

the last several years to identify, clean and recapture these sites for public use. However, the language in this bill would work to prevent us from carrying on this important work.

With the inability of this Congress to reach a compromise on a bipartisan Superfund reform and reauthorization bill, continued funding for the Brownfields Initiative is imperative to the health and safety of America. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the amendment number 19 of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STOKES)?

If not, the question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STOKES).

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there other amendments to this title?

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on VA, HUD and Independent Agencies is willing to engage in a colloquy with me regarding the amendment just passed.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I guess I will have a colloquy with my friend.

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to be clear in the legislative history, I would say to the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) that the enactment of that amendment that just passed does not give EPA any new or additional statutory authority to conduct its brownfields programs.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Finance and Hazardous Materials, which has primary jurisdiction over the Superfund law in the House, I do not want the EPA or anyone else to think that the current Superfund law authorizes the Agency to use brownfields money to capitalize revolving loan funds. Moreover, brownfields money may be used pursuant to section 311(c) of CERCLA to fund only, and I quote, "Research with respect to the detection, assessment and evaluation of the effects on and risks to human health of hazardous substances and detection of hazardous substances in the environment."

The language of section 311(c) does not, I emphasize, does not, authorize the Agency to use brownfields money to fund conferences, seminars, meetings, workshops, or other activities that have nothing to do with actual research.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I concur with the gentleman's view that the current text of the bill before us does not authorize activities not currently authorized under CERCLA.

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, that being the case, I hope that the gentleman will make the permissible scope of the activities clear in his work in conference.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, we will do everything we can to

ensure that EPA is not permitted to exceed the scope of its current authorized activities.

I might add that we have made serious effort to put pressure on EPA in a number of other areas, and they are not always as responsive as I might like.

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would just like to be clear that the use of the EPA funding that is contemplated in the brownfields program, we have no objection to it being used for the purposes which the statute was intended, but I think it is a little inaccurate to say that there has been legal authority saying that it is not intended to be used for revolving funds and other purposes.

First of all, the Inspector General audited pilot programs issued by the EPA and in March 1998 issued a report that said there was not any misuse of funds. In fact, the Inspector General's report concluded that the activities reviewed were authorized under CERCLA.

The Inspector General's only recommendations were administrative in nature, such as the recommendation to revise the EPA's ranking criteria. None of the recommendations implied, as I understand it, that the grant should be terminated, or that the grant program itself was at all questionable. In fact, the Inspector General praised the program.

The EPA has agreed, I would like to stress, to all of the Inspector General's recommendations and states, "We believe the corrective actions underway and planned by the agency address the report's recommendations. Therefore, we are closing this report upon recommendation."

The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BLILEY), our Chairman, asked the GAO to review grants and agreements awarded by the EPA since 1993, the first year the Agency began the brownfields efforts. The GAO found during its 1998 on-site audit of financial records that overall, the recipients were spending the funds in accordance with guidance of OMB.

So I guess I would just like to state for the record that I agree that EPA should not be able to use these funds for any illegal purpose beyond its legal authority, but I think that to state that they have been using them for illegal purposes goes beyond what the Inspector General and GAO have, in fact, said.

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. DEGETTE. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding and would concur in what she said, pointed out that she was not referring to any case to revolving loan funds and the money therein, because obviously, they could not be conducted under the current law, and as long as we clarify

that, I think that is important to put in the RECORD.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, in 1997, EPA issued 24 grants to States and local governments to establish revolving loan funds, and on October 2, 1997, the general counsel issued a legal memorandum identifying the EPA's legal authority to set up the brownfields clean-up revolving loan request programs.

The EPA legal authority for these revolving loan funds has never been independently evaluated or challenged by the GAO or the Inspector General.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. DEGETTE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I must say we welcome the authorizers presence when we have our bill on the floor any time. I know authorizers often like to use appropriations bills to effectively implement their work, especially when these kinds of disagreements occur from time to time.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time again, I would like to thank the distinguished chairman for working with us on these issues.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I think it is important for the Members who are present to know that our bill will be taken up one more time on Tuesday of the coming week. Further discussion regarding matters that relate to the bill will be taking place at that time in case there are those present who might have been expecting some further activity on the part of the committee this afternoon.

Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PEASE) having assumed the chair, Mr. HULSHOF, Chairman pro tempore of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4194) making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

#### LIMITING FURTHER AMENDMENTS TO SHAYS AMENDMENT DURING FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2183, BIPARTISAN CAMPAIGN INTEGRITY ACT OF 1997

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during further consideration of H.R. 2183, pursuant to H. Res. 442 and H. Res. 458, no other amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN) shall be in order, except

the amendments that have been placed at the desk.

Each amendment may be considered only in the order listed, may be offered only by the Member designated or his designee, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and opponent, and shall not be subject to a demand for a division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole.

The amendments that have been placed at the desk are in a particular order and consist of 55 amendments with times ranging from 40 minutes to 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) a question, and I appreciate the gentleman's work in trying to come to an accommodation on this.

I am looking at the schedule for next week, and I only see campaign finance reform scheduled for 1 day, which is Monday. Is that correct?

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEEHAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, that is correct, on the current calendar. I would tell the gentleman, though, that as usual, Mondays are not a heavily scheduled day, and it is entirely possible that we could begin the campaign reform debate once again at approximately 5 o'clock, and we could then continue into the evening as long as Members are willing.

I would not at this time say that we would then continue into the morning, depending upon whether the Members are willing, but my guess is that we could put together continuously, which I think is the best use of time in the debate, for perhaps 4 or 5, maybe even 6 hours, and that would constitute a full one-third of what we have available to us under this unanimous consent request.

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, obviously I am not thrilled about 55 amendments to the Shays-Meehan bill to begin with, but as I add it up, it looks certainly like we could get through this in a shorter period of time, but I look at the schedule and I see that really we only have 3 weeks left to the session, and I would hope that assuming we come in on Monday and debate campaign finance reform for some period until 11 o'clock or so, if we did not deal with it the rest of the week, I would be concerned because the following week we start the 27th, and then the final week would be the last week.

In addition to that, as the gentleman knows, we have a very aggressive schedule in a number of appropriations bills that we need to pass. We have tobacco legislation, Commerce-Justice appropriations, D.C. appropriations,

foreign appropriations, VA-HUD appropriations, Transportation.

So I am concerned about when we are ultimately going to get our vote on this, on the Shays-Meehan proposal, and then as the gentleman knows, we have another nine or so substitutes which presumably are open to amendments as well.

Given the fact that the clock is ticking, and given the fact that I know the gentleman and the leadership has indicated we would finish campaign finance reform by August 7, I would hope that we could get through this quickly, maybe work out some kind of an additional agreement to at some point stop the debate and get an up or down vote on the significant proposals before us.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEEHAN. Further reserving the right to object, I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SHAYS. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose in my participating in this dialogue is to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) for his participation. I know that the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON) has played a major role in terms of the rule, and we do know that time is becoming tighter and tighter. I think the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) would acknowledge that if we are able to have a schedule that includes more than just Monday, other unanimous consents may not be necessary, but working together, I hope that we can continue this process, but, again, to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) for his work and his commitment that will get the job done with cooperation.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. MEEHAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, my commitment may be useful, but it is not sufficient. Obviously, it is the leadership that has made the commitment. So when I tell the gentleman from Massachusetts that we are going to get it done during this period, it is from the leadership of the majority party in the House of Representatives. I am a conveyor of that, and I feel comfortable that that will be honored.

I understand the gentleman's concern, and this is not to reflect on where we have been, but we have already lost a full day that could have been devoted to campaign finance reform because we did not have an orderly process in place. For a while, we were working day by day. What we have here now is a clear plan to deal with one of the major substitutes that we have to deal with.

I know the gentleman from Massachusetts, and I thank him for making sure that as his mother watches the program she feels comfortable, because it was only out of ignorance that I did not know that I should not use the "H"

in the gentleman from Massachusetts' name and, in fact, that it is silent.

I would tell the gentleman from Massachusetts, I know he is anxious and concerned. This to me is a significant step forward in dealing with one of the major substitutes.

What happens to this substitute fairly clearly will dictate what occurs with other bills, whether it passes or it does not, but to try to get a commitment now locked in time, because of the very appropriations bills that the gentleman from Massachusetts mentioned are coming up, and obviously funding the Federal Government is of paramount importance, to try to lock the whole process in, in essence, returns us to square one where we have been.

What I am trying to do is to create as much order in as large a segment as I can.

Clearly, the flow of those appropriations bills to the floor probably will not be in a clear, automatic, understood pattern. We will do everything we can to create blocks of time, as close to Monday as we can, to accomplish the purposes of this unanimous consent, because the gentleman from Massachusetts is absolutely correct, accomplishing this unanimous consent only gets us on the way to finalizing campaign reform debate in votes.

□ 1345

It is an important segment, but it is not all the way there. If I could give the gentleman greater assurances than that, I would. What he has is my commitment, evidenced by this UC, to work closely with leadership and both sides of the aisle to accomplish what has been committed, and that is finalizing debate and voting on the measure before we leave for the August recess.

Mr. MEEHAN. Reclaiming my time, first of all, both my mother and I thank the gentleman for his work on the UC and also for his pronunciation of her name. Also, let me just mention the fact that I think it is clear from the votes that have been taken that there probably is a majority of the Members of this House that are ready, willing and able to vote for passage of the Shays-Meehan substitute.

I would hope that we would do everything in our power to get that up-or-down vote and to get through with this debate. The majority of the Members of this House, I think, want to pass this bill and get it over to the other body and get it over there in enough time to get a bill to the President's desk. So I would ask the Speaker and the Republican leadership to keep that in mind.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, just to say that, frankly, given the pivotal role of this particular amendment, whether it passes or fails will dictate clearly what is done with the rest of the campaign reform rule package in terms of the other amendments. So regardless of whether it passes or fails, getting to the vote will be a significant assistance in allowing us to examine

how we might be able to package the rest of the time in a meaningful way.

Just let me, in responding to the gentleman, add that, from this side of the aisle, I do think this is a good-faith effort in terms of trying to create a reasonable time frame. It would be extremely disappointing if from our side of the aisle, for example, on Monday, where we have devoted a significant time for campaign reform, that it would be consumed in part by procedural motions of limiting debate and that sort.

If the gentleman examines the list, which I know he has, there are a significant number of amendments that have only been given 10 minutes time. That is far less than is ordinarily given for the number of amendments. What we have tried to do is limit the time. No amendment has an hour. The greatest amount of time is 40 minutes. And if there were procedural motions, that would be extremely disappointing and make the ability to create an orderly process for the entire package extremely difficult.

I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I agree to the unanimous consent request, and I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Without objection, the list of amendments designated is at the desk under the request and the amendments themselves will be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There was no objection.

The text of the list of amendments and the amendments are as follows:

- (1) the amendment by Representative PICKERING of Mississippi for 10 minutes;
- (2) the first amendment by Representative SMITH of Michigan for 10 minutes;
- (3) the first amendment by Representative DELAY of Texas for 10 minutes;
- (4) the amendment by Representative MCINNIS of Colorado for 10 minutes;
- (5) the amendment by Representative PAXON of New York for 10 minutes;
- (6) the amendment by Representative HEFLEY of Colorado for 10 minutes;
- (7) the second amendment by Representative HEFLEY of Colorado for 10 minutes;
- (8) the amendment by Representative NORTHUP of Kentucky for 10 minutes;
- (9) the amendment by Representative GOODLATTE of Virginia for 40 minutes;
- (10) the amendment by Representative WICKER of Mississippi for 40 minutes;
- (11) the amendment by Representative SNOWBARGER of Kansas for 10 minutes;
- (12) the first amendment by Representative WHITFIELD of Kentucky for 10 minutes;
- (13) the amendment by Representative CALVERT of California for 40 minutes;
- (14) the amendment by Representative SALMON of Arizona for 10 minutes;

(15) the first amendment by Representative STEARNS of Florida for 10 minutes;

(16) the amendment by Representative ROHRABACHER of California for 10 minutes;

(17) the first amendment by Representative PAUL of Texas for 10 minutes;

(18) the second amendment by Representative PAUL of Texas for 40 minutes;

(19) the second amendment by Representative DELAY of Texas for 40 minutes;

(20) the third amendment by Representative DELAY of Texas for 40 minutes;

(21) the amendment by Representative PETERSON of Pennsylvania for 40 minutes;

(22) the first amendment by Representative BARR of Georgia for 40 minutes;

(23) the second amendment by Representative BARR of Georgia for 10 minutes;

(24) the amendment by Representative TRAFICANT of Ohio for 10 minutes;

(25) the fourth amendment by Representative DELAY of Texas for 10 minutes;

(26) the fifth amendment by Representative DELAY of Texas for 10 minutes;

(27) the sixth amendment by Representative DELAY of Texas for 10 minutes;

(28) the seventh amendment by Representative DELAY of Texas for 10 minutes;

(29) the eighth amendment by Representative DELAY of Texas for 10 minutes;

(30) the amendment by Representative GUTKNECHT of Minnesota for 10 minutes;

(31) the amendment by Representative SCHAFER of Colorado for 10 minutes;

(32) the amendment by Representative HORN of California for 10 minutes;

(33) the amendment by Representative UPTON of Michigan for 10 minutes;

(34) the second amendment by Representative SMITH of Michigan for 10 minutes;

(35) the amendment by Representative SHADEGG of Arizona for 10 minutes;

(36) the ninth amendment by Representative DELAY of Texas for 40 minutes;

(37) the amendment by Representative SHAW of Florida for 10 minutes;

(38) the first amendment by Representative KAPTUR of Ohio for 10 minutes;

(39) the second amendment by Representative KAPTUR of Ohio for 10 minutes;

(40) the first amendment by Representative SMITH of Washington for 10 minutes;

(41) the second amendment by Representative SMITH of Washington for 10 minutes;

(42) the third amendment by Representative SMITH of Washington for 10 minutes;

(43) the fourth amendment by Representative SMITH of Washington for 10 minutes;

(44) the fifth amendment by Representative SMITH of Washington for 10 minutes;

(45) the sixth amendment by Representative SMITH of Washington for 10 minutes;

(46) the second amendment by Representative SMITH of Washington for 10 minutes;

(47) the third amendment by Representative STERNS of Florida for 10 minutes;

(48) the third amendment by Representative STERNS of Florida for 10 minutes;

(49) the fourth amendment by Representative STERNS of Florida for 10 minutes;

(50) the second amendment by Representative WHITFIELD of Kentucky for 10 minutes;

(51) the third amendment by Representative WHITFIELD of Kentucky for 10 minutes;

(52) the amendment by Representative ENGLISH of Pennsylvania for 10 minutes;

(53) the amendment by Representative GEKAS of Pennsylvania for 10 minutes;

(54) the amendment by Representative MILLER of Florida for 10 minutes;

(55) the amendment by Representative DOOLITTLE of California for 10 minutes;

(Prohibiting certain defenses to violation of foreign contribution ban)

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PICKERING OF MISSISSIPPI TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SHAYS OR MR. MEEHAN

(Substitute for H.R. 2183)

In section 506, strike "Section 319" and insert "(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 319", and add at the end the following:

(b) PROHIBITING USE OF WILLFUL BLINDNESS AS DEFENSE AGAINST CHARGE OF VIOLATING FOREIGN CONTRIBUTION BAN.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 319 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 441e) is amended—

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

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

"(b) It shall not be a defense to a violation of subsection (a) that the defendant did not know that the contribution originated from a foreign national if the defendant was aware of a high probability that the contribution originated from a foreign national."

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

(Modification of Pickering amendment on defenses to foreign money ban)

MODIFICATION TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PICKERING OF MISSISSIPPI

The amendment is modified as follows:

In section 319(b) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as proposed to be inserted by the amendment—

(1) strike "was aware of a high probability" and insert "should have known"; and

(2) strike the period at the end and insert the following: ", except that the trier of fact

may not find that the defendant should have known that the contribution originated from a foreign national solely because of the name of the contributor.”.

(Penalty for violation of foreign contribution ban)

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF MICHIGAN TO THE AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. SHAYS

(Substitutes for H.R. 2183)

Add at the end the following new title:

**TITLE —PENALTY FOR VIOLATION OF FOREIGN CONTRIBUTION BAN**

**SEC. —01. PENALTY FOR VIOLATION OF PROHIBITION AGAINST FOREIGN CONTRIBUTIONS.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—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) Any person who violates subsection (a) shall be sentenced to a term of imprisonment which may not be less than 5 years or more than 20 years, fined in an amount not to exceed \$1,000,000, or both.”.

(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.

(Controlling legal authority)

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DELAY OF TEXAS TO THE AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY SHAYS/MEEHAN

(Substitutes for H.R. 2183)

Add at the end the following new title:

**TITLE —SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING FUNDRAISING ON FEDERAL PROPERTY**

**SEC. —01. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING APPLICABILITY OF CONTROLLING LEGAL AUTHORITY TO FUNDRAISING ON FEDERAL PROPERTY.**

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) On March 2, 1997, the Washington Post reported that Vice President Gore “played the central role in soliciting millions of dollars in campaign money for the Democratic Party during the 1996 election” and that he was known as the administration’s “solicitor-in-chief”.

(2) The next day, Vice President Gore held a nationally televised press conference in which he admitted making numerous calls from the White House in which he solicited campaign contributions.

(3) The Vice President said that there was “no controlling legal authority” regarding the use of government telephones and properties for the use of campaign fundraising.

(4) Documents that the White House released reveal that Vice President Gore made 86 fundraising calls from his White House office, and these new records reveal that Vice President Gore made 20 of these calls at taxpayer expense.

(5) Section 641 of title 18, United States Code, (prohibiting the conversion of government property to personal use) clearly prohibits the use of government property to raise campaign funds.

(6) On its face, the conduct to which Vice President Gore admitted appears to be a clear violation of section 607 of title 18, United States Code, which makes it unlawful for “any person to solicit . . . any (campaign) contribution . . . in any room or building occupied in the discharge of official (government) duties”.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that Federal law clearly dem-

onstrates that “controlling legal authority” prohibits the use of Federal property to raise campaign funds.

(Prohibition against acceptance or solicitation to obtain access to certain government property)

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MCINNIS OF COLORADO TO THE AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. SHAYS

(Substitutes for H.R. 2183)

Add at the end the following new title:

**TITLE —PROHIBITING SOLICITATION TO OBTAIN ACCESS TO CERTAIN GOVERNMENT PROPERTY**

**SEC. —01. PROHIBITION AGAINST ACCEPTANCE OR SOLICITATION TO OBTAIN ACCESS TO CERTAIN GOVERNMENT PROPERTY.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 11 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

**“§ 226. Acceptance or solicitation to obtain access to certain government property**

“Whoever solicits or receives anything of value in consideration of providing a person with access to Air Force One, Marine One, Air Force Two, Marine Two, the White House, or the Vice President’s residence, shall be fined under this title, or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 11 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“226. Acceptance or solicitation to obtain access to certain government property.”.

(Disclosure of spending by unions)

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PAXON OF NEW YORK TO THE AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. SHAYS

(Substitutes for H.R. 2183)

Add at the end the following new title:

**TITLE —UNION DISCLOSURE**

**SEC. —01. UNION DISCLOSURE.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 201(b) of the Labor Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 (29 U.S.C. 431(b)) is amended—

(1) by striking “and” at the end of paragraph (5); and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(7) an itemization of amounts spent by the labor organization for—

“(A) contract negotiation and administration;

“(B) organizing activities;

“(C) strike activities;

“(D) political activities;

“(E) lobbying and promotional activities; and

“(F) market recovery and job targeting programs; and

“(8) all transactions involving a single source or payee for each of the activities described in subparagraphs (A) through (F) of paragraph (7) in which the aggregate cost exceeds \$10,000.”.

(b) COMPUTER NETWORK ACCESS.—Section 201(c) of the Labor Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 (29 U.S.C. 431(c)) is amended by inserting “including availability of such reports via a public Internet site or another publicly accessible computer network,” after “its members.”.

(c) REPORTING BY SECRETARY.—Section 205(a) of the Labor Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 (29 U.S.C. 435(a)) is amended by inserting after “and the Secretary” the following: “shall make the reports and documents filed pursuant to section 201(b) available via a public Internet site or another public accessible computer network. The Secretary”.

(Reimbursement by national parties for use of Air Force One for fundraising trips)

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HEFLEY OF COLORADO TO THE AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. SHAYS

(Substitutes for H.R. 2183)

Add at the end the following new title:

**TITLE —REIMBURSEMENT FOR USE OF AIR FORCE ONE FOR POLITICAL FUNDRAISING**

**SEC. —01. REQUIRING NATIONAL PARTIES TO REIMBURSE AT COST FOR USE OF AIR FORCE ONE FOR POLITICAL FUNDRAISING.**

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:

“REIMBURSEMENT BY POLITICAL PARTIES FOR USE OF AIR FORCE ONE FOR POLITICAL FUNDRAISING

“SEC. 323. (a) IN GENERAL.—If the President, Vice President, or the head of any executive department (as defined in section 101 of title 5, United States Code) uses Air Force One for transportation for any travel which includes a fundraising event for the benefit of any political committee of a national political party, such political committee shall reimburse the Federal Government for the actual costs incurred as a result of the use of Air Force One for the transportation of the individual involved.

“(b) AIR FORCE ONE DEFINED.—In subsection (a), the term ‘Air Force One’ means the airplane operated by the Air Force which has been specially configured to carry out the mission of transporting the President.”.

(Air Force One)

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HEFLEY OF COLORADO TO THE AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. SHAYS

(Substitutes for H.R. 2183)

Add at the end the following new title:

**TITLE —PROHIBITING USE OF AIR FORCE ONE FOR POLITICAL FUNDRAISING**

**SEC. —01. PROHIBITING USE OF AIR FORCE ONE FOR POLITICAL FUNDRAISING.**

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:

“PROHIBITING USE OF AIR FORCE ONE FOR POLITICAL FUNDRAISING

“SEC. 323. (a) IN GENERAL.—It shall be unlawful for any person to provide or offer to provide transportation on Air Force One in exchange for any money or other thing of value in support of any political party or the campaign for electoral office of any candidate, without regard to whether or not the money or thing of value involved is otherwise treated as a contribution under this title.

“(b) AIR FORCE ONE DEFINED.—In subsection (a), the term ‘Air Force One’ means the airplane operated by the Air Force which has been specially configured to carry out the mission of transporting the President.”.

(Prohibiting use of “walking around money” by campaigns)

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. NORTHUP OF KENTUCKY TO THE AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. SHAYS

(Substitutes for H.R. 2183)

Add at the end the following new title:

# **TITLE—PROHIBITING USE OF WALKING AROUND MONEY**

## **SEC.—01. PROHIBITING CAMPAIGNS FROM PROVIDING CURRENCY TO INDIVIDUALS FOR PURPOSES OF ENCOURAGING TURNOUT ON DATE OF ELECTION.**

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:

### **“PROHIBITING USE OF CURRENCY TO PROMOTE ELECTION DAY TURNOUT**

“SEC. 323. It shall be unlawful for any political committee to provide currency to any person for purposes of carrying out activities on the date of an election to encourage or assist individuals to appear at the polling place for the election.”.

(Reform of Motor Voter law)

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOODLATTE OF VIRGINIA TO THE AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. SHAYS

(Substitutes for H.R. 2183)

Add at the end the following new title:

## **TITLE —VOTER REGISTRATION REFORM**

### **SEC. —01. REPEAL OF REQUIREMENT FOR STATES TO PROVIDE FOR VOTER REGISTRATION BY MAIL.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 4(a) of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (42 U.S.C. 1973gg-2) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by adding “and” at the end;

(2) by striking paragraph (2); and

(3) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (2).

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS RELATING TO UNIFORM MAIL VOTER REGISTRATION FORM.—(1) The National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (42 U.S.C. 1973gg et seq.) is amended by striking section 9.

(2) Section 7(a)(6)(A) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1973gg-5(a)(6)(A)) is amended by striking “assistance—” and all that follows and inserting the following: “assistance a voter registration application form which meets the requirements described in section 5(c)(2) (other than subparagraph (A)), unless the applicant, in writing, declines to register to vote.”.

(c) OTHER CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—(1) The National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (42 U.S.C. 1973gg et seq.) is amended by striking section 6.

(2) Section 8(a)(5) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1973gg-6(a)(5)) is amended by striking “5, 6, and 7” and inserting “5 and 7”.

### **SEC. —02. REQUIRING APPLICANTS REGISTERING TO VOTE TO PROVIDE CERTAIN ADDITIONAL INFORMATION.**

(a) SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 5(c)(2) of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (42 U.S.C. 1973gg-3(c)(2)) is amended—

(A) by striking “and” at the end of subparagraph (D);

(B) by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (E) and inserting “; and”; and

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

“(F) shall require the applicant to provide the applicant’s Social Security number.”.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 5(c)(2)(A) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1973gg-3(c)(2)(A)) is amended by inserting after “subparagraph (C)” the following: “, or the information described in subparagraph (F)”.

(3) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect January 1, 1999, and shall apply with respect to applicants registering to vote in elections for Federal office on or after such date.

(b) ACTUAL PROOF OF CITIZENSHIP.—

(1) REGISTRATION WITH APPLICATION FOR DRIVER’S LICENSE.—Section 5(c) of the Na-

tional Voter Registration Act of 1993 (42 U.S.C. 1973gg-3(c)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(3) The voter registration portion of an application for a State motor vehicle driver’s license shall not be considered to be completed unless the applicant provides to the appropriate State motor vehicle authority proof that the applicant is a citizen of the United States.”.

(2) REGISTRATION WITH VOTER REGISTRATION AGENCIES.—Section 7(a) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1973gg-5(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(8) A voter registration application received by a voter registration agency shall not be considered to be completed unless the applicant provides to the agency proof that the applicant is a citizen of the United States.”.

(3) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 8(a)(5)(A) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1973gg-6(a)(5)(A)) is amended by striking the semicolon and inserting the following: “, including the requirement that the applicant provide proof of citizenship.”.

(4) NO EFFECT ON ABSENT UNIFORMED SERVICES AND OVERSEAS VOTERS.—Nothing in the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (as amended by this subsection) may be construed to require any absent uniformed services voter or overseas voter under the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act to provide any evidence of citizenship in order to register to vote (other than any evidence which may otherwise be required under such Act).

### **SEC. —03. REMOVAL OF CERTAIN REGISTRANTS FROM OFFICIAL LIST OF ELIGIBLE VOTERS.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 8(d) of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (42 U.S.C. 1973gg-6(d)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (4); and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following new paragraph:

“(3)(A) At the option of the State, a State may remove the name of a registrant from the official list of eligible voters in elections for Federal office on the ground that the registrant has changed residence if—

“(i) the registrant has not voted or appeared to vote (and, if necessary, correct the registrar’s record of the registrant’s address) in an election during the period beginning on the day after the date of the second previous general election for Federal office held prior to the date the confirmation notice described in subparagraph (B) is sent and ending on the date of such notice;

“(ii) the registrant has not voted or appeared to vote (and, if necessary, correct the registrar’s record of the registrant’s address) in any of the first two general elections for Federal office held after the confirmation notice described in subparagraph (B) is sent; and

“(iii) during the period beginning on the date the confirmation notice described in subparagraph (B) is sent and ending on the date of the second general election for Federal office held after the date such notice is sent, the registrant has failed to notify the State in response to the notice that the registrant did not change his or her residence, or changed residence but remained in the registrar’s jurisdiction.

(B) A confirmation notice described in this subparagraph is a postage prepaid and pre-addressed return card, sent by forwardable mail, on which a registrant may state his or her current address, together with information concerning how the registrant can continue to be eligible to vote if the registrant has changed residence to a place outside the registrar’s jurisdiction and a statement that the registrant may be re-

moved from the official list of eligible voters if the registrant does not respond to the notice (during the period described in subparagraph (A)(iii)) by stating that the registrant did not change his or her residence, or changed residence but remained in the registrar’s jurisdiction.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 8(i)(2) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1973gg-6(d)) is amended by inserting “or subsection (d)(3)” after “subsection (d)(2)”.

### **SEC. —04. PERMITTING STATE TO REQUIRE VOTERS TO PRODUCE ADDITIONAL INFORMATION PRIOR TO VOTING.**

(a) PHOTOGRAPHIC IDENTIFICATION.—Section 8 of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (42 U.S.C. 1973gg-6) is amended—

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

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

“(j) PERMITTING STATES TO REQUIRE VOTERS TO PRODUCE PHOTO IDENTIFICATION.—A State may require an individual to produce a valid photographic identification before receiving a ballot (other than an absentee ballot) for voting in an election for Federal office.”.

(b) SIGNATURE.—Section 8 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1973gg-6), as amended by subsection (a), is further amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (k) as subsection (l); and

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

“(k) PERMITTING STATES TO REQUIRE VOTERS TO PROVIDE SIGNATURE.—A State may require an individual to provide the individual’s signature (in the presence of an election official at the polling place) before receiving a ballot for voting in an election for Federal office, other than an individual who is unable to provide a signature because of illiteracy or disability.”.

### **SEC. —05. REPEAL OF REQUIREMENT THAT STATES PERMIT REGISTRANTS CHANGING RESIDENCE TO VOTE AT POLLING PLACE FOR FORMER ADDRESS.**

Section 8(e)(2) of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (42 U.S.C. 1973gg-6(e)(2)) is amended—

(1) by striking “(2)(A)” and inserting “(2)”;

and

(2) by striking “election, at the option of the registrant—” and all that follows and inserting the following: “election shall be permitted to correct the voting records for purposes of voting in future elections at the appropriate polling place for the current address and, if permitted by State law, shall be permitted to vote in the present election, upon confirmation by the registrant of the new address by such means as are required by law.”.

### **SEC. —06. EFFECTIVE DATE.**

The amendments made by this title shall apply with respect to elections for Federal office occurring after December 1999.

(Photo ID requirement for voting)

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WICKER OF MISSISSIPPI TO THE AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. SHAYS

(Substitutes for H.R. 2183)

Add at the end the following new title:

## **TITLE —PHOTO IDENTIFICATION REQUIREMENT FOR VOTERS**

### **SEC. —01. PERMITTING STATE TO REQUIRE VOTERS TO PRODUCE PHOTOGRAPHIC IDENTIFICATION.**

Section 8 of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (42 U.S.C. 1973gg-6) is amended—

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

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

“(i) PERMITTING STATES TO REQUIRE VOTERS TO PRODUCE PHOTO IDENTIFICATION.—A State may require an individual to produce a valid photographic identification before receiving a ballot for voting in an election for Federal office.”.

(Enhancing enforcement of campaign finance law)

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SNOWBARGER OF KANSAS TO THE AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. SHAYS

(Substitutes for H.R. 2183)

Add at the end the following new title:

**TITLE —ENHANCING ENFORCEMENT OF CAMPAIGN LAW**

**SEC. —01. ENHANCING ENFORCEMENT OF CAMPAIGN FINANCE LAW.**

(a) MANDATORY IMPRISONMENT FOR CRIMINAL CONDUCT.—Section 309(d)(1)(A) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 437g(d)(1)(A)) is amended—

(1) in the first sentence, by striking “shall be fined, or imprisoned for not more than one year, or both” and inserting “shall be imprisoned for not fewer than 1 year and not more than 10 years”; and

(2) by striking the second sentence.

(b) CONCURRENT AUTHORITY OF ATTORNEY GENERAL TO BRING CRIMINAL ACTIONS.—Section 309(d) of such Act (2 U.S.C. 437g(d)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(4) In addition to the authority to bring cases referred pursuant to subsection (a)(5), the Attorney General may at any time bring a criminal action for a violation of this Act or of chapter 95 or chapter 96 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to actions brought with respect to elections occurring after January 1999.

(Ban on party coordination of soft money for issue advocacy by candidates receiving presidential campaign funds)

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WHITFIELD OF KENTUCKY TO THE AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. SHAYS

(Substitutes for H.R. 2183)

Add at the end the following new title:

**TITLE —BAN ON COORDINATED SOFT MONEY ACTIVITIES BY PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATES**

**SEC. —01. BAN ON COORDINATION OF SOFT MONEY FOR ISSUE ADVOCACY BY PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATES RECEIVING 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) BAN ON COORDINATION OF SOFT MONEY FOR ISSUE ADVOCACY.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—No candidate for election to the office of President or Vice President who is certified to receive amounts from the Presidential Election Campaign Fund under this chapter or chapter 96 may coordinate the expenditure of any funds for issue advocacy with any political party unless the funds are subject to the limitations, prohibitions, and reporting requirements of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971.

“(2) ISSUE ADVOCACY DEFINED.—In this section, the term ‘issue advocacy’ means any activity carried out for the purpose of 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 (without regard to whether the activity is carried out for the

purpose of influencing any election for Federal office).”.

(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.

(Requiring 50 percent of contributions to come from local individual residents)

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CALVERT OF CALIFORNIA TO THE AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. SHAYS

(Substitutes for H.R. 2183)

Add at the end the following new title:

**TITLE —RESTRICTIONS ON NONRESIDENT FUNDRAISING**

**SEC. —01. LIMITING AMOUNT OF CONGRESSIONAL CANDIDATE CONTRIBUTIONS FROM INDIVIDUALS NOT RESIDING IN DISTRICT OR STATE INVOLVED.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—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:

“(1) A candidate for the office of Senator or the office of Representative in, or Delegate or Resident Commissioner to, the Congress may not accept contributions with respect to an election from persons other than local individual residents totaling in excess of the aggregate amount of contributions accepted from local individual residents (as determined on the basis of the information reported under section 304(d)).

“(2) In determining the amount of contributions accepted by a candidate for purposes of this subsection, the amounts of any contributions made by a political committee of a political party shall be allocated as follows:

“(A) 50 percent of such amounts shall be deemed to be a contributions from local individual residents.

“(B) 50 percent of such amounts shall be deemed to be contributions from persons other than local individual residents.

“(3) As used in this subsection, the term ‘local individual resident’ means—

“(A) with respect to an election for the office of Senator, an individual who resides in the State involved; and

“(B) with respect to an election for the office of Representative in, or Delegate or Resident Commissioner to, the Congress, an individual who resides in the congressional district involved.”.

(b) REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—Section 304 of such Act (2 U.S.C. 434) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(d) Each principal campaign committee of a candidate for the Senate or the House of Representatives shall include the following information in the first report filed under subsection (a)(2) which covers the period which begins 19 days before an election and ends 20 days after the election:

“(1) The total contributions received by the committee with respect to the election involved from local individual residents (as defined in section 315(i)(3)), as of the last day of the period covered by the report.

“(2) The total contributions received by the committee with respect to the election involved from all persons, as of the last day of the period covered by the report.”.

(c) PENALTY FOR VIOLATION OF LIMITS.—Section 309(d) of such Act (2 U.S.C. 437g(d)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(4)(A) Any candidate who knowingly and willfully accepts contributions in excess of any limitation provided under section 315(i) shall be fined an amount equal to the greater of 200 percent of the amount accepted in excess of the applicable limitation or (if applicable) the amount provided in paragraph (1)(A).

“(B) Interest shall be assessed against any portion of a fine imposed under subparagraph (A) which remains unpaid after the expiration of the 30-day period which begins on the date the fine is imposed.”.

(Posting names of certain Air Force One passengers on Internet)

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SALMON OF ARIZONA TO THE AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. SHAYS

(Substitutes for H.R. 2183)

Add at the end the following new title:

**TITLE —POSTING NAMES OF CERTAIN AIR FORCE ONE PASSENGERS ON INTERNET**

**SEC. —01. REQUIREMENT THAT NAMES OF PASSENGERS ON AIR FORCE ONE AND AIR FORCE TWO BE MADE AVAILABLE THROUGH THE INTERNET.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—The President shall make available through the Internet the name of any non-Government person who is a passenger on an aircraft designated as Air Force One or Air Force Two not later than 30 days after the date that the person is a passenger on such aircraft.

(b) EXCEPTION.—Subsection (a) shall not apply in a case in which the President determines that compliance with such subsection would be contrary to the national security interests of the United States. In any such case, not later than 30 days after the date that the person whose name will not be made available through the Internet was a passenger on the aircraft, the President shall submit to the chairman and ranking member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives and of the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate—

(1) the name of the person; and

(2) the justification for not making such name available through the Internet.

(c) DEFINITION OF PERSON.—As used in this Act, the term “non-Government person” means a person who is not an officer or employee of the United States, a member of the Armed Forces, or a Member of Congress.

(Ban on disbursements of soft money by foreign nationals)

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. STEARNS OF FLORIDA TO THE AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. SHAYS

(Substitutes for H.R. 2183)

Add at the end the following new title:

**TITLE —BAN ON SOFT MONEY OF FOREIGN NATIONALS**

**SEC. —01. 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.

(Partial removal of contribution limits for candidates with opponents making large amounts of personal expenditures)

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROHRABACHER OF CALIFORNIA TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SHAYS OR MR. MEEHAN

(Substitute for H.R. 2183)

Add at the end of title V the following new section (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

**SEC. 510. PARTIAL REMOVAL OF LIMITATIONS ON CONTRIBUTIONS TO CANDIDATES WHOSE OPPONENTS USE LARGE AMOUNTS OF PERSONAL FUNDS.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—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)(1) If a candidate for Federal office makes contributions or expenditures from the personal funds of the candidate totaling more than \$1,000 with respect to an election, the candidate shall so notify the Commission and each other candidate in the election. The notification shall be made in writing within 48 hours after the contribution or expenditure involved is made.

“(2) In any case described in paragraph (1), any person who is otherwise permitted under this Act to make contributions to such other candidate may make contributions in excess of any otherwise applicable limitation on such contributions, to the extent that the total of such excess contributions accepted by such other candidate does not exceed the total of contributions or expenditures from personal funds referred to in paragraph (1).”

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to elections occurring after January 1999.

(Ballot access rights)

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PAUL OF TEXAS TO THE AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. SHAYS

(Substitutes for H.R. 2183)

Add at the end the following new title:

**TITLE —BALLOT ACCESS RIGHTS**

**SEC. 101. FINDINGS AND PURPOSES.**

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Voting participation in the United States is lower than in any other advanced industrialized democracy.

(2) The rights of eligible citizens to seek election to office, vote for candidates of their choice and associate for the purpose of taking part in elections, including the right to create and develop new political parties, are fundamental in a democracy. The rights of citizens to participate in the election process, provided in and derived from the first and fourteenth amendments to the Constitution, have consistently been promoted and protected by the Federal Government. These rights include the right to cast an effective vote and the right to associate for the advancement of political beliefs, which includes the “constitutional right . . . to create and develop new political parties.” *Norman v. Reed*, 502 U.S. 279, 112 S.Ct. 699 (1992). It is the duty of the Federal Government to see that these rights are not impaired in elections for Federal office.

(3) Certain restrictions on access to the ballot impair the ability of citizens to exercise these rights and have a direct and damaging effect on citizens’ participation in the electoral process.

(4) Many States unduly restrict access to the ballot by nonmajor party candidates and nonmajor political parties by means of such devices as excessive petition signature requirements, insufficient petitioning periods, unconstitutionally early petition filing deadlines, petition signature distribution cri-

teria, and limitations on eligibility to circulate and sign petitions.

(5) Many States require political parties to poll an unduly high number of votes or to register an unduly high number of voters as a precondition for remaining on the ballot.

(6) In 1983, the Supreme Court ruled unconstitutional an Ohio law requiring a nonmajor party candidate for President to qualify for the general election ballot earlier than major party candidates. This Supreme Court decision, *Anderson v. Celebrezze*, 460 U.S. 780 (1983) has been followed by many lower courts in challenges by nonmajor parties and candidates to early petition filing deadlines. See, e.g., *Stoddard v. Quinn*, 593 F. Supp. 300 (D.Me. 1984); *Cripps v. Seneca County Board of Elections*, 629 F. Supp. 1335 (N.D. Oh. 1985); *Libertarian Party of Nevada v. Swackhamer*, 638 F. Supp. 565 (D. Nev. 1986); *Cromer v. State of South Carolina*, 917 F.2d 819 (4th Cir. 1990); *New Alliance Party of Alabama v. Hand*, 933 F. 2d 1568 (11th Cir. 1991).

(7) In 1996, 34 States required nonmajor party candidates for President to qualify for the ballot before the second major party national convention (Arizona, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Missouri, Montana, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, and Wyoming). Twenty-six of these States required nonmajor party candidates to qualify before the first major party national convention (Arizona, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Missouri, Montana, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Texas, Washington, and West Virginia).

(8) Under present law, in 1996, nonmajor party candidates for President were required to obtain at least 701,089 petition signatures to be listed on the ballots of all 50 States and the District of Columbia—28 times more signatures than the 25,500 required of Democratic Party candidates and 13 times more signatures than the 54,250 required of Republican Party candidates. To be listed on the ballot in all 50 States and the District of Columbia with a party label, nonmajor party candidates for President were required to obtain approximately 651,475 petition signatures and 89,186 registrants. Thirty-two of the 41 States that hold Presidential primaries required no signatures of major party candidates for President (Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Mexico, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin). Only three States required no signatures of nonmajor party candidates for President (Arkansas, Colorado, and Louisiana; Colorado and Louisiana, however, required a \$500 filing fee).

(9) Under present law, the number of petition signatures required by the States to list a major party candidate for Senate on the ballot in 1996 ranged from zero to 15,000. The number of petition signatures required to list a nonmajor party candidate for Senate ranged from zero to 196,788. Thirty-one States required no signatures of major party candidates for Senate (Alabama, Alaska, Arkansas, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Min-

nesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Carolina, Texas, Utah, Washington, West Virginia, Wyoming). Only one State required no signatures of nonmajor party candidates for Senate, provided they were willing to be listed on the ballot without a party label (Louisiana, although a \$600 filing fee was required, and to run with a party label, a candidate was required to register 111,121 voters into his or her party).

(10) Under present law, the number of petition signatures required by the States to list a major party candidate for Congress on the ballot in 1996 ranged from zero to 2,000. The number of petition signatures required to list a nonmajor party candidate for Congress ranged from zero to 13,653. Thirty-one States required no signatures of major party candidates for Congress (Alabama, Alaska, Arkansas, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Carolina, Texas, Utah, Washington, West Virginia, Wyoming). Only one State required no signatures of nonmajor party candidates for Congress, provided they are willing to be listed on the ballot without a party label (Louisiana, although a \$600 filing fee was required).

(11) Under present law, in 1996, eight States required additional signatures to list a nonmajor party candidate for President on the ballot with a party label (Alabama, Arizona, Idaho, Kansas, Nebraska, North Dakota, Ohio, Tennessee). Thirteen States required additional signatures to list a nonmajor party candidate for Senate or Congress on the ballot with a party label (Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Idaho, Hawaii, Kansas, Louisiana, North Dakota, Nebraska, Ohio, Oregon, Tennessee). Two of these States (Ohio and Tennessee) required 5,000 signatures and 25 signatures, respectively, to list a nonmajor party candidate for President or Senate on the ballot in 1996, but required 33,463 signatures and 37,179 signatures, respectively, to list the candidate on the ballot with her or his party label. One State (California) required a nonmajor party to have 89,006 registrants in order to have its candidate for President listed on the ballot with a party label.

(12) Under present law, in 1996 one State (California) required nonmajor party candidates for President or Senate to obtain 147,238 signatures in 105 days, but required major party candidates for Senate to obtain only 65 signatures in 105 days, and required no signatures of major party candidates for President. Another State (Texas) required nonmajor party candidates for President or Senate to obtain 43,963 signatures in 75 days, and required no signatures of major party candidates for President or Senate.

(13) Under present law, in 1996, seven States required nonmajor party candidates for President or Senate to collect a certain number or percentage of their petition signatures in each congressional district or in a specified number of congressional districts (Michigan, Missouri, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New York, North Carolina, Virginia). Only three of these States impose a like requirement on major party candidates for President or Senate (Michigan, New York, Virginia).

(14) Under present law, in 1996, 20 States restricted the circulation of petitions for nonmajor party candidates to residents of those States (California, Colorado, Connecticut, District of Columbia, Idaho, Illinois, Kansas, Michigan, Missouri, Nebraska, Nevada, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Texas, Virginia, West



Virginia, Wisconsin). Two States restricted the circulation of petitions for nonmajor party candidates to the county or congressional district where the circulator lives (Kansas and Virginia).

(15) Under present law, in 1996, three States prohibited people who voted in a primary election from signing petitions for nonmajor party candidates (Nebraska, New York, Texas, West Virginia). Twelve States restricted the signing of petitions to people who indicate intent to support or vote for the candidate or party (California, Delaware, Hawaii, Illinois, Indiana, Maryland, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Oregon, Utah). Five of these 12 States required no petitions of major party candidates (Delaware, Maryland, North Carolina, Oregon, Utah), and only one of the six remaining States restricted the signing of petitions for major party candidates to people who indicate intent to support or vote for the candidate or party (New Jersey).

(16) In two States (Louisiana and Maryland), no nonmajor party candidate for Senate has qualified for the ballot since those States' ballot access laws have been in effect.

(17) In two States (Georgia and Louisiana), no nonmajor party candidate for the United States House of Representatives has qualified for the ballot since those States' ballot access laws have been in effect.

(18) Restrictions on the ability of citizens to exercise the rights identified in this subsection have disproportionately impaired participation in the electoral process by various groups, including racial minorities.

(19) The establishment of fair and uniform national standards for access to the ballot in elections for Federal office would remove barriers to the participation of citizens in the electoral process and thereby facilitate such participation and maximize the rights identified in this subsection.

(20) The Congress has authority, under the provisions of the Constitution of the United States in sections 4 and 8 of article I, section 1 of article II, article VI, the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth amendments, and other provisions of the Constitution of the United States, to protect and promote the exercise of the rights identified in this subsection.

(b) **PURPOSES.**—The purposes of this title are—

(1) to establish fair and uniform standards regulating access to the ballot by eligible citizens who desire to seek election to Federal office and political parties, bodies, and groups which desire to take part in elections for Federal office; and

(2) to maximize the participation of eligible citizens in elections for Federal office.

#### **SEC. 02. BALLOT ACCESS RIGHTS.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—An individual shall have the right to be placed as a candidate on, and to have such individual's political party, body, or group affiliation in connection with such candidacy placed on, a ballot or similar voting materials to be used in a Federal election, if—

(1) such individual presents a petition stating in substance that its signers desire such individual's name and political party, body or group affiliation, if any, to be placed on the ballot or other similar voting materials to be used in the Federal election with respect to which such rights are to be exercised;

(2) with respect to a Federal election for the office of President, Vice President, or Senator, such petition has a number of signatures of persons qualified to vote for such office equal to one-tenth of one percent of the number of persons who voted in the most recent previous Federal election for such office

in the State, or 1,000 signatures, whichever is greater;

(3) with respect to a Federal election for the office of Representative in, or Delegate or Resident Commissioner to, the Congress, such petition has a number of signatures of persons qualified to vote for such office equal to one-half of one percent of the number of persons who voted in the most recent previous Federal election for such office, or, if there was no previous Federal election for such office, 1,000 signatures;

(4) with respect to a Federal election the date of which was fixed 345 or more days in advance, such petition was circulated during a period beginning on the 345th day and ending on the 75th day before the date of the election; and

(5) with respect to a Federal election the date of which was fixed less than 345 days in advance, such petition was circulated during a period established by the State holding the election, or, if no such period was established, during a period beginning on the day after the date the election was scheduled and ending on the tenth day before the date of the election, provided, however, that the number of signatures required under paragraph (2) or (3) shall be reduced by  $\frac{1}{270}$  for each day less than 270 in such period.

(b) **SPECIAL RULE.**—An individual shall have the right to be placed as a candidate on, and to have such individual's political party, body, or group affiliation in connection with such candidacy placed on, a ballot or similar voting materials to be used in a Federal election, without having to satisfy any requirement relating to a petition under subsection (a), if that or another individual, as a candidate of that political party, body, or group, received one percent of the votes cast in the most recent general Federal election for President or Senator in the State.

(c) **SAVINGS PROVISION.**—Subsections (a) and (b) shall not apply with respect to any State that provides by law for greater ballot access rights than the ballot access rights provided for under such subsections.

#### **SEC. 03. RULEMAKING.**

The Attorney General shall make rules to carry out this title.

#### **SEC. 04. GENERAL DEFINITIONS.**

As used in this title—

(1) the term "Federal election" means a general or special election for the office of—

(A) President or Vice President;

(B) Senator; or

(C) Representative in, or Delegate or Resident Commissioner to, the Congress;

(2) the term "State" means a State of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and any other territory or possession of the United States;

(3) the term "individual" means an individual who has the qualifications required by law of a person who holds the office for which such individual seeks to be a candidate;

(4) the term "petition" includes a petition which conforms to section 02(a)(1) and upon which signers' addresses and/or printed names are required to be placed;

(5) the term "signer" means a person whose signature appears on a petition and who can be identified as a person qualified to vote for an individual for whom the petition is circulated, and includes a person who requests another to sign a petition on his or her behalf at the time when, and at the place where, the request is made;

(6) the term "signature" includes the incomplete name of a signer, the name of a signer containing abbreviations such as first or middle initial, and the name of a signer preceded or followed by titles such as "Mr.," "Ms.," "Dr.," "Jr.," or "III"; and

(7) the term "address" means the address which a signer uses for purposes of registration and voting.

(Participation by presidential candidates in debates with candidates with broad-based support)

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PAUL OF TEXAS  
TO THE AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. PAUL

(Substitutes for H.R. 2183)

Add at the end the following new title:

#### **TITLE —DEBATE REQUIREMENTS FOR PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATES**

#### **SEC. 01. REQUIREMENT THAT CANDIDATES WHO RECEIVE CAMPAIGN FINANCING FROM THE PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION CAMPAIGN FUND AGREE NOT TO PARTICIPATE IN MULTICANDIDATE FORUMS THAT EXCLUDE CANDIDATES WITH BROAD-BASED PUBLIC SUPPORT.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—In addition to the requirements under subtitle H of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, in order to be eligible to receive payments from the Presidential Election Campaign Fund, a candidate shall agree in writing not to appear in any multicandidate forum with respect to the election involved unless the following individuals are invited to participate in the multicandidate forum:

(1) Each other eligible candidate under such subtitle.

(2) Each individual who is qualified in at least 40 States for the ballot for the office involved.

(b) **ENFORCEMENT.**—If the Federal Election Commission determines that a candidate—

(1) has received payments from the Presidential Election Campaign Fund; and

(2) has violated the agreement referred to in subsection (a); the candidate shall pay to the Treasury an amount equal to the amount of the payments so made.

(c) **DEFINITION.**—As used in this title, the term "multicandidate forum" means a meeting—

(1) consisting of a moderated reciprocal discussion of issues among candidates for the same office; and

(2) to which any other person has access in person or through an electronic medium.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DELAY OF TEXAS  
TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SHAYS  
OR MR. MEEHAN

Amendment No. 81: Add at the end of section 301(20) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as added by section 201(b) of the substitute, the following:

(C) Exception for legislative alerts: The term "express advocacy" does not include any communication which—

(i) deals solely with an issue or legislation which is or may be the subject of a vote in the Senate or House of Representatives; and

(ii) encourages an individual to contact an elected representative in Congress in order to exercise the right protected under the first amendment of the Constitution to inform the representative of the individual's views on such issue or legislation.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DELAY OF TEXAS  
TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY SHAYS/MEEHAN

#### **TITLE —SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING APPOINTMENT OF INDEPENDENT COUNSEL**

#### **SEC. 01. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING APPOINTMENT OF INDEPENDENT COUNSEL TO INVESTIGATE CLINTON ADMINISTRATION.**

(a) **FINDINGS.**—Congress finds as follows:

(1) The Independent Counsel Act (chapter 40 of title 28, United States Code) was designed to avoid even the appearance of impropriety in the consideration of allegations



of misconduct by high-level Executive Branch officials.

(2) Section 591(a)(1) of title 28, United States Code, requires the Attorney General of the United States to conduct a preliminary investigation whenever the Attorney General finds specific and credible evidence that a covered person "may have violated any Federal criminal law . . .".

(3) Under the statute (28 U.S.C. 591(b)), the President is a covered person.

(4) The bribery statute (chapter 11 of title 18, United States Code) prohibits Federal officials, including the President, from receiving any benefit in return for any official action.

(5) Numerous published reports describe circumstances that suggest that President Clinton may have received campaign contributions in return for official government actions he took on behalf of the contributors.

(6) Any such scheme may also violate other statutes including the following sections of title 18, United States Code: section 371 (conspiracy to defraud the United States), section 600 (promising of government benefits in return for political support), section 872 (extortion by government officials), and sections 1341, 1343, and 1346 (mail and wire fraud by defrauding the United States of honest services).

(7) On February 13, 1997, the Washington Post reported that the Department of Justice had obtained intelligence information that the government of the People's Republic of China had sought to direct contributions from foreign sources to the Democratic National Committee ("DNC") before the 1996 presidential campaign.

(8) In March 1995, Johnny Chung, a Democratic National Committee trustee and a businessman from Torrance, California, brought six officials of the government of the People's Republic of China and its state-owned companies, including Hongye Zheng, Chairman of the China Council for the Promotion of International Trade, and Yang Zanzhong, President of China Petro-Chemical Corp., to hear the President give his regular Saturday radio address.

(9) On March 8, 1995, Johnny Chung came to the First Lady's office in the White House seeking various favors for the officials, including admission to the radio address.

(10) Aides to Mrs. Clinton, Margaret Williams and Evan Ryan, suggested that Mr. Chung could get the favors if he helped Mrs. Clinton with her debts to the DNC for holiday parties.

(11) The next day, Mr. Chung gave Ms. Williams a check for \$50,000, and received a lunch in the White House mess, a picture with Mrs. Clinton, and admission to the radio address for himself and the officials. Id. Records indicate that on Friday, March 17, 1995, Mr. Chung donated \$50,000 to the Democratic National Committee and on April 12, 1995, he donated an additional \$125,000.

(12) In commenting on the solicitation in the White House by the First Lady's aides, Mr. Chung said, "I see the White House is like a subway: You have to put in coins to open the gates."

(13) On February 6, 1996, Wang Jun attended a coffee at the White House with President Clinton. Mr. Wang is the head of the state-owned company, China International Trade and Investment Corp. ("CITIC"), a \$21,000,000,000 conglomerate, and its subsidiary Poly Technologies. Poly Technologies is the primary arms dealing company for the Chinese military. Mr. Wang gained access to the coffee through Charles Yah Lin Trie, an old Arkansas friend of President Clinton and Democratic Party fund-raiser.

(14) After the Wang visit came to public attention, President Clinton said he remembered "literally nothing" about the meeting, but he conceded that it was "clearly inappropriate."

(15) Mr. Trie had a number of interesting sources of funds. Among other things, in the spring of 1996, Mr. Trie delivered suspicious donations totaling \$789,000 to the President's legal defense fund.

(16) Mr. Trie made the donations on three dates: March 21, 1996, \$460,000; April 24, 1996, \$179,000; and May 17, 1996, \$150,000. These donations have now been returned. Recent reports reveal that most of this money came from members of a Taiwan-based religious sect, Suma Ching Hai. President and Mrs. Clinton knew about these suspicious donations at the time, and they concurred in efforts to conceal them until after the election. Notwithstanding that knowledge, President Clinton continued to grant favors to Mr. Trie.

(17) On April 19, 1996, President Clinton appointed Mr. Trie to the Commission on U.S. Pacific Trade and Investment Policy. On April 26, President Clinton signed a letter to Mr. Trie relating to U.S. policy in putting carriers in the Taiwan Straits.

(18) During 1995 and 1996, Mr. Trie received a series of wire transfers in amounts of \$50,000 and \$100,000 from the Chinese government's state-owned bank, the Bank of China.

(19) Recent Senate testimony reveals that Mr. Trie received \$1,400,000 in wire transfers from abroad from 1994 through 1996. At least \$220,000 of this money has been traced into the treasury of the DNC.

(20) Of the total Mr. Trie received from overseas, \$905,000 came from Ng Lap Seng, a Macao-based businessman who was Trie's partner and who was also known as Mr. Wu. Mr. Ng is an adviser to the Chinese Communist government. Although he is a foreign national who cannot legally make donations to U.S. campaigns, he gave money through two employees to attend a dinner for big contributors with President Clinton on February 16, 1995.

(21) Returning to Mr. Wang's visit to the coffee with President Clinton, just four days before the meeting, Mr. Wang's arms trading company received special permission to import 100,000 assault weapons, along with millions of bullets, into the United States despite the assault weapons ban.

(22) On the day of the coffee, Democratic fund-raiser Ernest G. Green, another Arkansas friend of the President's, delivered a \$50,000 donation to the Democratic National Committee. Mr. Green, a managing director at Lehman Brothers, had never before given such a large contribution to the Democratic Party. Mr. Wang used a letter of invitation written by Mr. Green to obtain a visa for Mr. Wang's trip to the White House for coffee. After delivering the check, Mr. Green met with Mr. Wang before Mr. Wang went to the White House.

(23) Several lengthy reports in the Chicago Tribune and the Washington Post detail the depths of Mr. Wang's international arms dealing activities.

(24) Beginning in the summer of 1994, Federal agents began an undercover sting investigation of Poly's efforts to smuggle weapons into the United States. On March 8, 1996, just a month after Mr. Wang's visit with President Clinton, the President of Poly's U.S. subsidiary, Robert Ma, sold his house in Atlanta and fled the country.

(25) On March 18, 1996, Federal agents surreptitiously seized a Poly shipment of 2,000 AK-47 assault rifles in Oakland, California. These weapons had left China on February 18 aboard a vessel belonging to another state-owned company, the Chinese Ocean Shipping Company ("COSCO"). Id. In May, Federal

agents hastily shut down the operation when they learned that the Chinese had been tipped to its existence. The stories indicate that the Department is currently investigating to determine the source of the leak.

(26) Smuggling the weapons into the United States has not harmed the fortunes of COSCO. In April 1996, with the support of the Clinton Administration, COSCO signed a lease with the City of Long Beach, California to rent a now defunct navy base in Long Beach, California. In addition, the Clinton Administration has allowed COSCO's ships access to our most sensitive ports with one day's notice rather than the usual four, and it has given COSCO a \$138,000,000 loan guarantee to build ships in Alabama. The Administration has made all of these concessions since the coffee with Mr. Wang. That COSCO participated in the shipment of illegal arms does not appear to have dampened the Administration's enthusiasm in any of these matters.

(27) These circumstances strongly suggest that there was a quid pro quo, and that the contributions from Mr. Chung, Mr. Green, and Mr. Trie, may have come from the Chinese government in return for the various government favors described. The President met directly with the Chinese officials whom Mr. Chung and Mr. Trie brought to the White House, and he knew about the suspicious circumstances of Mr. Trie's donations. If the President knew about a quid pro quo, he may have violated section 201 of title 18, United States Code, and the other statutes cited above.

(28) Mr. Chung has admitted that a large portion of the money he raised for the Democrats originated with the People's Liberation Army in China. He has identified the conduit as a Chinese aerospace executive, based in Hong Kong, who is also the daughter of General Liu Huaqing, who was China's top military commander at the time.

(29) Closely related to the allegations concerning the government of the People's Republic of China are the allegations relating to the Lippo Group.

(30) The Lippo Group ("Lippo") is a multi-billion dollar real estate and financial conglomerate based in Indonesia. The Riady family, an ethnic Chinese family living in Indonesia, owns and controls Lippo. The patriarch of the Riady family is Mochtar Riady. His son, James, has known President Clinton since the late 1970s when he interned with an investment bank in Little Rock, Arkansas. Since President Clinton began his first presidential campaign in 1991, members of the Riady family and Lippo's subsidiaries and executives have contributed more than \$475,000 to the Democratic Party and its candidates. Lippo and the Riady family have numerous business interests in China and Hong Kong.

(31) In the early 1980s, John Huang, the former Commerce Department official at the center of this controversy, worked for Lippo in Little Rock at the Worthen Bank, in which Lippo had a large stake. In 1986, Mr. Huang moved to Los Angeles to help run the Lippo Bank, which has had a number of problems with banking regulators. In that role, he became Lippo's chief representative in the United States.

(32) Mr. Huang began raising illegal contributions for the Democratic Party as early as 1992. The recent Senate Governmental Affairs Committee hearings revealed that in August 1992 Huang gave a \$50,000 contribution to the DNC through Hip Hing Holdings, a U.S.-based Lippo subsidiary. He then requested and received reimbursement for the contribution from Lippo's Indonesian headquarters. Senator Lieberman said, "Here's a clear trail of foreign money coming into United States elections."

(33) Maria L. Haley, a presidential aide, recommended Mr. Huang for a job at the Commerce Department in October 1993. In January 1994 while he was still an employee of Lippo, Mr. Huang received a top-secret security clearance without a full background check.

(34) On July 18, 1994, he became principal deputy assistant secretary for international economic policy in the Department of Commerce. He received a \$780,000 severance payment from Lippo. David J. Rothkopf, the deputy undersecretary of commerce, and Jeffrey Garten, the undersecretary, expressed misgivings about Mr. Huang's suitability for the job. In recent Senate testimony, Mr. Garten said that Mr. Huang was "totally unqualified" for the job and that "he should not be involved in China at all." Mr. Rothkopf has said his complaints were to no avail and that he "got the distinct impression that this was a done deal. But it was unclear to me at what level it was done." The Riadys have apparently boasted to friends that they placed Huang in the job.

(35) The Commerce Department now acknowledges that Mr. Huang attended 109 meetings at which classified information might have been discussed. Phone records show that Mr. Huang made at least 70 calls to Lippo during his tenure at the Commerce Department, many of which occurred near the time of the briefings. He had contacts with officials of the Chinese Embassy. Mr. Huang also maintained an office at a private investment firm with Arkansas and Asian ties, Stephens, Inc., where he made numerous phone calls and received faxes and packages during his Commerce tenure.

(36) Mr. Huang began to raise money illegally before he even left the Commerce Department, and the DNC attributed these donations to his wife. In mid-1995, he expressed an interest in going to the DNC to raise funds. DNC Chairman Don Fowler did not think that the move was necessary and took no action.

(37) In September 1995, the President and his closest adviser, Bruce Lindsey, met with Mr. Huang, James Riady, and C. Joseph Giroir, a former law partner of Mrs. Clinton's who was close to the Riadys, regarding Mr. Huang's desire to move to the DNC. The President has acknowledged that he had a role in recommending Mr. Huang for the DNC job, and other former Clinton aides with ties to Asia, including Mr. Giroir, apparently mounted a concerted campaign to bring about Mr. Huang's job there. In December 1995, Mr. Huang moved to the DNC with the title finance vice chairman. After Mr. Huang left, his Commerce Department position was eliminated. Id. Strangely, however, Mr. Huang kept his security clearance long after he left the Commerce Department.

(38) At the DNC, Mr. Huang embarked on an unusual fund-raising drive in which he raised \$3,400,000. Of that amount, the DNC has identified \$1,600,000 as being illegal, improper, or sufficiently suspect that it will be sent back to donors. Many of these donations came from fictitious donors and, in at least one case, a dead person. One of the most egregious examples is the \$450,000 donated by Arief and Soraya Wiriadinata. Until December 1995 when they left the country, this couple lived in a modest townhouse in Northern Virginia. Mr. Wiriadinata was a landscape architect, and Mrs. Wiriadinata was a homemaker. Despite these modest circumstances, the couple wrote 23 separate checks to the DNC totaling \$425,000 from November 9, 1995 until June 7, 1996. However, Mrs. Wiriadinata is the daughter of Hashim Ning, a partner of the Riadys in owning Lippo. Democratic Party officials had concerns about the legality of Mr. Huang's activities as early as July 1996, but they did not remove him from his job.

(39) The Wiriadinatas are not the only conduit through which Lippo money apparently benefited the Clintons. Existing Independent Counsel Kenneth Starr is reportedly investigating whether payments that Lippo made to Webster Hubbell were made to buy his silence in the Whitewater investigation. These payments reportedly included paying for a vacation the Hubbell family took to Bali in the summer of 1994.

(40) One possible quid pro quo for this Lippo money is the possibility that Lippo bought Mr. Huang's position in the Commerce Department as well as the accompanying access to classified information. In addition, during September 1996, the President announced that he was designating 1.7 million acres of Utah wilderness as a national monument. This designation abruptly halted plans to mine the world's largest deposit of clean-burning "super compliance coal." The President made this move with virtually no consultation with people in the affected area of Utah. The second largest deposit of this kind of coal lies in Indonesia, and critics suggest that the designation was made as a reward to Lippo.

(41) If there was a quid pro quo for Mr. Huang's position at the Department of Commerce, his access to classified information, the designation of the national monument, or all three, then there may have been a violation of section 201 of title 18, United States Code, and the other statutes mentioned above. The President's direct involvement includes his participation in the September 1995 meeting at which Mr. Huang expressed his desire to go to the DNC and his participation in the designation of the national monument.

(42) On February 20, 1997, the Wall Street Journal reported that a Miami computer executive with close ties to the government of Paraguay had a number of dealings with the White House.

(43) The computer executive, Mark Jimenez, is a native of the Philippines, and he is a legal resident of the United States. His company, Future Tech International, sells computer parts in Latin America, including Paraguay. He apparently has close ties to the government of Paraguay. Since 1993, Mr. Jimenez and his employees have given over \$800,000 to the Democratic Party, the Clinton-Gore campaign, and other private initiatives linked to President Clinton, like the effort to restore the President's birthplace. Mr. Jimenez has visited the White House at least twelve times since April 1994, and on at least seven of these occasions, he met personally with President Clinton.

(44) The timing of some of these donations strongly suggests that there was a quid pro quo. From February through April 1996, Mr. Jimenez and various officials of the government of Paraguay met in the White House with presidential adviser and former chief of staff, Mack McLarty regarding threats to the government of Paraguay. On March 1, the State Department recommended that Paraguay no longer receive American foreign aid because it had not done enough to stop drug smuggling. President Clinton then issued a waiver allowing the continued aid despite the State Department's finding.

(45) On April 22, the military of Paraguay attempted a coup against the President of Paraguay, Carlos Wasmosy. The White House allowed President Wasmosy to take refuge in the American embassy in Asuncion and took other steps to support him. The same day, Mr. Jimenez gave \$100,000 to the Democratic National Committee.

(46) In addition, during February 1996, Mr. Jimenez attended one of the now famous White House coffees. Ten days later, he gave another \$50,000 to the Democratic National Committee. On September 30, 1996, Mr. Ji-

menez arranged for a White House tour for a number of business friends who were attending a meeting of the International Monetary Fund. The same day, he sent \$75,000 to the Democratic National Committee. The close coincidence of Mr. Jimenez's contributions with the favors he received is highly suspicious. The President's direct involvement includes his calling President Wasmosy to assure him of American support with respect to the coup attempt and his direct participation in the coffee in question. If there was a quid pro quo involved, these incidents may violate section 201, of title 18, United States Code, and the other statutes cited above.

(47) In February, the Washington Post reported that on September 4, 1995, First Lady Hillary Clinton stopped over in Guam on the way to the International Women's Conference in Beijing, China. She ended her visit with a shrimp cocktail buffet hosted by Guam's governor, Carl T. Gutierrez, a Democrat. Three weeks later, a Guam Democratic Party official arrived in Washington with more than \$250,000 in campaign contributions. Within six additional months, Governor Gutierrez and a small group of Guam businessmen had produced an additional \$132,000 for the Clinton-Gore reelection campaign and \$510,000 in soft money for the Democratic National Committee.

(48) In December 1996, the Administration circulated a memo that would have granted a long sought reversal of the Administration's position on labor and immigration issues in a way that was very favorable to businesses in Guam. The story gave the following reason for this shift: Some officials also attribute the administration's support for the reversal to the money raised for the president's reelection campaign. One senior U.S. official said "the political side" of her agency had informed her that the administration's shift was linked to campaign contributions. "We had always opposed giving Guam authority over its own immigration," the official said. "But when that \$600,000 was paid, the political side switched." United States officials from three other agencies added that they too had been told that the policy shift was linked to money.

(49) Various published reports discussed below indicate that the President was intimately involved in the details of fundraising for his reelection. As President, he ultimately controls the Administration's policy. Thus, if these assertions prove true, a reasonable mind could reach the conclusion that the President knew about and condoned a direct quid pro quo for these policy changes. If he did so, such a quid pro quo would violate section 201 of title 18, United States Code, and the other statutes.

(50) At least three criminal statutes address the use of the White House for political purposes. Section 600 of title 18, United States Code, prohibits the promising of any government benefit in return for any kind of political support or activity. Section 607 of title 18, United States Code, prohibits the solicitation or receipt of contributions for Federal campaigns in Federal buildings. Section 641 of title 18, United States Code, prohibits the conversion of government property to personal use.

(51) During January 1995, President Clinton authorized a plan under which the Democratic National Committee would hold fund-raising coffees and sleepovers in the White House. During 1995 and 1996, the White House held 103 of the coffees. To quote the New York Times, "[t]he documents [released by the White House] themselves make explicit that the coffees were fund-raising vehicles \* \* \* [they] also make clear that the Democratic National Committee was virtually being run out of the Clinton White House despite the President's initial efforts after the

election to draw a distinction between his own campaign organization and the committee." The Los Angeles Times said: "The result [of the coffees] was not only lucrative, according to some involved, but occasionally bizarre—sometimes the political equivalent of the bar scene in the film 'Star Wars.' The president and vice president were surrounded by rotating casts of rich strangers with unknown motives or backgrounds, including some from faraway places who didn't speak the same language."

(52) These reports indicate that Democratic Party fundraising staff have said in interviews that they directly sold access to the President and Vice President at the coffees. The New York Times quoted a Democratic fund-raiser's response to a White House denial that there was a requirement for a coffee participant to make a contribution as: "I don't understand why they continue to deny the obvious." The Los Angeles Times quoted a fund-raiser as saying: "I can't count the number of times I heard, 'Tell them they can come to a coffee with the President for \$50,000.' It was routine. In fact, when [staffers] said, 'This is all I can raise,' they were told, 'Keep selling the coffees.'"

(53) In short, these reports make it obvious that the coffees, which President Clinton directly authorized, were nothing but fundraising events. According to the New York Times, the Democratic National Committee raised \$27,000,000 from 350 people who attended White House coffees.

(54) President Clinton also entertained 938 overnight guests in the White House during his first term. This, too, became a means of fund-raising. When the original plan to hold coffees was suggested to the President, he not only approved it, but also originated the idea of the overnight visits. On the memo suggesting the plan, he wrote, "Ready to start overnights right away \* \* \* get other names at 100,000 or more, 50,000 or more." The New York Times reports that these guests donated \$10,210,840 to the Democratic Party from 1992 through 1996. The New York Times said about the President's notation: "The memorandum to Mr. Clinton and the response from the President show Mr. Clinton's direct involvement in authorizing the fund-raising practices that are now under scrutiny by Congressional and Justice Department investigators."

(55) At least one document the White House has recently released strongly suggests that President Clinton made telephone solicitations from the White House. The document, written by Vice President Gore's deputy chief of staff, David Strauss, contained the notation, "BC made 15 to 20 calls, raised 500K." Other documents indicate that presidential adviser Harold Ickes also proposed that President Clinton make fund-raising calls. President Clinton has said that he cannot remember whether he made the calls. If President Clinton made these calls from the White House, he may have violated section 607 of title 18, United States Code.

(56) The circumstances of the coffees, the sleepovers, and the possible telephone calls strongly suggest that the President may have violated the following provisions of title 18, United States Code: (1) Section 600 (by promising government access in return for campaign contributions). (2) Section 607 (by soliciting campaign contributions in Federal buildings). (3) Section 641 (by converting Federal property, the White House, to his own private use).

(57) Under the independent counsel statute (28 U.S.C. 591(b)(1)), the Vice President is a covered person. Based on published reports, the Attorney General has sufficient grounds to investigate whether Vice President Gore may have violated Federal criminal law.

(58) On April 29, 1996, Vice President Gore attended a fund-raiser at the Hsi Lai Buddhist Temple in Hacienda Heights, California. This fund-raiser, organized by John Huang, brought in \$140,000 for the Democratic National Committee. When the event first came to public attention, the Vice President claimed that the event was intended as "community outreach" and that "[i]t was not billed as a fund-raiser" and "no money was offered or collected or raised". The Vice President made this claim notwithstanding reports that checks changed hands at the event and that virtually everyone else involved thought the event was an explicit fund-raiser.

(59) In January 1997, the Vice President admitted that he knew the event was "a finance-related event." A month later, documents released by the White House revealed that the Vice President's staff had referred to the event as a fund-raiser in making inquiries to the National Security Council staff about the appropriateness of the event. The National Security Council advised that he should proceed with "great, great caution", but the Vice President proceeded to go forward with the fund-raiser. This event is apparently now under investigation by a Federal grand jury.

(60) Hsi Lai Temple, if it is like most religious organizations, is a tax-exempt organization under section 501(c) of the Internal Revenue Code. If that is so, it may not "participate in, or intervene in (including the publishing or distributing of statements), any political campaign on behalf of (or in opposition to) any candidate for public office," (section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986). By holding such an obviously political event, the Temple violated its tax exempt status, and Vice President Gore actively and enthusiastically participated in that violation. That action may violate section 371 of title 18, United States Code, as a conspiracy to defraud the United States by interfering with the functions of the Internal Revenue Service, and section 7201 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as an evasion of the income tax.

(61) On March 2, 1997, the Washington Post reported that Vice President Gore "played the central role in soliciting millions of dollars in campaign money for the Democratic Party during the 1996 election" and that he was known as the administration's "solicitor-in-chief". The next day, Vice President Gore held a nationally televised press conference in which he admitted making numerous calls from the White House in which he solicited campaign contributions. He said that he made these phone calls with a DNC credit card. His spokesman later clarified that the card that he used belonged to the Clinton-Gore reelection campaign (statement of Vice Presidential Communications Director Lorraine Voles, dated March 5, 1997). The use of the Clinton-Gore credit card suggests that the solicitations were for "hard money" which goes to campaigns rather than "soft money" which goes to parties.

(62) Documents that the White House has only recently released reveal that Vice President Gore made 86 fundraising calls from his White House Office. More disturbingly, these new records reveal that Vice President Gore made twenty of these calls at taxpayer expense. This use of taxpayer resources for private political uses may violate section 641 of title 18, United States Code, (converting government property to personal use).

(63) On its face, the conduct to which Vice President Gore admitted appears to be a clear violation of section 607 of title 18, United States Code. Section 607 of such title makes it unlawful for "any person to solicit

\* \* \* any [campaign] contribution \* \* \* in any room or building occupied in the discharge of official [government] duties \* \* \*".

(64) Recent reports have completely undermined these two claims with respect to the calls that Vice President Gore made. The Washington Post on September 3, 1997, reported that at least \$120,000 of the money he solicited from his office was "hard money." As the story notes, "The [hard] money came from at least eight of 46 donors the vice president telephoned from his White House office to ask for contributions to the Democratic National Committee, according to records released by Gore's office." The American people should be deeply troubled by the length of time it took for these records, which have apparently been under Vice President Gore's control, to come to public light. With respect to the second claim, no person has made any claim that Vice President Gore made these calls from any place other than his office, an area clearly covered under section 607 of title 18, United States Code, as a "room or building occupied in the discharge of official [government] duties."

(65) The Washington Post also asserted that Vice President Gore made the telephone solicitations "with an urgency and directness that several large Democratic donors said they found heavy-handed and inappropriate." The story quoted two donors as follows: "Another donor recalled Gore phoning and saying, 'I've been tasked with raising \$2,000,000 by the end of the week, and you're on my list.' The donor, a well-known business figure who declined to allow his name to be used, gave about \$100,000 to the DNC. The donor said he felt pressured by the Vice President's sales pitch. 'It's revolting,' said the donor, a longtime Gore friend and supporter. Yet another major business figure and donor who was solicited by Gore, and who refused to be identified, said, 'There were elements of a shakedown in the call. It was very awkward. For a Vice President, particularly this Vice President who has real power and is the heir apparent, to ask for money gave me no choice. I have so much business that touches on the Federal Government—the Telecommunications Act, tax policy, regulations galore.' The donor said he immediately sent a check for \$100,000 to the DNC."

(66) Although the Vice President may legally solicit campaign contributions, it is not legal to exert pressure based on government actions. The bribery statute (section 201(b)(2) of title 18, United States Code) provides that a public official may not "directly or indirectly, corruptly demand[], [or] seek[], \* \* \* anything of value personally or for any other person or entity, in return for: (A) being influenced in the performance of any official act; \* \* \*" In addition, section 872 of title 18, United States Code, prohibits government officials from engaging in acts of extortion. Through the use of untoward pressure, the Vice President may have violated these statutes.

(67) Sufficient specific and credible evidence exists to warrant a preliminary investigation under the independent counsel statute.

(68) The fund-raising disclosures have blown up into the biggest scandal in the United States since Watergate.

(69) This situation is paralyzing the President, preoccupying Congress and fueling public cynicism about our political system.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that Attorney General Reno should apply immediately for the appointment of an independent counsel to investigate alleged criminal conduct relating to the financing of the 1996 Federal elections.

(Voter eligibility verification system; H.R. 1428)

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PETERSON OF PENNSYLVANIA TO THE AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. SHAYS

(Substitutes for H.R. 2183)

Add at the end the following new title:

**TITLE \_\_\_\_—VOTER ELIGIBILITY  
CONFIRMATION PROGRAM**

**SEC. \_\_\_\_01. 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 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) subject to subparagraph (I), 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 un-

authorized disclosure of personal information, including violations of the requirements of section 205(c)(2)(C)(viii) of the Social Security Act;

(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 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 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 social security account number (or numbers, if the individual has more than one such number) issued to the individual by the Commissioner.

(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. —02. 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 title.

(Citizenship verification for voters)

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BARR OF GEORGIA  
TO THE AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. SHAYS

(Substitutes for H.R. 2183)

Add at the end the following new title:

#### TITLE —CITIZENSHIP VERIFICATION FOR VOTING

#### SEC. —01. REQUIRING VOTERS TO PROVIDE PROOF OF CITIZENSHIP.

Section 8 of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (42 U.S.C. 1973gg-6) is amended—

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

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

“(i) REQUIRING VOTERS TO PROVIDE PROOF OF CITIZENSHIP.—A State may not provide any individual with a ballot for voting in an election for Federal office unless the individual provides the State election official involved with verification of the individual's status as a citizen of the United States, including—

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

“(2) if the individual is a naturalized citizen of the United States, the date on which the individual was admitted to citizenship and the location where the admission to citizenship occurred (if applicable).”.

(Prohibiting bilingual voting materials)

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BARR OF GEORGIA  
TO THE AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. SHAYS

(Substitutes for H.R. 2183)

Add at the end the following new title:

#### TITLE —PROHIBITING BILINGUAL VOTING MATERIALS

#### SEC. 01. PROHIBITING USE OF BILINGUAL VOTING MATERIALS.

(a) PROHIBITION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—No State may provide voting materials in any language other than English.

(2) VOTING MATERIALS DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term “voting materials” means registration or voting notices, forms, instructions, assistance, or other materials or information relating to the electoral process, including ballots.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—The Voting Rights Act of 1965 is amended—

(1) by striking section 203 (42 U.S.C. 1973aa-1a);

(2) in section 204 (42 U.S.C. 1973aa-2), by striking “, or 203”; and

(3) in section 205 (42 U.S.C. 1973aa-3), by striking “, 202, or 203” and inserting “or 202”.

(Expulsion of House members convicted of receiving prohibited foreign contributions)

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TRAFICANT OF OHIO TO THE AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. SHAYS

(Substitutes for H.R. 2183)

Add at the end the following new title:

#### TITLE —EXPULSION PROCEEDINGS FOR HOUSE MEMBERS RECEIVING FOREIGN CONTRIBUTIONS

#### SEC. —01. PERMITTING CONSIDERATION OF PRIVILEGED MOTION TO EXPEL HOUSE MEMBER ACCEPTING ILLEGAL FOREIGN CONTRIBUTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—If a Member of the House of Representatives is convicted of a violation of section 319 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (or any successor provision prohibiting the solicitation, receipt, or acceptance of a contribution from a foreign national), it shall be in order in the House at any time after the fifth legislative day following the date on which the Member is convicted to move to expel the Member from the House of Representatives. A motion to expel a Member under the authority of this subsection shall be highly privileged. An amendment to the motion shall not be in order, and it shall not be in order to move to reconsider the vote by which the motion was agreed to or disagreed to.

(b) EXERCISE OF RULEMAKING AUTHORITY.—This section is enacted by Congress—

(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the House of Representatives, and as such it is deemed a part of the rules of the House of Representatives, and it supersedes other rules only to the extent that it is inconsistent therewith; and

(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of the House of Representatives to change the rule at any time, in the same manner and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of the House of Representatives.

(To provide that background music shall not be taken into account in determining whether a communication constitutes express advocacy)

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DELAY TO THE  
AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SHAYS

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

#### SEC. . EXPRESS ADVOCACY DETERMINED WITHOUT REGARD TO BACKGROUND MUSIC.

Section 301 (2 U.S.C. 431) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(20) In determining whether any communication by television or radio broadcast constitutes express advocacy for purposes of this Act, there shall not be taken into account any background music used in such broadcast.”

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DELAY TO THE  
AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SHAYS OR MR. MEEHAN

Amendment No. 84 In section 301(8) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended by section 205(a)(1)(B) of the substitute, add at the end the following:

(F) For purposes of subparagraph (C), no communication with a Senator or Member of the House of Representatives (including the staff of a Senator or Member) regarding any pending legislative matter, regarding the position of any Senator or Member on such manner, may be construed to establish coordination with a candidate.

AMENDMENT #27 HAS BEEN WITHDRAWN BY THE  
AUTHOR

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DELAY TO THE  
AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SHAYS OR MR. MEEHAN

Amendment No. 83. In section 301(8)(C) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as added by section 205(a)(1)(B) of the substitute, strike clause (vi) and redesignate clauses (viii) through (x) as clauses (vi) through (ix).

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DELAY TO THE  
AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SHAYS OR MR. MEEHAN

Amendment No. 84. In section 301(8) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended by section 205(a)(1)(B) of the substitute, add at the end the following:

(F) For purposes of subparagraph (C), no communication with a Senator or Member of the House of Representatives (including the staff of a Senator or Member) regarding any pending legislative matter, including any survey, questionnaire, or written communication soliciting or providing information regarding the position of any Senator or Member on such manner, may be construed to establish coordination with a candidate.

(Prohibition against fundraising on Federal property)

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GUTKNECHT OF MINNESOTA TO THE AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. SHAYS

(Substitutes for H.R. 2183)

Add at the end the following new title:

#### TITLE —PROHIBITING FUNDRAISING ON FEDERAL PROPERTY

#### SEC. —01. PROHIBITION AGAINST POLITICAL FUNDRAISING ON FEDERAL PROPERTY.

Section 607 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking subsection (a) and inserting the following:

“(a) PROHIBITION.—It shall be unlawful for any persons to solicit or receive a donation of money or other thing of value for a political committee or a candidate for Federal, State, or local office from a person who is located in a room or building, including by not limited to the White House, occupied in the discharge of official duties by an officer or employee of the United States. An individual who is an officer or employee of the Federal Government, including the President, Vice President, and Members of Congress, shall not solicit a donation of money or other thing of value for a political committee or candidate for Federal, State, or local office, while in any room or building, including but not limited to the White House, occupied in the discharge of official duties by an officer or employee of the United States, from any person.”.

(Replace Beck codification with paycheck protection provisions)

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BOB SCHAFER OF COLORADO TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SHAYS OR MR. MEEHAN

(Substitute for H.R. 2183)

Strike section 501 and insert the following (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

**SEC. 501. PROHIBITING INVOLUNTARY ASSESSMENT OF EMPLOYEE FUNDS 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) Except with the separate, prior, written, voluntary authorization of each individual, it shall be unlawful—

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

“(B) for any labor organization described in this section to collect from or assess its members or nonmembers any dues, initiation fee, or other payment if any part of such dues, fee, or payment will be used for political activity in which the labor organization is engaged.

“(2) An authorization described in paragraph (1) 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 paragraph shall provide the individual with a statement that the individual may at any time revoke the authorization.

“(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 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.

(Reduced postage rates for principal campaign committees)

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HORN OF CALIFORNIA TO THE AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. SHAYS

(Substitutes for H.R. 2183)

Add at the end the following new title:

**TITLE —REDUCED POSTAGE RATES**

**SEC. —01. REDUCED POSTAGE RATES FOR PRINCIPAL CAMPAIGN COMMITTEES OF CONGRESSIONAL CANDIDATES.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 3626(e)(2)(A) of title 39, United States Code, is amended by striking “and the National Republican Congressional Committee” and inserting “the National Republican Congressional Committee, and the principal campaign committee of a candidate for election for the office of Senator or Representative in or Delegate or Resident Commissioner to the Congress”.

(b) LIMITING REDUCED RATE TO TWO PIECES OF MAIL PER REGISTERED VOTER.—Section 3626(e)(1) of such title is amended by striking the period at the end and inserting the following: “, except that in the case of a committee which is a principal campaign committee such rates shall apply only with respect to the election cycle involved and only to a number of pieces equal to the product of 2 times the number (as determined by the Postmaster General) of addresses (other than business possible delivery stops) in the con-

gressional district involved (or, in the case of a committee of a candidate for election for the office of Senator, in the State involved).”.

(c) PRINCIPAL CAMPAIGN COMMITTEE DEFINED.—Section 3626(e)(2) of such title is amended—

(1) by striking “and” at the end of subparagraph (B);

(2) by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (C) and inserting “; and”; and

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

“(D) the term ‘principal campaign committee’ has the meaning given such term in section 301(5) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971.”.

(Limitation on contributions from PACs and parties)

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. UPTON OF MICHIGAN TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SHAYS OR MR. MEEHAN

(Substitute for H.R. 2183)

Add at the end of title I the following new section (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

**SEC. 104. LIMITATION ON CONTRIBUTIONS FROM PERSONS OTHER THAN INDIVIDUALS.**

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) A candidate for the office of Senator or Representative in, or Delegate or Resident Commissioner to, the Congress may not accept contributions with respect to a reporting period for an election from persons other than individuals totaling in excess of the total of contributions accepted from individuals.”.

(Penalty for violation of foreign contribution ban)

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. NICK SMITH OF MICHIGAN TO THE AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. SHAYS

(Substitutes for H.R. 2183)

Add at the end the following new title:

**TITLE —PENALTY FOR VIOLATION OF FOREIGN CONTRIBUTION BAN**

**SEC. —01. PENALTY FOR VIOLATION OF PROHIBITION AGAINST FOREIGN CONTRIBUTIONS.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—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) Any person who violates subsection (a) shall be sentenced to a term of imprisonment which may not be less than 5 years or more than 20 years, fined in an amount not to exceed \$1,000,000, or both.”.

(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.

(Expedited review of allegations of FECA violations)

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SHADEGG OF ARIZONA TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SHAYS OR MR. MEEHAN

(Substitute for H.R. 2183)

Add at the end of title V the following new section (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

**SEC. 510. EXPEDITED COURT REVIEW OF CERTAIN ALLEGED VIOLATIONS OF FEDERAL ELECTION CAMPAIGN ACT OF 1971.**

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

(1) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (e); and

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

“(d)(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, if a candidate (or the candidate’s authorized committee) believes that a violation described in paragraph (2) has been committed with respect to an election during the 90-day period preceding the date of the election, the candidate or committee may institute a civil action on behalf of the Commission for relief (including injunctive relief) against the alleged violator in the same manner and under the same terms and conditions as an action instituted by the Commission under subsection (a)(6), except that the court involved shall issue a decision regarding the action as soon as practicable after the action is instituted and to the greatest extent possible issue the decision prior to the date of the election involved.

“(2) A violation described in this paragraph is a violation of this Act or of chapter 95 or chapter 96 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 relating to—

“(A) whether a contribution is in excess of an applicable limit or is otherwise prohibited under this Act; or

“(B) whether an expenditure is an independent expenditure under section 301(17).”.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DELAY TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SHAYS OR MR. MEEHAN

(Substitute for H.R. 2183)

Strike section 301(20)(B) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as added by section 201(b) of the substitute, and insert the following:

“(B) NONAPPLICATION TO PUBLICATIONS ON VOTING RECORDS.—The term ‘express advocacy’ shall not apply with respect to any printed communication which provides information or commentary on the voting record of, or positions on issues taken by, any individual holding Federal office or any candidate for election for Federal office, unless the communication contains explicit words expressly urging a vote for or against any identified candidate or political party.”.

(Requiring majority of House candidate funds to come from in-State individual residents)

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SHAW OF FLORIDA TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SHAYS OR MR. MEEHAN

(Substitute for H.R. 2183)

Add at the end of title V the following new section (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

**SEC. 510. REQUIRING MAJORITY OF AMOUNT OF CONTRIBUTIONS ACCEPTED BY HOUSE CANDIDATES TO COME FROM IN-STATE RESIDENTS.**

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)(1) With respect to each reporting period for an election, the total of contributions accepted by a candidate for the office of Representative in, or Delegate or Resident Commissioner to, the Congress from in-State individual residents shall be at least 50 percent of the total of contributions accepted from all sources.

“(2) As used in this subsection, the term ‘in-State individual resident’ means an individual who resides in the State in which the congressional district involved is located.”.

(Expedited consideration of constitutional amendment)

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. KAPTUR OF OHIO TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SHAYS OR MR. MEEHAN

(Substitute for HR 2183)

Insert after section 602 the following new section (and redesignate the succeeding provisions and conform the table of contents accordingly):

**SEC. 603. EXPEDITED CONSIDERATION OF CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—If any provision of this Act or any amendment made by this Act is found unconstitutional by the Supreme Court, the provisions of section 2908 (other than subsection (a)) of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 shall apply to the consideration of a joint resolution described in subsection (c) in the same manner as such provisions apply to a joint resolution described in section 2908(a) of such Act.

(b) SPECIAL RULES.—For purposes of applying subsection (a) with respect to such provisions, the following rules shall apply:

(1) Any reference to the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives shall be deemed a reference to the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and any reference to the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate shall be deemed a reference to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate.

(2) Any reference to the date on which the President transmits a report shall be deemed a reference to the date on which the Supreme Court finds a provision of this Act or an amendment made by this Act unconstitutional.

(c) CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT DESCRIBED.—For purposes of subsection (a), a joint resolution described in this section is a joint resolution proposing the following text as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

“ARTICLE —

“SECTION 1. Congress shall have power to set reasonable limits on expenditures made in support of or in opposition to the nomination or election of any person to Federal office.

“SEC. 2. Each State shall have power to set reasonable limits on expenditures made in support of or in opposition to the nomination or election of any person to State office.

“SEC. 3. Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.”.

(Restrictions on and regulation of foreign lobbying)

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. KAPTUR OF OHIO TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SHAYS OR MR. MEEHAN

(Substitutes for H.R. 2183)

Add at the end the following new title:

**TITLE —ETHICS IN FOREIGN LOBBYING**

**SEC. —01. PROHIBITION OF CONTRIBUTIONS AND EXPENDITURES BY MULTICANDIDATE POLITICAL COMMITTEES OR SEPARATE SEGREGATED FUNDS SPONSORED BY FOREIGN-CONTROLLED CORPORATIONS AND ASSOCIATIONS.**

Title III of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 441 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“PROHIBITION OF CONTRIBUTIONS AND EXPENDITURES BY MULTICANDIDATE POLITICAL COMMITTEES SPONSORED BY FOREIGN-CONTROLLED CORPORATIONS AND ASSOCIATIONS

“SEC. 323. (a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law—

“(1) no multicandidate political committee or separate segregated fund of a foreign-controlled corporation may make any contribution or expenditure with respect to an election for Federal office; and

“(2) no multicandidate political committee or separate segregated fund of a trade organization, membership organization, cooperative, or corporation without capital stock may make any contribution or expenditure with respect to an election for Federal office if 50 percent or more of the operating fund of the trade organization, membership organization, cooperative, or corporation without capital stock is supplied by foreign-controlled corporations or foreign nationals.

“(b) INFORMATION REQUIRED TO BE REPORTED.—The Commission shall—

“(1) require each multicandidate political committee or separate segregated fund of a corporation to include in the statement of organization of the multicandidate political committee or separate segregated fund a statement (to be updated annually and at any time when the percentage goes above or below 50 percent) of the percentage of ownership interest in the corporation that is controlled by persons other than citizens or nationals of the United States;

“(2) require each trade association, membership organization, cooperative, or corporation without capital stock to include in its statement of organization of the multicandidate political committee or separate segregated fund (and update annually) the percentage of its operating fund that is derived from foreign-owned corporations and foreign nationals; and

“(3) take such action as may be necessary to enforce subsection (a).

“(c) LIST OF ENTITIES FILING REPORTS.—The Commission shall maintain a list of the identity of the multicandidate political committees or separate segregated funds that file reports under subsection (b), including a statement of the amounts and percentage reported by such multicandidate political committees or separate segregated funds.

“(d) DEFINITIONS.—As used in this section—

“(1) the term ‘foreign-owned corporation’ means a corporation at least 50 percent of the ownership interest of which is controlled by persons other than citizens or nationals of the United States;

“(2) the term ‘multicandidate political committee’ has the meaning given that term in section 315(a)(4);

“(3) the term ‘separate segregated fund’ means a separate segregated fund referred to in section 316(b)(2)(C); and

“(4) the term ‘foreign national’ has the meaning given that term in section 319.”.

**SEC. —02. PROHIBITION OF CERTAIN ELECTION-RELATED ACTIVITIES OF FOREIGN NATIONALS.**

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:

“(c) A foreign national shall not direct, dictate, control, or directly or indirectly participate in the decisionmaking process of any person, such as a corporation, labor organization, or political committee, with regard to such person’s Federal or non-Federal election-related activities, such as decisions concerning the making of contributions or expenditures in connection with elections for any local, State, or Federal office or decisions concerning the administration of a political committee.”.

**SEC. —03. ESTABLISHMENT OF A CLEARINGHOUSE OF POLITICAL ACTIVITIES INFORMATION WITHIN THE FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION.**

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There shall be established within the Federal Election Commis-

sion a clearinghouse of public information regarding the political activities of foreign principals and agents of foreign principals. The information comprising this clearinghouse shall include only the following:

(1) All registrations and reports filed pursuant to the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.) during the preceding 5-year period.

(2) All registrations and reports filed pursuant to the Foreign Agents Registration Act, as amended (22 U.S.C. 611 et seq.), during the preceding 5-year period.

(3) The listings of public hearings, hearing witnesses, and witness affiliations printed in the Congressional Record during the preceding 5-year period.

(4) Public information disclosed pursuant to the rules of the Senate or the House of Representatives regarding honoraria, the receipt of gifts, travel, and earned and unearned income.

(5) All reports filed pursuant to title I of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) during the preceding 5-year period.

(6) All public information filed with the Federal Election Commission pursuant to the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 431 et seq.) during the preceding 5-year period.

(b) DISCLOSURE OF OTHER INFORMATION PROHIBITED.—The disclosure by the clearinghouse, or any officer or employee thereof, of any information other than that set forth in subsection (a) is prohibited, except as otherwise provided by law.

(c) DIRECTOR OF CLEARINGHOUSE.—(1) The clearinghouse shall have a Director, who shall administer and manage the responsibilities and all activities of the clearinghouse.

(2) The Director shall be appointed by the Federal Election Commission.

(3) The Director shall serve a single term of a period of time determined by the Commission, but not to exceed 5 years.

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to conduct the activities of the clearinghouse.

**SEC. —04. DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE DIRECTOR OF THE CLEARINGHOUSE.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—It shall be the duty of the Director of the clearinghouse established under section —03—

(1) to develop a filing, coding, and cross-indexing system to carry out the purposes of this Act (which shall include an index of all persons identified in the reports, registrations, and other information comprising the clearinghouse);

(2) notwithstanding any other provision of law, to make copies of registrations, reports, and other information comprising the clearinghouse available for public inspection and copying, beginning not later than 30 days after the information is first available to the public, and to permit copying of any such registration, report, or other information by hand or by copying machine or, at the request of any person, to furnish a copy of any such registration, report, or other information upon payment of the cost of making and furnishing such copy, except that no information contained in such registration or report and no such other information shall be sold or used by any person for the purpose of soliciting contributions or for any profit-making purpose;

(3) to compile and summarize, for each calendar quarter, the information contained in such registrations, reports, and other information comprising the clearinghouse in a manner which facilitates the disclosure of political activities, including, but not limited to, information on—



(A) political activities pertaining to issues before the Congress and issues before the executive branch; and

(B) the political activities of individuals, organizations, foreign principals, and agents of foreign principals who share an economic, business, or other common interest;

(4) to make the information compiled and summarized under paragraph (3) available to the public within 30 days after the close of each calendar quarter, and to publish such information in the Federal Register at the earliest practicable opportunity;

(5) not later than 150 days after the date of the enactment of this Act and at any time thereafter, to prescribe, in consultation with the Comptroller General, such rules, regulations, and forms, in conformity with the provisions of chapter 5 of title 5, United States Code, as are necessary to carry out the provisions of section \_\_\_\_03 and this section in the most effective and efficient manner; and

(6) at the request of any Member of the Senate or the House of Representatives, to prepare and submit to such Member a study or report relating to the political activities of any person and consisting only of the information in the registrations, reports, and other information comprising the clearing-house.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—As used in this section—

(1) the terms “foreign principal” and “agent of a foreign principal” have the meanings given those terms in section 1 of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended (22 U.S.C. 611);

(2) the term “issue before the Congress” means the total of all matters, both substantive and procedural, relating to—

(A) any pending or proposed bill, resolution, report, nomination, treaty, hearing, investigation, or other similar matter in either the Senate or the House of Representatives or any committee or office of the Congress; or

(B) any pending action by a Member, officer, or employee of the Congress to affect, or attempt to affect, any action or proposed action by any officer or employee of the executive branch; and

(3) the term “issue before the executive branch” means the total of all matters, both substantive and procedural, relating to any pending action by any executive agency, or by any officer or employee of the executive branch, concerning—

(A) any pending or proposed rule, rule of practice, adjudication, regulation, determination, hearing, investigation, contract, grant, license, negotiation, or the appointment of officers and employees, other than appointments in the competitive service; or

(B) any issue before the Congress.

#### SEC. \_\_\_\_05. PENALTIES FOR DISCLOSURE.

Any person who discloses information in violation of section \_\_\_\_03(b), and any person who sells or uses information for the purpose of soliciting contributions or for any profit-making purpose in violation of section \_\_\_\_04(a)(2), shall be imprisoned for a period of not more than 1 year, or fined in the amount provided in title 18, United States Code, or both.

#### SEC. \_\_\_\_06. AMENDMENTS TO THE FOREIGN AGENTS REGISTRATION ACT OF 1938, AS AMENDED.

(a) QUARTERLY REPORTS.—Section 2(b) of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended (22 U.S.C. 612(b)), is amended in the first sentence by striking out “, within thirty days” and all that follows through “preceding six months’ period” and inserting in lieu thereof “on January 31, April 30, July 31, and October 31 of each year, file with the Attorney General a supplement thereto on a form prescribed by the Attorney General, which shall set forth regarding the three-

month periods ending the previous December 31, March 31, June 30, and September 30, respectively, or if a lesser period, the period since the initial filing.”.

(b) EXEMPTION FOR LEGAL REPRESENTATION.—Section 3(g) of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended (22 U.S.C. 613(g)) is amended by adding at the end the following: “A person may be exempt under this subsection only upon filing with the Attorney General a request for such exemption.”.

(c) CIVIL PENALTIES.—Section 8 of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended (22 U.S.C. 618), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

“(i)(1) Any person who is determined, after notice and opportunity for an administrative hearing—

“(A) to have failed to file a registration statement under section 2(a) or a supplement thereto under section 2(b),

“(B) to have omitted a material fact required to be stated therein, or

“(C) to have made a false statement with respect to such a material fact, shall be required to pay a civil penalty in an amount not less than \$2,000 or more than \$5,000 for each violation committed. In determining the amount of the penalty, the Attorney General shall give due consideration to the nature and duration of the violation.

“(2)(A) In conducting investigations and hearings under paragraph (1), administrative law judges may, if necessary, compel by subpoena the attendance of witnesses and the production of evidence at any designated place or hearing.

“(B) In the case of contumacy or refusal to obey a subpoena lawfully issued under this paragraph and, upon application by the Attorney General, an appropriate district court of the United States may issue an order requiring compliance with such subpoena and any failure to obey such order may be punished by such court as a contempt thereof.”.

(Coverage of voter guides posted on the Internet under voter guide exception)

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. SMITH OF WASHINGTON TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SHAYS OR MR. MEEHAN

(Substitute for H.R. 2183)

In section 301(20)(B) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as added by section 201(a) of the substitute, strike “a printed communication” and insert “a communication which is in printed form or posted on the Internet and”.

(Application of voter guide exception to guides covering 1 candidate)

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. SMITH OF WASHINGTON TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SHAYS OR MR. MEEHAN

(Substitute for H.R. 2183)

In section 301(20)(B)(i) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as added by section 201(a) of the substitute, strike “2 or more candidates” and insert “1 or more candidates”.

(Permitting clearly identified opinions of publisher to appear on voting guides)

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. SMITH OF WASHINGTON TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SHAYS OR MR. MEEHAN

(Substitute for H.R. 2183)

In section 301(20)(B)(i) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as added by section 201(a) of the substitute, insert before the semicolon the following: “(other than information describing the opinion of the person publishing the communication on the record or position involved, if the information is

clearly identified as describing the opinion of such person)”.

(Clarification that submission and collection of voter guides is not a coordinated contribution or expenditure)

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. SMITH OF WASHINGTON TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SHAYS OR MR. MEEHAN

(Substitute for H.R. 2183)

In section 301(8) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended by section 205(a)(1)(B) of the substitute, add at the end the following:

“(F) Nothing in subparagraph (A)(iii) or subparagraph (D) may be construed to treat the submission by any person of a communication described in paragraph (20)(B) to a candidate, a candidate’s authorized committee, or an agent acting on behalf of a candidate or authorized committee, or the collection by any person of such a communication from a candidate, a candidate’s authorized committee, or an agent acting on behalf of a candidate or authorized committee as an item of value provided in coordination with a candidate for purposes of subparagraph (A)(iii).”.

(Clarification that lobbying candidates who hold elective office is not coordinated campaign activity)

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. SMITH OF WASHINGTON TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SHAYS OR MR. MEEHAN

(Substitute for H.R. 2183)

In section 301(8)(C)(v) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as added by section 205(a)(1)(B) of the substitute, strike “Federal office,” and insert the following: “Federal office (other than any discussion consisting of a lobbying contact under the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 in the case of a candidate holding Federal office or consisting of similar lobbying activity in the case of a candidate holding State or local elective office)”.

(Repeal treatment of all shared vendor services as coordinated campaign activity)

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. SMITH OF WASHINGTON TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SHAYS OR MR. MEEHAN

(Substitute for H.R. 2183)

In section 301(8)(C) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as added by section 205(a)(1)(B) of the substitute, strike clause (vi) and redesignate the succeeding provisions accordingly.

In section 301(8)(C)(vi) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as added by section 205(a)(1)(B) of the substitute (and as so redesignated), strike “clauses (i) through (vi)” in clause (vii) and insert “clauses (i) through (v)”.

(Penalty for violation of foreign contribution ban)

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF MICHIGAN TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SHAYS OR MR. MEEHAN

(Substitute for H.R. 2183)

Add at the end of title V the following new section (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

#### SEC. 510. PENALTY FOR VIOLATION OF PROHIBITION AGAINST FOREIGN CONTRIBUTIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—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)(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), notwithstanding any other provision of this title any person who violates subsection (a) shall be sentenced to a term of imprisonment which may not be less than 5 years or more than 20 years, fined in an amount not to exceed \$1,000,000, or both.

“(2) Paragraph (1) shall not apply with respect to any violation of subsection (a) arising from a contribution or donation made by an individual who is lawfully admitted for permanent residence (as defined in section 101(a)(20) of the Immigration and Nationality Act).”

(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.

(Permitting permanent resident aliens serving in the Armed Forces to make contributions)

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. STEARNS OF FLORIDA TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SHAYS OR MR. MEEHAN

(Substitute for H.R. 2183)

Add at the end of title V the following new section (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

**SEC. 510. PERMITTING PERMANENT RESIDENT ALIENS SERVING IN ARMED FORCES TO MAKE CONTRIBUTIONS.**

Section 319 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 441e) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, an individual who is lawfully admitted for permanent residence (as defined in section 101(a)(20) of the Immigration and Nationality Act) and who is a member of the Armed Forces (including a reserve component of the Armed Forces) shall not be subject to the prohibition under this section.”

(Prohibiting conspiracy to violate presidential campaign spending limits)

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. STEARNS OF FLORIDA TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SHAYS OR MR. MEEHAN

(Substitute for H.R. 2183)

Add at the end of title V the following new section (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

**SEC. 510. CONSPIRACY TO VIOLATE PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGN SPENDING LIMITS.**

(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:

“(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.

(Ban on solicitation of soft money by candidates receiving Federal presidential campaign funds)

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. STEARNS OF FLORIDA TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SHAYS OR MR. MEEHAN

(Substitute for H.R. 2183)

Add at the end of title V the following new section (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

**SEC. 510. 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 the purposes of influencing 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.

(Raise contribution limit for contributions to candidates from \$1,000 to \$3,000)

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WHITFIELD OF KENTUCKY TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SHAYS OR MR. MEEHAN

(Substitute for H.R. 2183)

Add at the end of title I the following new section (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

**SEC. 104. INCREASE IN CONTRIBUTION LIMIT FOR CONTRIBUTIONS TO CANDIDATES BY PERSONS OTHER THAN PACS.**

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 “\$3,000”.

(Limiting definition of “express advocacy” to communications containing certain words or phrases)

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WHITFIELD OF KENTUCKY TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SHAYS OR MR. MEEHAN

(Substitute for H.R. 2183)

Amend section 301(20)(A) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as added by section 201(b) of the substitute, to read as follows:

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘express advocacy’ means a communication that advocates the election or defeat of a candidate by containing a phrase such as ‘vote for’, ‘re-elect’, ‘support’, ‘cast your ballot for’, ‘(name of candidate) for Congress’, ‘(name of candidate) in 1997’, ‘vote against’, ‘defeat’, ‘reject’.”

(Prohibiting bundling of contributions)

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ENGLISH OF PENNSYLVANIA TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SHAYS OR MR. MEEHAN

(Substitute for H.R. 2183)

Add at the end of title V the following new section (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

**SEC. 510. PROHIBITING BUNDLING OF CONTRIBUTIONS.**

Section 315(a)(8) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 441a(a)(8)) is amended to read as follows:

“(8) No person may make a contribution through an intermediary or conduit, except that a person may facilitate a contribution by providing—

“(A) advice to another person as to how the other person may make a contribution; and

“(B) addressed mailing material or similar items to another person for use by the other person in making a contribution.”

(Treatment of refunded donations)

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GEKAS OF PENNSYLVANIA TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SHAYS OR MR. MEEHAN

(Substitute for H.R. 2183)

Add at the end of title V the following new section (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

**SEC. 510. DEPOSIT OF CERTAIN CONTRIBUTIONS AND DONATIONS IN TREASURY ACCOUNT.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title III of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 431 et seq.), as amended by sections 101, 401, and 507, is further amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“TREATMENT OF CERTAIN CONTRIBUTIONS AND DONATIONS TO BE RETURNED TO DONORS

“SEC. 326. (a) TRANSFER TO COMMISSION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, if a political committee intends to return any contribution or donation given to the political committee, the committee shall transfer the contribution or donation to the Commission if—

“(A) the contribution or donation is in an amount equal to or greater than \$500 (other than a contribution or donation returned within 60 days of receipt by the committee); or

“(B) the contribution or donation was made in violation of section 315, 316, 317, 319, or 320 (other than a contribution or donation returned within 30 days of receipt by the committee).

“(2) INFORMATION INCLUDED WITH TRANSFERRED CONTRIBUTION OR DONATION.—A political committee shall include with any contribution or donation transferred under paragraph (1)—

“(A) a request that the Commission return the contribution or donation to the person making the contribution or donation; and

“(B) information regarding the circumstances surrounding the making of the contribution or donation and any opinion of the political committee concerning whether the contribution or donation may have been made in violation of this Act.

“(3) ESTABLISHMENT OF ESCROW ACCOUNT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall establish a single interest-bearing escrow account for deposit of amounts transferred under paragraph (1).

“(B) DISPOSITION OF AMOUNTS RECEIVED.—On receiving an amount from a political committee under paragraph (1), the Commission shall—

“(i) deposit the amount in the escrow account established under subparagraph (A); and

“(ii) notify the Attorney General and the Commissioner of the Internal Revenue Service of the receipt of the amount from the political committee.

“(C) USE OF INTEREST.—Interest earned on amounts in the escrow account established under subparagraph (A) shall be applied or used for the same purposes as the donation or contribution on which it is earned.

"(4) TREATMENT OF RETURNED CONTRIBUTION OR DONATION AS A COMPLAINT.—The transfer of any contribution or donation to the Commission under this section shall be treated as the filing of a complaint under section 309(a).

"(b) USE OF AMOUNTS PLACED IN ESCROW TO COVER FINES AND PENALTIES.—The Commission or the Attorney General may require any amount deposited in the escrow account under subsection (a)(3) to be applied toward the payment of any fine or penalty imposed under this Act or title 18, United States Code against the person making the contribution or donation.

"(c) RETURN OF CONTRIBUTION OR DONATION AFTER DEPOSIT IN ESCROW.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall return a contribution or donation deposited in the escrow account under subsection (a)(3) to the person making the contribution or donation if—

"(A) within 180 days after the date the contribution or donation is transferred, the Commission has not made a determination under section 309(a)(2) that the Commission has reason to believe that the making of the contribution or donation was made in violation of this Act; or

"(B)(i) the contribution or donation will not be used to cover fines, penalties, or costs pursuant to subsection (b); or

"(ii) if the contribution or donation will be used for those purposes, that the amounts required for those purposes have been withdrawn from the escrow account and subtracted from the returnable contribution or donation.

"(2) NO EFFECT ON STATUS OF INVESTIGATION.—The return of a contribution or donation by the Commission under this subsection shall not be construed as having an effect on the status of an investigation by the Commission or the Attorney General of the contribution or donation or the circumstances surrounding the contribution or donation, or on the ability of the Commission or the Attorney General to take future actions with respect to the contribution or donation."

(b) AMOUNTS USED TO DETERMINE AMOUNT OF PENALTY FOR VIOLATION.—Section 309(a) of such Act (2 U.S.C. 437g(a)) is amended by inserting after paragraph (9) the following new paragraph:

"(10) For purposes of determining the amount of a civil penalty imposed under this subsection for violations of section 326, the amount of the donation involved shall be treated as the amount of the contribution involved."

(c) DONATION DEFINED.—Section 301 of such Act (2 U.S.C. 431), as amended by sections 201(b) and 307(b), is further amended by adding at the end the following:

"(22) DONATION.—The term 'donation' means a gift, subscription, loan, advance, or deposit of money or anything else of value made by any person to a national committee of a political party or a Senatorial or Congressional Campaign Committee of a national political party for any purpose, but does not include a contribution (as defined in paragraph (8))."

(d) DISGORGEMENT AUTHORITY.—Section 309 of such Act (2 U.S.C. 437g) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(e) Any conciliation agreement, civil action, or criminal action entered into or instituted under this section may require a person to forfeit to the Treasury any contribution, donation, or expenditure that is the subject of the agreement or action for transfer to the Commission for deposit in accordance with section 326."

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsections (a), (b), and (c) shall apply to contributions or donations refunded

on or after the date of the enactment of this Act, without regard to whether the Federal Election Commission or Attorney General has issued regulations to carry out section 326 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (as added by subsection (a)) by such date.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MILLER OF FLORIDA TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SHAYS AND MR. MEEHAN

Page 39, line 3, insert "(a) IN GENERAL.—" before "Section".

Page 41, after line 6, insert the following:

(b) REPORTING AND DISCLOSURE.—

(1) REQUIREMENTS.—Section 201(b) of the Labor Management and Disclosure Act of 1959 is amended—

(A) in paragraph (3), by striking "\$10,000" and inserting "40,000";

(B) by redesignating paragraphs (5) and (6) as (7) and (8), respectively; and

(C) by inserting after paragraph (4), the following:

"(5) a functional allocation that—

"(A) aggregates the amount spent for (i) officer payments, (ii) employee payments, (iii) fees, fines, and assessments, (iv) office and administrative expense and direct taxes, (v) educational and publicity expenses, (vi) professional fees, benefits, (vii) contributions, gifts and grants, and

"(B) specifies the total amount reported for each category in subparagraph (A) and the portion of such total expended for (i) contract negotiations, (ii) organizing, (iii) strike activities, (iv) political activities, and (v) lobbying and promotional activities;."

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by paragraph (1) shall take effect on December 31, 2000.

(Permitting attorney's fees to be awarded against FEC)

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DOOLITTLE OF CALIFORNIA TO THE AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. SHAYS

(Substitutes for H.R. 2183)

Add at the end the following new title:

**TITLE PERMITTING COURTS TO REQUIRE FEC TO PAY ATTORNEY'S FEES IN CERTAIN CASES**

**SEC. 01. PERMITTING COURTS TO REQUIRE FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION TO PAY ATTORNEY'S FEES AND COSTS TO CERTAIN PREVAILING PARTIES.**

Section 309 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 437g) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(e) In any action or proceeding brought by the Commission against any person which is based on an alleged violation of this Act or of chapter 95 or 96 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, the court in its discretion may require the Commission to pay the costs incurred by the person under the action or proceeding, including a reasonable attorney's fee, if the court finds that the law, rule, or regulation upon which the action or proceeding is based is unconstitutional or that the bringing of the action or proceeding against the person is unconstitutional."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

**APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 1853, CARL D. PERKINS VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL EDUCATION ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1997**

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from

the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 1853) to amend the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will name the conferees momentarily.

**REPORT CONCERNING EMIGRATION LAWS AND POLICIES OF ALBANIA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 105-285)**

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

I am submitting an updated report to the Congress concerning the emigration laws and policies of Albania. The report indicates continued Albanian compliance with U.S. and international standards in the area of emigration. In fact, Albania has imposed no emigration restrictions, including exit visa requirements, on its population since 1991.

On December 5, 1997, I determined and reported to the Congress that Albania is not in violation of the freedom of emigration criteria of sections 402 and 409 of the Trade Act of 1974. That action allowed for the continuation of most-favored-nation (MFN) status for Albania and certain other activities without the requirement of an annual waiver. This semiannual report is submitted as required by law pursuant to the determination of December 5, 1997.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, July 16, 1998.

**REPORT ON DEVELOPMENTS CONCERNING FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF YUGOSLAVIA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 105-286)**

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, without objection, referred to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

On May 30, 1992, by Executive Order 12808, President Bush declared a national emergency to deal with the unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States constituted by the actions and policies of