in the legislation include job training, vocational education, and adult education. Additionally, it provides strong, mandatory linkages to welfare to work, Wagner-Peyser, Job Corps, Older Americans, Vocational Rehabilitation, the Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training, veterans, Trade Adjustment Assistance, as well as other training related programs.

While separate funding streams will be maintained for each of the activities, in recognition of their function, States and localities will be empowered with the tools and the flexibility to implement real reform in order to provide comprehensive services to those seeking assistance.

Under this bill, States will have the ability to submit a unified plan for all of the programs incorporated in and linked to this legislation to the appropriate Secretary describing how they will coordinate services in order to avoid duplication.

Statewide and local partnerships, led by the business community, will be established to assist in the development of such a plan, set policy for training, and generally advise the appropriate elected official overseeing the system.

At the local level, all services provided must be accessible through a one stop customer service system. Consumers, both employers and job seekers seeking assistance, will be able to receive comprehensive information regarding the availability, eligibility,

and quality of the programs. With this kind of system, we can remove the confusion and frustration inherent in the current programs.

Finally, training will be delivered under a framework of an individual training account which will be used to ensure the principle of consumer choice. The specific nature of the individuals training account will be determined by States and localities.

In conclusion, I would like to thank my colleagues, Senators JEFFORDS, KENNEDY, and WELLSTONE, as well as the other members of the Subcommittee of Employment and Training for their cooperation and dedication in developing a piece of legislation that moves us forward. This has been a bipartisan effort from Day One. I believe that level of cooperation and leadership is essential if we are to have a chance to pass real reform.

There have been a number of orgnizations—both public and private—who have participated in an open and constructive process used to develop this legislation. Their input has been vital.

Again, the Workforce Investment Partnership Act is designed to address and reform the Federal Government's role in providing job training assistance to Americans. For too long, that role has been to foster confusion, frustration and complication. With this bill, we offer a new foundation, and a positive framework for success. Instead of rules that tie the hands of States and localities, this bill provides the tools to empower them to develop comprehensive work force investment systems that address the needs of job seekers and employers. This bill is a road map to a better system, and if we are to achieve the goals we have set—a stronger economy, a better-trained work force, and welfare reform—we need to begin that journey today.

Mr. KENNEDY. Madam President, an educated work force has become the most valuable resource in the modern economy. Our Nation's long term economic vitality depends on the creation of an effective, accessible, and accountable system of job training and career development which is open to all our citizens. Schools must assume more responsibility for preparing their students to meet the challenges of the 21st century workplace. Disadvantaged adults and out of school youth need the opportunity to develop job skills which will make them productive members of the community. Dislocated workers who have been displaced by the rapid pace of technological change deserve the chance to pursue new careers. The way in which we respond to these challenges today will determine how prosperous a nation we are in the next century.

The importance of highly developed employment skills has never been greater. The gap in earnings between skilled and unskilled workers is steadily widening. For those who enter the work force with good academic training and well developed career skills, this new economy offers almost unlimited potential. However, for those who lack basic proficiency in language, math and science and who have no career skills, the new economy presents an increasingly hostile environment.

The Workforce Investment Partnership Act which I am introducing with Senators JEFFORDS, DEWINE, and WELLSTONE will provide employment training opportunities for millions of Americans. It responds to the challenge of the changing workplace by enabling men and women to both acquire the skills necessary to enter the work force and upgrade their skills throughout their careers. It will provide access to the educational tools that will enable them not only to keep up, but to get ahead.

The legislation which we will be introducing represents a true collaboration of our four offices. I want to publicly commend Senators JEFFORDS and DEWINE for the genuine spirit of bipartisanship which has made this collaborative effort possible. Senator WELLSTONE and I appreciate it. Over the last 6 months, each of us has devoted an enormous amount of time and effort to fashioning a legislative consensus which will truly expand career options, encourage greater program innovation, and facilitate cooperative efforts amongst business, labor, education, and State and local government. While each of us can cite provisions in this bill which we would like to change, we all believe that the Workforce Investment Partnership Act will accomplish our principal goals.

I also want to recognize the important role President Clinton has played in bringing about this dramatic reform of our current job training system. He has consistently emphasized the need for greater individual choice in the selection of career paths and training providers. The philosophy behind the skill grant proposal is reflected in our legislation.

The Workforce Investment Partnership Act is designed to provide easy access to state of the art employment training programs which are geared to real job opportunities in the community. The cornerstones of this new system are individual choice and quality labor market information. In the past, men and women seeking new careers often did not know what job skills were most in demand and which training programs had the best performance record. All to often, they were forced to make one of the most important decisions in their lives based on anecdotes and late-night advertisements.

No training system can function effectively without accurate and timely information. The frequent unavailability of quality labor market information is one of the most serious flaws in the current system. In order to make sound career choices, prospective trainees need both detailed information on local career opportunities and performance based information on training providers. That information will now be available at easily accessible one stop employment centers, along with career counseling and other employment services. The legislation places a strong emphasis on providing information about what area industries are growing, what skills those jobs require, and what earning potential they have. Extensive business community participation is encouraged in developing this information. Once a career choice is made, the individual must still select a training provider. At present, many applicants make that choice with a little or no reliable information. Under our bill, each training provider will have to publicly report graduation rates, job placement and retention rates, and average earnings of graduates.

Because of the extensive information which will be available to each applicant, real consumer choice in the selection of a career and of a training provider will be possible. The legislation establishes individual training accounts for eligible participants, which they can use to access career education and skill training programs. Men and women seeking training assistance will no longer be limited to a few predetermined options. As long as there are real job opportunities in the field selected and the training provider meets established performance standards, the individual will be free to choose which option best suits his or her needs.

This legislation will organize the delivery of services more effectively and utilize resources more creatively. There will be a significant consolidation of the dozens of narrowly focused programs which currently exist into several broad funding streams for the distinct populations needing assistance. Consolidation makes sense in those areas in which multiple programs are currently serving the same population. However, it is equally important to preserve separate streams of funding for distinct populations. The programmatic needs of middle age dislocated workers with extensive employment histories are quite different from the services required by young adults with limited skills and no work histories. Similarly the problems faced by out of school youth require very different solutions than those confronting the adult population. Ensuring that services which are designed to meet the needs of each of these populations are available is a Federal responsibility. For that reason, this legislation maintains distinct programs with separate appropriations for dislocated workers, disadvantaged adults, and at risk youth.

The WIPA gives State and local government significantly enhanced discretion in designing their training systems. If this reform is to be truly responsive to those at the community level who are in need of services, it is essential that the authority which the Federal Government delegates to the States be exercised through a broad

based decisionmaking process. Governors, State legislatures, mayors, and other county and local officials should all have a meaningful voice in the design of a State's new job training system and they will under this legislation. Local boards of business, labor, education and community leaders are—in my opinion—essential to insuring that programs meet the real world needs of participants, and that the training programs correspond to labor market demands. The success we have had a Massachusetts has been due to large measure to active participation by local business leaders on the regional employment boards. WIPA strengthens the role of such boards, giving them major new policy making responsibilities. These boards will play the primary role in assuring that training programs address the actual employment needs of area businesses.

An essential element of the new system we have designed in accountability. As I noted earlier, each training provider will have to monitor and report the job placement and retention achieved by its graduates and their average earnings. Only those training programs that meet an acceptable performance standard will remain eligible for receipt of public funds. The same principle of accountability is applied to those agencies administering State and local programs. They are being given wide latitude to innovate under this legislation. But they too will be held accountable if they programs fail to meet challenging performance targets.

There is no challenge facing America today which is tougher or more important than providing at risk, often out of school, youth with meaningful education and employment opportunities. Far too many of our teenagers are being left behind without the skills needed to survive in the 21st century economy. I am particularly proud of the commitment which the Workforce Investment Partnership Act makes to these young men and women. This legislation authorizes a new initiative focused on teenagers living in the most impoverished communities in America. These areas range from the poorest neighborhoods of our largest cities to impoverished rural counties. Each year, the Secretary of Labor will award grants from a $250 million fund to innovative programs designed to provide opportunities to youth living in these areas. The programs will emphasize mentoring, strong links between academic and worksite learning, and job placement and retention. It will encourage broad based community participation from local service agencies and area employers. These model programs will, we believe, identify the techniques which are most effective in reaching those youth at greatest risk.

The Workforce Investment Partnership Act includes titles reauthorizing major vocational education and adult literacy programs. Both programs will continue to be separately funded and independently administered. We have incorporated them in the Workplace Act because they must be integral components of any comprehensive strategy to prepare to meet the demands of the 21st century workplace. Students who participate in vocational education must be provided with broad based career preparation courses which meet both high academic standards and teach state of the art technological skills. Adult literacy programs are essential for the 27 percent of the adult population who have not earned a high school diploma or its equivalent. Learning to read and communicate effectively are the first steps to career advancement. In vocational education and adult literacy, we are placing the same emphasis on program accountability which we did in job training.

The Workforce Investment Partnership Act we are introducing today will make it possible for millions of Americans to gain the skills needed to compete in a global economy. In doing so, we are also enabling them to realize their personal American dreams.

In closing, I want to recognize the important contribution which Stephen Springer, a key member of my staff during the 104th Congress, played in the evolution of job training reform. Tragically, he died at a young age after a courageous battle with cancer. He believed that the type of innovative work force development system which this legislation would create had the potential to open doors of opportunity for millions of Americans. His commitment was extraordinary. He continued to work on this issue even as his health was failing. He is no longer with us, but he continues to inspire us. Stephen Springer's creative vision of a work force development system equal to the challenges of the 21st century economy is reflected in the Workforce Investment Partnership Act. When enacted, it will be a wonderful legacy for this extraordinary individual.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I am pleased to join my colleagues, Senators DEWINE, JEFFORDS, and KENNEDY, in introducing the Workforce Investment Partnership Act of 1997. This bipartisan bill is a major accomplishment for Americans who need Federal assistance to acquire skills to qualify for good jobs.

The bill also is a major accomplishment for my colleague from Ohio, Senator DEWINE, Chairman of the Labor Committee's Employment and Training Subcommitee, whom I commend for bringing us to this point through numerous valuable hearings and a rigorous, cooperative drafting process. A number of Minnesotans testified at our hearings. Groups from Minnesota and from around the country have been consulted and listened to. I thank both Senator DEWINE and Senator JEFFORDS for the openness of the process. As always, I would also like to acknowledge the leadership of Senator KENNEDY. His deep experience and commitment have helped make this an excellent bill.

As leaders for our respective parties on the Subcommittee and on the full Labor Committee, the four of us may not always agree on issues facing America's working families. But we agree on this bill. It will fundamentally improve our Federal system of job training, adult and vocational education, and vocational rehabilitation programs.

The bill will help coordinate, streamline and decentralize our Federal job training system. It will make that system more accountable to real performance measures. It gives private sector employers—the people who have jobs to offer and who need workers with the right skills—a greater role in directing policy at the State and local level, which is where most decision-making power resides in this bill. And it moves the whole country to where Minnesota has already moved decisively: to a system of one-stop service centers where people can get all the information they need in one location. At these one stops, people then will have the ability to make their own choices, based on the best information, about which profession they want and ought to pursue, about the skills and training they'll need, and about the best place to get those skills and that training. I have visited one-stop centers in Minnesota. They work.

In addition, and this is very important, our bill achieves the things I have mentioned above without neglecting the need to target resources from the Federal level to those who need them most: to disadvantaged adults and youth, and to dislocated workers.

That is crucial. This bill does not overreach. It does not block-grant all Federal job training, adult education and vocational education progams to governors. It retains crucial federal priorities, then allows State and local authorities to decide how best to address their needs. That is why I believe this Congress will succeed where we did not during the last Congress. We'll pass this bill, reach an acceptable conference agreement with the House, and send major, important legislation to the President for his signature.

By Mr. LAUTENBERG (for himself, Mr. HOLLINGS and Mr. THURMOND):

S. 1187. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on ferroboron; to the Committee on Finance.

DUTY SUSPENSION LEGISLATION

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce legislation with Senators HOLLINGS and THURMOND to temporarily suspend the rate of duty imposed on imported ferroboron. Ferroboron is the key raw material in amorphous metal electrical power distribution transformer cores. Transformers using these cores reduce energy losses and greenhouse gas emissions associated with these losses by 60 to 80 percent when compared to other transformer core technologies. This provides both increased energy conservation and decreases environmental

degradation in those developing nations where the most promising market opportunities exist.

While these benefits are tangible and significant, they, and the extensive research and development that yielded them, are costly. An amorphous metal transformer has an initial cost 20 to 30 percent higher than the less energy efficient and environmentally friendly transformers it seeks to replace. Fortunately, because of its many benefits, the total owning cost of an amorphous metal transformer over its 20- to 30-year life is far lower than the initially cheaper competition. Reducing the cost of an important and costly raw material, by suspending the duty paid on it, helps to ensure the cost-competitiveness of the end product in the export markets. This is good for manufacturers, for American workers, and for our economy.

Mr. President, I have received assurances from my constituent, AlliedSignal, Inc., that there is no U.S. manufacturer of ferroboron, thus, this legislation does not adversely affect any American business.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 1187

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

SECTION 1. TEMPORARY SUSPENSION OF DUTY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter II of chapter 99 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States is amended by inserting in numerical sequence the following new heading:

''9902.72.02	Ferroboron (provided for in subheading 7202.99.50.	Free	No change	No change	On or before 12/31/2000''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to goods entered, or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption, on or after the date that is 15 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

By Mr. KOHL:

S. 1188. A bill to amend chapters 83 and 85 of title 28, United States Code, relating to the jurisdiction of the District Court for the District of Columbia, and the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

THE COURT CONSISTENCY IN COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1997

Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Court Consistency in Communications Act of 1997. The purpose of this bill is to bring consistency to the judicial interpretation of some of the central provisions of the Telecommunications Act, to make sure that an appellate court with broad and deep understanding of these issues can bring its expertise to bear on them, and to resolve related litigation as quickly as possible. In many other areas, such as bankruptcy and labor, strong precedent exists for consolidation of cases to bring about more efficient and informed judgments.

This measure is simple, effective and straightforward. It consolidates in the District of Columbia Federal courts all appeals of FCC decisions under title II of the Communications Act of 1934 and State commission decisions under section 252 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996. Let me tell you why this legislation is crucially needed.

The telecommunications industry accounts for about one-sixth of our national economy. And almost 2 years ago we passed legislation designed to unleash competition in the industry. It was signed into law with great fanfare. As President Clinton said, ''Today with the stroke of [my] pen, competition and innovation can move as quick as light.'' But we are still waiting for lower rates, better service, and greater innovation that was promised when the Telecom Act was signed.

The sad truth is that the promise of the Telecom Act has gotten bogged down in litigation. Lawyers are arguing about the meaning of its provisions in courts all across the country. Indeed, today a major challenge to the FCC's jurisdiction over long distance service is being filed in the Eighth Circuit. In my opinion, even under current law this case should have been filed in the District of Columbia.

We don't, of course, want to take away people's ability to redress grievances through the courts. The right to sue is, for better or worse, almost sacred to American culture. But while some people may choose to wait for a resolution to emerge from the 93 different Federal district courts and 12 distinct Federal circuits, to my mind the better way to bring competition to telecommunications markets is to have some judicial certainty about the rules of the game—and to have it sooner, rather than later. This bill should create the necessary framework for predictability in the courts, so that companies can shift their rivalry from the courtroom to the marketplace.

This proposal is not a panacea, but it does move us in the right direction. By streamlining the appellate process, the Court Consistency in Communications Act will speed the arrival of local and long distance telephone competition. It will help consumers—the people who pay the bills, who deserve more choice and who wonder why their rates aren't going down.

Mr. President, this judicial reform bill does not alter the substance of the Telecommunications Act in any way—that is clearly in the jurisdiction of the Commerce Committee. Nor does it affect pending cases. Finally, to those who have expressed concerns about the measure, let me remind them that this is not a final product, but a work in progress; in other words, we want to work with you.

I urge my colleagues to support this measure, because all of us have an interest in reducing litigation and encouraging competition.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 1188

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 ''Court Consistency in Communications Act of 1997''.

SEC. 2. JURISDICTION OF THE DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AND THE COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

(a) JURISDICTION OF REVIEW BY DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 85 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''§ 1369. District Court for the District of Columbia; review of certain communications determinations

''The United States District Court for the District of Columbia shall have exclusive jurisdiction to review a determination as provided under section 252(j)(2) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 252(j)(2)).''.

(2) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 85 of title 28, United States code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''1369. District Court for the District of Columbia; review of certain communications determinations.''.

(b) JURISDICTION OF THE COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 83 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''§ 1297. Jurisdiction of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit

''The United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit shall have exclusive jurisdiction of an appeal as provided under sections 252(j)(2) and 402(b) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 252(j)(2) and 402(b)).''.

(2) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 83 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''1297. Jurisdiction of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit.''.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Communications Act of 1934 is amended—

(A) in section 252 (47 U.S.C. 252)—

(i) in subsection (e)(6), by striking the second sentence;

(ii) by redesignating subsection (j) as subsection (k); and

(iii) by inserting after subsection (i) the following new subsection (j):

''(j) JUDICIAL REVIEW OF STATE COMMISSION ACTIONS.—

''(1) REVIEW.—In any case in which a State commission makes a determination under this section, any party aggrieved by the determination shall bring an action for the review of the determination, if at all, in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia.

''(2) APPEAL.—Any appeal of a decision of the court under subparagraph (A) shall be brought in the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit.''; and

(B) in section 402(b) (47 U.S.C. 402(b)), by adding at the end the following:

''(10) By any person challenging any other decision or order of the Commission under title II.''.

''(2) APPLICABILITY.—The amendments made by paragraph (1) shall apply to determinations of the Federal Communications Commission under title II of the Communications Act of 1934 and to determinations by State commissions (as that term is defined in section 3(41) of that Act (47 U.S.C. 153(41)) under section 252 of that Act on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

By Mr. SMITH of Oregon (for himself and Mr. HATCH):

S. 1189. A bill to increase the criminal penalties for assaulting or threatening Federal judges, their family members, and other public servants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

THE FEDERAL JUDICIARY PROTECTION ACT OF 1997

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. President, former Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles once stated that ''Of all the tasks of government, the most basic is to protect its citizens against violence.'' While this has been one of our biggest challenges, Congress has the ability to also strengthen those laws that deter violence and provide protection to those whose careers are dedicated to protecting our families and also our communities.

With that intent, I rise today with my colleague, Senator HATCH, to introduce the Federal Judiciary Protection Act, a bill to provide greater protection to Federal law enforcement officials and their families. Under current law, a person who assaults, attempts to assault, or who threatens to kidnap or murder a member of the immediate family of a U.S. official, a U.S. judge, or a Federal law enforcement official, is subject to a punishment of a fine or imprisonment of up to 5 years, or both. This legislation seeks to expand these penalties in instances of assault with a weapon and a prior criminal history. In such cases, an individual could face up to 20 years in prison.

This legislation would also strengthen the penalties for individuals who communicate threats through the mail. Currently, individuals who knowingly use the U.S. Postal Service to deliver any communication containing any threat are subject to a fine of up to $1,000 or imprisonment of up to 5 years. Under this legislation, anyone who communicates a threat could face imprisonment of up to 10 years.

Briefly, I would like to share an example illustrating the need for this legislation. In my State of Oregon, Chief Judge Michael Hogan and his family were subjected to frightening, threatening phone calls, letters, and messages from an individual who had been convicted of previous crimes in Judge Hogan's courtroom. For months, he and his family lived with the fear that these threats to the lives of his wife and children could become reality, and, equally disturbing, that the individual could be back out on the street again in a matter of a few months, or a few years.

Judge Hogan and his family are not alone. In April of this year, the wife of a circuit court judge in Florida was stalked by an individual who had been convicted of similar offenses in 1994 and 1995. Mrs. Linda Cope, the wife of Circuit Judge Charles Cope was leaving a shopping mall one afternoon and as pursued by a man named Stelios Kostakis. As she left the parking lot, she realized that she was being followed and attempted to lose Kostakis by taking alternative routes and speeding through residential streets. In a desperate attempt, Mrs. Cope cut in front of a semitrailer truck, risking a serious accident and possible loss of life, to escape. Even after this third offense, stalking the wife of a circuit court judge, he was sentenced to only 6 months on probation and $150 in fines and other court costs.

In September 1996, Lawrence County Judge Dominick Motto was stalked, harassed, and subjected to terrorist threats by Milton C. Reiguert, who was upset by a verdict in a case that Judge Motto had heard in his courtroom. After hearing the verdict, Reiguert stated his intention to ''point a rifle at his head and get what he wanted.''

Mr. President, these are only a few examples of vicious acts focused at our Federal law enforcement officials. As a member of the legislative branch, I believe it is our responsibility to provide adequate protection to all Americans who serve to protect the life and liberty of every citizen in this Nation. I encourage my colleagues to join us in sponsoring this important legislation.

By Mr. ALLARD:

S. 1190. A bill to reform the financing of Federal elections; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

THE CAMPAIGN FINANCE INTEGRITY ACT OF 1997

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. President, campaign finance reform is the catch phrase of the year in politics. The problem is that every Senator has a different definition of reform, including myself. That is why today I am introducing the Campaign Finance Integrity Act. I want to ensure that we change the campaign finance system without being unconstitutional and that flies in the face of the first amendment, especially in light of the fact that today is the 210th anniversary of the signing of the Constitution.

Some in Congress have stated that freedom of speech and the desire for healthy campaigns in a healthy democracy are in direct conflict and that you can't have both. But fortunately for those of us who believe in the first amendment rights of all American citizens, the Founding Fathers and the Supreme Court are on our side.

Thomas Jefferson repeatedly stated the importance of the first amendment and how it allows the people and the press the right to speak their minds freely. Jefferson clearly stated its importance back in 1798 with, ''One of the amendments to the Constitution * * * expressly declares that 'Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, or abridging the freedom of speech or of the press,' thereby guarding in the same sentence and under the same words, the freedom of religion, speech, and of the press; insomuch that whatever violates either throws down the sanctuary which covers the others.'' Again in 1808, he stated that ''The liberty of speaking and writing guards our other liberties.'' And in 1823, Jefferson stated, ''The force of public opinion cannot be resisted when permitted freely to be expressed. The agitation it produces must be submitted to.'' Jefferson knew and believed that if we begin restricting what people say, how they say it, and how much they can say, then we deny the first and fundamental freedom given to all citizens.

The Supreme Court has also been very clear in its rulings concerning campaign finance and the first amendment. Since the post-Watergate changes to the campaign finance system, 24 congressional actions have been declared unconstitutional, with 9 rejections based on the first amendment. Out of those nine four dealt directly with campaign finance reform laws. In each case, the Supreme Court has ruled that political spending is equal to political speech.

In the now famous decision, or infamous to some, Buckley versus Valeo, the Court states that,

> The First Amendment denies government the power to determine that spending to promote one's political views is wasteful, excessive, or unwise. In the free society ordained by our Constitution it is not the government but the people—individually as citizens and candidates and collectively as associations and political committees—who must retain control over the quantity and range of debate on public issues in a political campaign.

Simply stated, the government cannot ration or regulate political speech of an American through campaign spending limits any more than it can tell the local newspaper how many papers it can print or what it can print. This reinforces Jefferson's statement that to impede one of these rights is to impede all first amendment rights.

Also, supporters of some of the campaign finance reform bills, believe that if we stop the growth of campaign spending and force giveaways of public and private resources then all will be fine with the campaign finance system. It seems to me that if you look at history, price controls didn't work in the 1970's and they won't work in the 1990's. The Supreme Court agrees and is again very clear in its intent on price controls in campaigns. The Buckley decision says, ''* * * the mere growth in the cost of federal election campaigns in and of itself provides no basis for governmental restrictions on the quality of campaign spending.* * *''

Campaigns are about ideas and expressing those ideas, no matter how great or small the means. The ''distribution of the humblest handbill'' to

the ''expensive modes of communication'' are both indispensable instruments of effective political speech. We should not force one sector to freely distribute our political ideas just because it is more expensive than all the other sectors. So no matter how objectionable the cost of campaigns are, the Supreme Court has stated that this is not reason enough to restrict the speech of candidates or any other groups involved in political speech.

We need a campaign finance bill that does not violate the first amendment, while providing important provisions to open the campaign finance of candidates up to the scrutiny of the American people and I believe the Campaign Finance Integrity Act does that.

My bill would: Require candidates to raise at least 50 percent of their contributions from individuals in the State or district in which they are running; equalize contributions from individuals and political action committees, PAC's, by raising the individual limits from $1,000 to $2,500 and reducing the PAC limit from $5,000 to $2,500; index individual and PAC contribution limits for inflation; reduce the influence of a candidate's personal wealth by allowing political party committees to match dollar for dollar the personal contribution of a candidate above $5,000; require organizations, groups, and political party committees to disclose within 24 hours the amount and type of independent expenditures over $1,000 in support of or in opposition to a candidate; require corporations and labor organizations to seek separate, voluntary authorization of the use of any dues, initiative fees or payment as a condition of employment for political activity, and require annual full disclosure of those activities to members and shareholders; prohibit depositing of an individual contribution by a campaign unless the individual's profession and employer are reported; encourage the Federal Elections Commission to allow filing of reports by computers and other emerging technologies and to make that information accessible to the public on the Internet less than 24 hours of receipt; ban the use of taxpayer financed mass mailings, and create a tax deduction for political contributions up to $100 for individuals and $200 for a joint return.

This is commonsense campaign finance reform. It drives the candidate back into this district or State to raise money from individual contributions. It has some of the most open, full, and timeliest disclosure requirements of any other campaign finance bill in either the Senate or the House of Representatives. I strongly believe that sunshine is the best disinfectant.

The right of political parties, groups, and individuals to say what they want in a political campaign is preserved but the right of the public to know how much they are spending and what they are saying is also recognized. I have great faith that the public can make its own decisions about campaign discourse if it is given full and timely information.

Many of the proponents of the more popular campaign finance bills try to reduce the influence of interests by suppressing their speech. I believe the best ways to reduce the special interests influence is to suppress and reduce the size of government. If the government rids itself of special interest funding and corporate welfare, then there would be little influence left for these large donors. Campaign contributions would no longer be based on special interests but on ideas. Let's stop corporate welfare, especially the Overseas Private Investment Corporation, OPIC, where companies get a subsidized ride on the backs of taxpayers in order to invest without risk or without the market controlling the outcome. The best way to eliminate corporate subsidies is to eliminate the Department of Commerce, where a majority of corporate welfare programs are funded. To break special interest money, we must break the so-called iron triangle of big business, big labor, and big government.

Ojbecting to the popular catch phrase of the moment is very difficult for any politician, but turning your back on the first amendment is more difficult for me. I want campaign finance reform but not at the expense of the first amendment and that is what my legislation does. Not everyone will agree with the Campaign Finance Integrity Act and many of us will disagree on this issue but the first amendment is the reason we can disagree.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 1190

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 Finance Integrity Act of 1997''.

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

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

TITLE I—CONTRIBUTIONS

Sec. 101. Requirement for in-state and in-district contributions to congressional candidates.
Sec. 102. Use of contributions to pay campaign debt.
Sec. 103. Modification of political party contribution limits to candidates when candidates make expenditures from personal funds.
Sec. 104. Modification of contribution limits.

TITLE II—DISCLOSURE REQUIREMENTS

Sec. 201. Disclosure of certain expenditures for issue advocacy.
Sec. 202. Disclosure of certain non-Federal financial activities of national political parties.
Sec. 203. Political activities of corporations and labor organizations.

TITLE III—REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

Sec. 301. Time for candidates to file reports.
Sec. 302. Contributor information required for contributions in any amount.
Sec. 303. Prohibition of depositing contributions with incomplete contributor information.
Sec. 304. Filing of reports using computers and facsimile machines; required electronic disclosure by commission.

TITLE IV—MISCELLANEOUS

Sec. 401. Ban on mass mailings.
Sec. 402. Tax deduction for political contributions.
Sec. 403. Effective date.

TITLE I—CONTRIBUTIONS

SEC. 101. REQUIREMENT FOR IN-STATE AND IN-DISTRICT CONTRIBUTIONS TO CONGRESSIONAL CANDIDATES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 315 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 441a) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (e), (f), (g), and (h) as subsections (f), (g), (h), and (i), respectively;

(2) by inserting after subsection (d) the following:

''(e) REQUIREMENT FOR IN-STATE AND IN-DISTRICT CONTRIBUTIONS TO CONGRESSIONAL CANDIDATES.—

''(1) DEFINITIONS.—

''(A) IN-STATE CONTRIBUTION.—In this subsection, the term 'in-State contribution' means a contribution from an individual that is a legal resident of the candidate's State.

''(B) IN-DISTRICT CONTRIBUTION.—In this subsection, the term 'in-district contribution' means a contribution from an individual that is a legal resident of the candidate's district.

''(2) LIMIT.—A candidate for nomination to, or election to, the Senate or House of Representatives and the candidate's authorized committees shall not accept an aggregate amount of contributions of which the aggregate amount of in-State contributions and in-district contributions is less than 50 percent of the total amount of contributions accepted by the candidate and the candidate's authorized committees.

''(3) TIME FOR MEETING REQUIREMENT.—A candidate shall meet the requirement of paragraph (2) at the end of each reporting period under section 304.

''(4) PERSONAL FUNDS.—For purposes of this subsection, a contribution that is attributable to the personal funds of the candidate or proceeds of indebtedness incurred by the candidate or the candidate's authorized committees shall not be considered to be an in-State contribution or in-district contribution.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 315 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 441a) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(1)(A), by striking ''(e)'' and inserting ''(f)'';

(2) in subsection (d)(2), by striking ''(e)'' and inserting ''(f)''; and

(3) in subsection (d)(3)(A)(i), by striking ''(e)'' and inserting ''(f)''.

SEC. 102. USE OF CONTRIBUTIONS TO PAY CAMPAIGN DEBT.

Section 315 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 441a) (as amended by section 101) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(j) LIMIT ON USE OF CONTRIBUTIONS TO PAY CAMPAIGN DEBT.—

''(1) TIME TO ACCEPT CONTRIBUTIONS.—Beginning on the date that is 90 days after the date of a general or special election, a candidate for election to the Senate or House of Representatives and the candidate's authorized committees shall not accept a contribution that is to be used to pay a debt, loan, or

other cost associated with the election cycle of such election.

''(2) PERSONAL OBLIGATION.—A debt, loan, or other cost associated with an election cycle that is not paid in full on the date that is 90 days after the date of the general or special election shall be assumed as a personal obligation by the candidate.''.

SEC. 103. MODIFICATION OF POLITICAL PARTY CONTRIBUTION LIMITS TO CANDIDATES WHEN CANDIDATES MAKE EXPENDITURES FROM PERSONAL FUNDS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 315 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 441a) (as amended by section 102) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(k) CONTRIBUTION LIMITS FOR POLITICAL PARTY COMMITTEES IN RESPONSE TO CANDIDATE EXPENDITURES OF PERSONAL FUNDS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a general election for the Senate or House of Representatives, a political party committee may make contributions to a candidate without regard to any limitation under subsections (a) and (d) until such time as the aggregate amount of contributions is equal to or greater than the applicable limit.

''(2) APPLICABLE LIMIT.—The applicable limit under paragraph (1), with respect to a candidate, shall be the greatest aggregate amount of expenditures that an opponent of the candidate in the same election and the opponent's authorized committee make using the personal funds of the opponent or proceeds of indebtedness incurred by the opponent (including contributions by the opponent to the opponent's authorized committee) in excess of 2 times the limit under subsection (a)(1)(A) with respect to a general election.

''(3) DEFINITION OF POLITICAL PARTY COMMITTEE.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'political party committee' means a political committee that is a national, State, district, or local committee of a political party (including any subordinate committee).''.

(b) NOTIFICATION OF EXPENDITURES FROM PERSONAL FUNDS.—Section 304(a)(6) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (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:

''(B)(i) The principal campaign committee of a candidate for nomination to, or election to, the Senate or House of Representatives shall notify the Commission of the aggregate amount expenditures made using personal funds of the candidate or proceeds of indebtedness incurred by the candidate (including contributions by the candidate to the candidate's authorized committee) in excess of an amount equal to 2 times the limit under section 301(a)(1)(A).

''(ii) The notification under clause (i) shall—

''(I) be submitted to the Commission not later than 24 hours after the expenditure that is the subject of the notification is made;

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

''(III) include the aggregate amount of expenditures from personal funds that have been made with respect to that election as of the date of the expenditure that is the subject of the notification.''.

SEC. 104. MODIFICATION OF CONTRIBUTION LIMITS.

Section 315 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 441a) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1)(A), by striking ''$1,000'' and inserting ''$2,500''; and

(B) in paragraph (2)(A), by striking ''$5,000'' and inserting ''$2,500''; and

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking ''subsection (b) and subsection (d)'' and inserting ''paragraphs (1)(A) and (2)(A) of subsection (a) and subsections (b) and (d)''; and

(B) in paragraph (2)(A), by striking ''means the calendar year 1974.'' and inserting ''means—

''(i) for purposes of subsections (b) and (d), calendar year 1974; and

''(ii) for purposes of paragraphs (1)(A) and (2)(A) of subsection (a), calendar year 1997.''.

TITLE II—DISCLOSURE REQUIREMENTS

SEC. 201. DISCLOSURE OF CERTAIN EXPENDITURES FOR ISSUE ADVOCACY.

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

''(d) ISSUE ADVOCACY.—

''(1) REQUIRED REPORT.—A person (other than a candidate or a candidate's authorized committee) who makes a payment in an aggregate amount equal to or greater than $1,000 for a communication containing issue advocacy shall submit a statement to the Commission (not later than 24 hours after making the payment) describing the amount spent, the type of communication involved, and the market or area in which the communication was disseminated.

''(2) DEFINITION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—In this subsection, the term 'a communication containing issue advocacy' means a communication that—

''(i) uses the name or likeness of an individual holding Federal office or a candidate for election to a Federal office;

''(ii) mentions a national political party; or

''(iii) uses the terms 'the President', 'Congress', 'Senate', or 'House of Representatives' in reference to an individual holding Federal office.

''(B) EXCEPTION.—The term shall not include a payment which would be—

''(i) described in clause (i), (iii), or (v) of section 301(9)(B) if the payment were an expenditure under such section; or

''(ii) an independent expenditure.''.

(b) INCREASED REPORTING FOR INDEPENDENT EXPENDITURES.—Section 304(c) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 434(c)) is amended in the matter following paragraph (2)(C), by striking ''after the 20th day, but more than 24 hours, before any election'' and inserting ''during a calendar year''.

SEC. 202. DISCLOSURE OF CERTAIN NON-FEDERAL FINANCIAL ACTIVITIES OF NATIONAL POLITICAL PARTIES.

Section 304(b)(4) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 434(b)(4)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (H)(v), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (I), by inserting ''and'' after the semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(J) for a national political committee of a political party, disbursements made by the committee in an aggregate amount greater than $1,000, during a calendar year, in connection with a political activity (as defined in section 316(c)(3));''.

SEC. 203. POLITICAL ACTIVITIES OF CORPORATIONS AND LABOR ORGANIZATIONS.

(a) DISCLOSURE TO EMPLOYEES AND SHAREHOLDERS REGARDING POLITICAL ACTIVITIES.—Section 316 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 441b) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(c) AUTHORIZATION REQUIRED FOR POLITICAL ACTIVITY.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Except with the separate, written, voluntary authorization of each individual, a national bank, corporation or labor organization shall not—

''(A) in the case of a national bank or corporation described in this section, collect from or assess its stockholders or employees any dues, initiation fee, or other payment as a condition of employment or membership if any part of the dues, fee, or payment will be used for a political activity in which the national bank or corporation is engaged; and

''(B) in the case of a labor organization described in this section, collect from or assess its members or nonmembers any dues, initiation fee, or other payment if any part of the dues, fee, or payment will be used for a political activity.

''(2) EFFECT OF AUTHORIZATION.—An authorization described in paragraph (1) shall remain in effect until revoked and may be revoked at any time.

''(3) DEFINITION OF POLITICAL ACTIVITY.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'political activity' includes a communication or other activity that involves carrying on propaganda, attempting to influence legislation, or participating or intervening in a political party or political campaign for a Federal office.

''(d) DISCLOSURE OF DISBURSEMENTS FOR POLITICAL ACTIVITIES.—

''(1) CORPORATIONS AND NATIONAL BANKS.—A corporation or national bank shall submit an annual written report to shareholders stating the amount of each disbursement made for political activities or that otherwise influences Federal elections.

''(2) LABOR ORGANIZATIONS.—A labor organization shall submit an annual written report to dues paying members and nonmembers stating the amount of each disbursement made for political activities or that otherwise influences Federal elections, including contributions and expenditures.''.

(b) DISCLOSURE TO THE COMMISSION OF CERTAIN PERMISSIBLE ACTIVITIES BY LABOR ORGANIZATIONS AND CORPORATIONS.—Section 304 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 434) (as amended in section 201) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(e) REQUIRED STATEMENT OF CORPORATIONS AND LABOR ORGANIZATIONS.—Each corporation, national bank, or labor organization who makes an aggregate amount of disbursements during a year in an amount equal to or greater than $1,000 for any activity described in subparagraph (A), (B), or (C) of section 316(a)(2) shall submit a statement to the Commission (not later than 24 hours after making the payments) describing the amount spent and the activity involved.''.

TITLE III—REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

SEC. 301. TIME FOR CANDIDATES TO FILE REPORTS.

Section 304(a)(2)(A) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 434(a)(2)(A)) is amended—

(1) in clause (ii), by striking ''and'' following the semicolon;

(2) in clause (iii), by striking ''; and''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(v) monthly reports during the months of July, August, September, and October, that shall be filed no later than the final day of the reporting month; and

''(vi) 24-hour reports, beginning on the day that is 15 days preceding an election, that shall be filed no later than the end of each 24-hour period; and''.

SEC. 302. CONTRIBUTOR INFORMATION REQUIRED FOR CONTRIBUTIONS IN ANY AMOUNT.

(a) SECTION 302.—Section 302 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 432) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking '', and if the amount'' and all that follows through

the period and inserting: ''and the following information:

''(A) The identification of the contributor.

''(B) The date of the receipt of the contribution.''; and

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subsection (A), by striking ''such contribution'' and inserting ''the contribution and the identification of the contributor''; and

(ii) in subsection (B), by striking ''such contribution'' and all that follows through the period and inserting '', no later than 10 days after receiving the contribution, the contribution and the following information:

''(i) The identification of the contributor.

''(ii) The date of the receipt of the contribution.'';

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) by striking paragraph (2);

(B) in paragraph (3), by striking ''or contributions aggregating more than $200 during any calendar year''; and

(C) by redesignating paragraphs (3), (4), and (5) as paragraphs (2), (3), and (4), respectively; and

(3) in subsection (h)(2), by striking ''(c)(5)'' and inserting ''(c)(4)''.

(b) SECTION 304.—Section 304(b)(3)(A) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 434(b)(3)(A)) is amended by striking ''whose contributions'' and all that follows through ''so elect,''.

SEC. 303. PROHIBITION OF DEPOSITING CONTRIBUTIONS WITH INCOMPLETE CONTRIBUTOR INFORMATION.

Section 302 of Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 432) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(j) DEPOSIT OF CONTRIBUTIONS.—The treasurer of a candidate's authorized committee shall not deposit or otherwise negotiate a contribution unless the information required by this section is complete.''.

SEC. 304. FILING OF REPORTS USING COMPUTERS AND FACSIMILE MACHINES; REQUIRED ELECTRONIC DISCLOSURE BY COMMISSION.

Section 304(a) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 434(a)) is amended by striking paragraph (11) and inserting the following:

''(11) ELECTRONIC FILING.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall issue a regulation to permit a report, designation, or statement required to be filed with the Commission under this Act to be filed in electronic form accessible by computer or through the use of a facsimile machine or other method of transmission that corresponds with the method of record-keeping or transmission used by persons required to file under this Act.

''(B) INTERNET ACCESS TO CAMPAIGN FINANCE INFORMATION.—The Commission shall make the information contained in a designation, statement, report, or notification filed with the Commission under this section accessible to the public on the Internet and publicly available at the offices of the Commission not later than 24 hours after the designation, statement, report, or notification is received by the Commission.''.

TITLE IV—MISCELLANEOUS

SEC. 401. BAN ON MASS MAILINGS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 3210(a)(6) of title 39, United States Code, is amended by striking subparagraph (A) and inserting the following:

''(A) A Member of, or Member-elect to, Congress may not mail any mass mailing as franked mail.''.

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 3210 of title 39, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)—

(i) in paragraph (3)—

(I) in subparagraph (G), by striking '', including general mass mailings,'';

(II) in subparagraph (I), by striking ''or other general mass mailing''; and

(III) in subparagraph (J), by striking ''or other general mass mailing'';

(ii) in paragraph (6)—

(I) by striking subparagraphs (B), (C), and (F);

(II) by striking the second sentence of subparagraph (D); and

(III) by redesignating subparagraphs (D) and (E) as subparagraphs (B) and (C), respectively; and

(iii) by striking paragraph (7);

(B) in subsection (c), by striking ''subsection (a) (4) and (5)'' and inserting ''paragraphs (4), (5), and (6) of subsection (a)'';

(C) by striking subsection (f); and

(D) by redesignating subsection (g) as subsection (f).

(2) Section 316 of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1990 (39 U.S.C. 3210 note) is amended by striking subsection (a).

(3) Section 311 of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1991 (2 U.S.C. 59e) is amended by striking subsection (f) and inserting the following:

''(f) **[Reserved]**.''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect at the beginning of the first Congress that begins after December 31, 1998.

SEC. 403. EFFECTIVE DATE.

Except as otherwise provided in this Act, this Act and the amendments made by this Act shall apply with respect to elections occurring, payments made, and filing periods beginning after December 31, 1998.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 222

At the request of Mr. DOMENICI, the name of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON] was added as a cosponsor of S. 222, a bill to establish an advisory commission to provide advice and recommendations on the creation of an integrated, coordinated Federal policy designed to prepare for and respond to serious drought emergencies.

S. 260

At the request of Mr. ABRAHAM, the name of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. GRAMS] was added as a cosponsor of S. 260, a bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act with respect to penalties for crimes involving cocaine, and for other purposes.

S. 358

At the request of Mr. DEWINE, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. REED] was added as a cosponsor of S. 358, a bill to provide for compassionate payments with regard to individuals with blood-clotting disorders, such as hemophilia, who contracted human immunodeficiency virus due to contaminated blood products, and for other purposes.

S. 401

At the request of Mr. JEFFORDS, the name of the Senator from Maine [Ms. SNOWE] was added as a cosponsor of S. 401, a bill to improve the control of outdoor advertising in areas adjacent to the Interstate System, the National Highway System, and certain other federally assisted highways, and for other purposes.

S. 852

At the request of Mr. LOTT, the name of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. LEAHY] was added as a cosponsor of S. 852, a bill to establish nationally uniform requirements regarding the titling and registration of salvage, nonrepairable, and rebuilt vehicles.

S. 948

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Louisiana [Ms. LANDRIEU] was added as a cosponsor of S. 948, a bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to improve the provisions relating to pension rights demonstration projects.

S. 980

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the names of the Senator from California [Mrs. BOXER] and the Senator from Illinois [Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN] were added as cosponsors of S. 980, a bill to require the Secretary of the Army to close the United States Army School of the Americas.

S. 1042

At the request of Mr. CRAIG, the name of the Senator from Montana [Mr. BAUCUS] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1042, a bill to require country of origin labeling of perishable agricultural commodities imported into the United States and to establish penalties for violations of the labeling requirements.

S. 1062

At the request of Mr. D'AMATO, the names of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. CHAFEE] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. GLENN] were added as cosponsors of S. 1062, a bill to authorize the President to award a gold medal on behalf of the Congress to Ecumenical Patriarch Bartholomew in recognition of his outstanding and enduring contributions toward religious understanding and peace, and for other purposes.

S. 1113

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. ASHCROFT] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1113, a bill to extend certain temporary judgeships in the Federal judiciary.

S. 1153

At the request of Mr. BAUCUS, the name of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. FAIRCLOTH] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1153, a bill to promote food safety through continuation of the Food Animal Residue Avoidance Database program operated by the Secretary of Agriculture.

S. 1164

At the request of Mr. ABRAHAM, the name of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. FAIRCLOTH] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1164, a bill to state a policy of the United States that engages the People's Republic of China in areas of mutual interest, promotes human rights, religious freedom, and democracy in China, and enhances the national security interests of the United States with respect to China, and for other purposes.