of Heartland Health System in St. Joseph, MO, for the past 10 years.

While Mr. Kruse has continued to strive for success, he has never turned his back on others in his community. In New York, he was a member of the Greater Rochester Area Citizens League Board, the United Way, and the board of directors of the Rochester Area Career Educational Council. In Missouri, he has served as chairman of the St. Joseph Development Corp., as well as chairman of the St. Joseph Chamber of Commerce, and is currently a fellow at the American College of Health Care Executives. These are just a few of the many contributions Mr. Kruse has made to fulfill his commitment and dedication to the communities in which he has lived.

Mr. Kruse has been the recipient of numerous awards for his devotion to community service. In 1970, he was listed as one the outstanding young men in America. In 1976, Mr. Kruse was awarded a Distinguished Service Award and honored as one of 10 outstanding young Minnesotans. In 1992, Mr. Kruse received the Midland Empire Arthritis Center's William E. Hillyard Jr. Humanitarian Award.

Throughout his career, Mr. Kruse has dedicated his life to helping and inspiring those around him. It is clear from his achievements that he is truly committed to making a difference in the lives of many. Mr. Kruse is a great humanitarian who has given his time graciously, caring for those who have been stricken by life threatening diseases. I am grateful for his service and commend him for his dedication to helping others, not just in Missouri, but across America.

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 1:02 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Ms. Goetz, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 1854) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. MCCAIN (for himself, Mr. FEINGOLD, Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. PELL, and Mr. WELLSTONE):

S. 1219. A bill to reform the financing of Federal elections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mrs. BOXER:

S. 1220. A bill to provide that Members of Congress shall not be paid during Federal Government shutdowns; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

By Mrs. KASSEBAUM (for herself and Mr. JEFFORDS):

S. 1221. A bill to authorize appropriations for the Legal Services Corporation Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

By Mr. FAIRCLOTH:

S. 1222. A bill to prevent the creation of an international bailout fund within the International Monetary Fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Ms. MIKULSKI (for herself, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. WARNER, and Mr. ROBB):

S. Res. 167. A resolution congratulating Cal Ripken, Jr. on the occasion of his breaking the Major League Baseball record for the highest total number of consecutive games played; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. LOTT:

S. Con. Res. 26. A concurrent resolution to authorize the Newington-Cropsey Foundation to erect on the Capitol Grounds and present to Congress and the people of the United States a monument dedicated to the Bill of Rights; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. MCCAIN (for himself, Mr. FEINGOLD, Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. PELL, and Mr. WELLSTONE):

S. 1219. A bill to reform the refinancing of Federal elections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

THE CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM ACT OF 1995

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I am pleased to join with my colleagues, Senator FEINGOLD and Senator THOMPSON, to introduce the Senate Campaign Finance Reform Act of 1995. This bill, if enacted, would dramatically change American political campaigns.

This legislation is intended to help restore the public's faith in the Congress and the electoral system; to reaffirm that elections are won and lost in a competition of ideas and character, not fundraising. Toward that end, we hope to level the playing field between challengers and incumbents.

Again, I want to note, this bill is about placing ideas over dollars. While my Democrat cosponsors may disagree, I believe that Republicans won majorities in Congress last year because the American people understood and supported our ideas for changing the American Government, not because we excelled at the money chase. We want to make sure that decisions about who governs America—decisions that are so profound in their consequences for current and future generations of Americans—will be made by voters who have a fair understanding of those consequences.

Campaigns, of course, cost money. This bill recognizes that fact. It does not end campaign spending, but limits it in a manner that forces candidates to rely more on their message than their money.

Mr. President, poll after poll reveals the public's loss of faith in the Congress. One of the reasons this has occurred is that the public believes—rightly or wrongly—that special interests control the political and electoral system. In order to limit the ability of special interests to control the process, and to change the perception that money controls politics, we must enact campaign finance reform.

A recent USA Today-CNN Gallup poll revealed that 83 percent of Americans want campaign finance reform enacted. According to the same poll, the only two issues that the public feels are more important than campaign finance reform are balancing the Federal budget and reforming welfare. To the surprise of many, the poll showed that changing Medicare and cutting taxes has less support than did campaign finance reform.

Mr. President, I would like to outline what the bill does:

Spending Limits and Benefits: Senate campaign spending limits would be based on each State's voting-age population, ranging from a high of over $8 million in a large State like California to a low of $1.5 million in a smaller State like Wyoming. Candidates that voluntarily comply with spending limits would receive:

Free Broadcast Time—Candidates would be entitled to 30 minutes of free broadcast time.

Broadcast Discounts—Broadcasters would be required to sell advertising to a complying candidate at 50 percent of the lowest unit rate.

Reduced Postage Rates—Candidates would be able to send up to two pieces of mail to each voting-age resident at the lowest 3d-class nonprofit bulk rate.

New Variable Contribution Limit—If a candidate's opponent does not agree to the spending limits or exceeds the limits, the complying candidate's individual contribution limit is raised from $1,000 to $2,000 and the complying candidate's spending ceiling is raised by 20 percent.

On the issue of Personal Funds: Complying candidates cannot spend more than $250,000 from their personal funds. Candidates who spend more than that amount are considered in violation of this act and therefore qualify for none of this Act's benefits.

Also candidates are required to raise 60 percent of campaign funds from individuals residing in the candidate's home State.

There is a ban on political action committee contributions. In case a PAC ban is ruled unconstitutional by the Supreme Court, backup limits on PAC contributions are also included. In such an instance, PAC contribution limits would be lowered from $5,000 to the individual contribution limit. Additionally, candidates could receive no more than 20 percent of their contributions from PAC's.

All franked mass mailings banned in year of campaign.

There is a requirement increased disclosure and accountability for those who engage in political advertising.

Bundling is limited.

It requires Full Disclosure of all Soft Money contributions.

There is a ban on personal use of campaign funds, which codifies a recent FEC ruling that prohibits candidates from using campaign funds for personal purposes such as mortgage payments or vacation trips

This bill will affect both parties equally. It does what other bills in the past did not, not benefit just one party. And that is also why it has bipartisan support.

Mr. President, is this a perfect bill? No, it is not. I do not know if it is even possible to write a perfect campaign reform bill. But it is a good bill, that addresses the partisan and nonpartisan concerns that have undermined previous reform attempts. As the Washington Post said, ''it would represent a large step forward.'' Also, as many have noted, we cannot let the perfect be the enemy of the good.

We must take this step. The American people expect us to do at least that much.

Mr. President, I want to make a few additional comments. I note the presence of my friend and colleague from Wisconsin, who is my partner in this effort, Senator FEINGOLD.

Sometimes, residing here in the Nation's capital, as we have to do a great percentage of our time, we have a tendency to not be aware of the hopes and aspirations and frustrations of the American people. Last week there was a CNN poll that showed what the American people want Congress to do and what they expect Congress to do. Mr. President, 88 percent of the American people want Congress to balance the budget; 31 percent believe that they will do it. The next highest on that list is 88 percent want Congress to reform welfare; 47 percent expect them to do it. Next in line is 83 percent of the American people want Congress to reform campaign financing, while only 30 percent of the American people believe that Congress will do it.

The article goes on to say Congress meanwhile has fallen to a 30-percent approval, its lowest level since Republicans won control in January. Analysts say it is largely due to the slowdown in legislation as items have moved to the Senate coupled with an increase in partisan bickering over Medicare and GOP squabbles over welfare reform.

Mr. President, I do not think we should rest easy when the approval of the American people of Congress is as low as 30 percent.

Recently there was a poll done by respected pollsters in this city. I would like to quote three very important items from that poll.

When asked: We need campaign finance reform to make politicians accountable to average voters rather than special interests, voters stated this was very convincing, 59 percent; somewhat convincing 31 percent; not very convincing, 5 percent; not at all convincing, 4 percent; and do not know, 2 percent.

Mr. President, let me repeat that. When asked: We need campaign finance reform to make politicians accountable to average voters rather than special interests, a total of 59 percent found that argument very convincing, and 31 percent; somewhat convincing, a total of 90 percent of those interviewed.

When asked: We do not need campaign finance reform, the election in November helped clean up a lot of problems in Washington, respondents said their argument was very convincing, 13 percent; somewhat convincing, 19 percent; not very convincing, 22 percent; and not at all convincing, 39 percent.

Reducing the amount special interest groups can contribute to a candidate would be very effective, 54 percent; somewhat effective, 34 percent.

Mr. President, when the respondents were asked: Those who make large campaign contributions get special favors from politicians, respondents said this is one of the things that worries you most, 34 percent; worries you a great deal, 34 percent. Sixty-eight percent of the American people believe that those who make large contributions get special favors from politicians bothers them most or bothers them a great deal.

What I am saying is that we need to reform this business. We must understand that money will always play a role in political campaigns. In an ideal world that would not be the case. We do not live in an ideal world. But there should be accountability.

I am pleased that Senator FEINGOLD and Senator THOMPSON and others are joining in this effort, the first bipartisan effort in over 10 years. This is not a popular issue, Mr. President. It is not one that the Congress would like to address. There are those who are cynical about the real prospects of fundamental campaign finance reform since it has been a high item on the agenda for a long time.

Frankly, I do not know if we will reform campaign financing. But I do know this: If we do not do something in this area, the very high disapproval that the American people have for our activities here in Congress will be reflected at the polls in November of 1996 since the American people have no other recourse. It is not clear to me what that reaction will be, whether it is a search for an independent party or candidate.

About 2 weeks ago was there was a poll taken by the Wall Street Journal and NBC that showed that 6 out of 10 Americans now would support an independent party for a candidate, or whether they would go back to the Democratic Party or they would believe that those on this side of the aisle are making a good effort. But I do know this: If we continue to experience such high disapproval ratings, the American people lose confidence in our ability to carry out their mandates and the repercussions cannot be good for our system of government.

So, Mr. President, I hope we will look at this issue carefully. I hope we will continue to try to work on a bipartisan basis. And I hope that all of those who are interested in this issue will understand that the Senator from Wisconsin and I do not believe that we have come up with a perfect document, there are parts of this bill that I have reservations about, parts of this bill that the Senator from Wisconsin has reservations about. We cannot let perfect be the enemy of the good. And always, if there is one lesson here, it is that this issue must be addressed on a bipartisan basis and from a bipartisan standpoint.

I reserve the remainder of my time and yield such time as he may use to the Senator from Wisconsin.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin is recognized.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I especially want to thank the Senator from Arizona. I am pleased to be a part of this effort, to be one of two authors in the McCain-Feingold bill, and am pleased to hear that Senator THOMPSON has joined us.

I have worked with the Senator from Arizona already this year on a number of issues and on a bipartisan basis about our concern about the revolving door. Members of Congress and staff sometimes move rather quickly over to lobbying ventures. We are trying to do something about that.

We worked hard together to try to do something about the great public frustration about pork items being placed on appropriations bills, and are trying to respond in another piece of legislation that is attached to the line-item veto, a bill that could do something about putting extraneous material on emergency spending bills.

I, of course, feel particular good about our recent effort and success on the gift ban which this body enacted just prior to the recess that we just had.

I have to tell you, back home the response to the gift ban was a lot more intense than I expected. People are looking for any sign of hope that things can change here in Washington. Even though the gift ban itself is not something that changes the world or solves all of our problems by any means, there was a feeling I got that people took some heart from that.

Our effort today in introducing this campaign finance reform bill is all about building on that initial success and doing it in an area that is even far more important; as the Senator from Arizona has said, the changing of the way we finance our campaigns. I am very optimistic that a number of Members from both sides of the aisle will join us in this effort soon. That is the indication I am getting from our conversations.

The Senator from Arizona said this is, will be, and will continue to be a bipartisan effort. Senator MCCAIN is speaking to Democrats and I am speaking to Republicans about this. We are not dividing up the Senate because this has to be a product of the Senate.

What we are really asking here is for both political parties to, in effect, sort of mutually disarm this money race in politics and to have a consensus that the Senate and the Congress in this country will all be better off if we stop this horrible trend for outrageous spending in campaigns.

I agree with the Senator from Arizona that this is not the perfect bill or the ideal bill, if there is one. I believe in complete public financing of campaigns. I think it would be better if we did not have any campaign contributions, if it was illegal to ask for campaign contributions. I think everybody would be better off. I suppose that is my ideal world. But I know that cannot pass here.

I introduced my own bill earlier this year, S. 46. I thought it was a good bill but it involved public financing. There are difficulties in getting a majority on that issue. But because campaign finance reform is such an overwhelming priority, I was not only pleased to see some of the ideas of the Senator from Arizona, but I was very surprised to see how far he would come to try to reach a consensus, to try to have a bipartisan bill to solve this problem. I believe it is one of the biggest problems we have in this country. I say the biggest problem we have in terms of our day-to-day operations in trying to solve a particular problem is balancing the Federal budget. That is No. 1.

But if we want to talk about the procedure, if we want to talk about the way this Government is run and why people feel it does not run right, I think the most important issue is changing the way campaigns are financed.

I say this from the point of view of maybe three different groups. The first group, the most important group, is the public at large. The Senator from Arizona says one of the reasons he thinks the Republicans won on November 8 is this issue. I think he is right. I think it is one of the reasons Bill Clinton and some of us won in 1992. It does not mean we earned that support if we do not do campaign finance reform. But I think it is one of the reasons. I think it has been a little bit surprising to people that in a reform Congress that this issue of campaign finance reform has not really come to the fore.

So from the point of view of the public, when they see the hundreds of thousands of dollars poured into the telecommunications bill or the regulatory reform bill, you name it, this is all happening in this Congress, the money race, the big contributions continue, and it makes people feel that they are disconnected from their elected representatives, that something is going on here, that after the election somebody comes here and they are distracted or disconnected from them, and that the big money in campaigns has a lot to do with it.

So from the point of view of the public, we need this legislation. We also need this legislation from the point of view of people who are challengers. We were all new candidates once for the Senate. We all had to face the reality that people would come to us and say, ''Well, you may be qualified, but where are you going to get the money?'' That ended up being the first question I was asked any time I went anywhere in Wisconsin or other places trying to figure out if I could run a credible race. How are you going to get the money?

Well, that has to change. Some of us were fortunate enough to win, maybe even without a great deal of money. But I cannot even imagine the thousands and thousands of Americans, good Americans, people who would have been wonderful Senators who did not even consider running because they believe this has become a game for either the wealthy or the well connected.

Finally, there is a third group that this should have great appeal for, and that is the 100 Members of this body. Ask any Senator what they do not like about their job. Most are so delighted to be here and consider it a great honor. The one thing that is the bane of any Senator's existence, if there is one, is this necessity of raising money. For many it is a demeaning process, to be told that if you do not raise $10,000 a week, you are not going to have a chance and you are going to have more opponents. It takes away from time with your family; it takes away from time with your constituents; it takes away from time to actually do the job here in Washington, to understand the issues, to talk to other Senators and to work out solutions. So from the point of view of the Senate and those who seek the Senate and those who elect us, it is time to come together, compromise if necessary, and have a real campaign finance reform bill.

The Senator from Arizona has outlined already the major provisions. Let me just highlight what I consider to be the three core provisions that I think make this bill very unique and not only strong but balanced from a partisan point of view. And these are the three provisions that all have to do with what happens if somebody complies with the incentives and with the limits in the bill in order to get various incentives.

First of all, there is a provision that might be called the more Democrat-supported provision. It was the one in S. 3 last year, the one that passed the Democratic Senate, and that is the voluntary limit. We would place a voluntary limit based on the size of the population in a State of how much can be spent in total in a U.S. Senate election from about $1.5 million in the smaller States to a maximum of about $7 million to $8 million in California. And we know even though that sounds like a lot of money, it does not even compare to the $50 million that was spent in a Senate race in California this past year.

So we provide a voluntary limit, and if you abide by the limit, you get benefits such as reduced television time and an opportunity to mail on a reduced basis to the constituents in your State.

The second idea is what I would call a more Republican idea, an idea that I have always liked, one idea I campaigned on and I believe in it, and that is that you should have to get a majority of your campaign contributions from individuals from your own home State—not from PAC's, not from out-of-State interests, but a majority of the money has to come from the folks for whom you work, the boss—in my case, the 5 million people who live in Wisconsin. I think that is a very important provision to return us to the grassroots politics it has been.

The third major provision has to do with a rising trend that we have all noticed and are all concerned about which makes the public terribly cynical, and that is the proliferation of big money being spent by very wealthy individuals to finance their own campaigns. This bill produces a voluntary limit of approximately $250,000, depending on the size of your State, saying that if you spend over that of your own money, your opponent gets some advantages in terms of raising funds to make it more competitive.

So this combination, doing something about the overall amount that is spent, doing something about obtaining funds from outside of your own home State, and doing something about the unfairness of the system that allows only the very wealthy to be able to just get right in the middle of an election, buy recognition and win an election, these three things I think make for the core of a very effective bill. There are other provisions that are important, but I think these three are the ones that will make this bill work and make the bill pass.

In addition, if a complying candidate is faced by an opponent that is pouring millions of dollars of their own money into their campaign, the complying candidate is granted the ability to raise additional campaign funds beyond the limits under current law.

I support that principle—that is, the idea that we should provide incentives for candidates to limit their personal funding, and the idea that if one candidate is facing someone with such vast resources, the candidate without personal wealth should have access to resources of equal value.

I do have concerns about this particular provision that raises the individual contribution limits and allows the complying candidate to raise hundreds of thousands of extra dollars. I am not sure that furthers the goal of bringing down the overall costs of Senate campaigns—in fact, it may only

add fuel to the fire. Providing the complying candidate with greater benefits may be a better alternative to raising the contribution limits. But again I support the principle of finding a way to encourage candidates to voluntarily limit their personal spending.

There are other important provisions in this legislation as well. We eliminate a traditional incumbent advantage—franked mass mailings, in the calendar year of an election. The bill contains another provision I have concerns about, a ban on political action committee contributions including the so-called leadership PAC's.

If such a ban is ruled unlawful, PAC contributions will be limited to no more than 20 percent of a candidate's campaign funds collected and the contribution levels for PAC's will be lowered from 5,000 dollars to whatever the applicable individual contribution limits are.

Some view a PAC ban as a cure-all to our campaign finance problems. I am not so sure of this. First, according to figures released by the Federal Election Commission, PAC contributions have remained at fairly equal levels over the past few election cycles. Aggregate PAC contributions totaled $149 million in 1990, rose to $178 million in 1992 and remained at $178 million in 1994.

During the same period, overall campaign spending has risen from $446 million in 1990 to $724 million in 1994—a 62-percent increase. So even though overall campaign costs have skyrocketed in recent years, the level of PAC contributions has remained relatively constant.

That is why I have very serious doubts that banning political action committees will be very helpful in getting a grip on the rapidly rising levels of overall campaign spending. The Senator from Arizona does however make a compelling point that incumbents by and large are most likely to benefit from PAC's as illustrated by the shift in PAC contributions from the Democratic Party to the Republican Party following the 1994 elections.

Though I question the legality and rationale in banning PAC contributions, I think it is entirely appropriate to limit the amount of PAC contributions a candidate may accept as a percentage of overall fundraising. The backup provision in this bill—the 20 percent aggregate limit on PAC contributions, as well as lowering PAC contribution limits so they are equal to individual contribution limits—is a good idea, and I would actually support lowering that aggregate threshold, perhaps 10 percent.

The bill also places new disclosure requirements and limits on the tremendous amounts of soft money, that is, the unregulated campaign funds that are poured into Federal campaigns including Presidential elections.

Soft money represents a real problem in our political system and this is clearly one obstacle that Republicans and Democrats should be working together to eliminate. The amount of soft money raised just this year—numbering in the tens of millions of dollars—stands to undermine the reforms of the Presidential Election System that have worked so well for over 20 years now.

Let me say that I was disappointed in the Democratic National Committee's recent fundraising effort that literally sought to sell access to the President in exchange for campaign contributions. I am very pleased that President Clinton, a longtime supporter of campaign finance reform, denounced this effort and distanced himself from it.

This sort of fundraising has occurred while the White House was in control of Democrats and Republicans alike—and let me be clear here—both parties are guilty of this kind of fundraising tactic that only underscores the need for comprehensive reform that includes soft money limits and disclosure.

Finally, the bill will codify a recent ruling by the Federal Election Commission that bars candidates from using campaign funds for personal purposes, such as mortgage payments, country club memberships and vacations.

Most of these provisions were included in S. 46, the campaign finance reform legislation I introduced on the first day of the 104th Congress, and I am delighted that Senator MCCAIN and I were able to come together, roll up our sleeves and produce a comprehensive reform bill that is fair to Democrats and Republicans alike.

The fact is, I do not support everything in this bill. There are provisions I would like to see modified. The legislation I introduced in January called for full public financing for candidates that agree to limit there overall campaign spending. I continue to believe that public financing is the best way to reform a system that has created dramatically unfair elections and caused Members of Congress to spend increasingly more time hosting fundraisers and less time fulfilling their legislative responsibilities.

However, if campaign finance reform is to pass with bipartisan support, a vehicle for such reform must be found that can be supported by Members from both parties and from across political ideologies. I believe that this bill provides that vehicle.

Having a fair and competitive election system is not a Democratic or Republican issue. How we elect our Representatives is a cornerstone of our Democratic political system. As a Nation, we have always put a tremendous value on participation in our Democratic process. We have repeatedly passed laws, even constitutional amendments, to expand the rights of our citizens to vote and express political viewpoints.

Yet here we are with a campaign system in which the average cost of running for a seat in the U.S. Senate is estimated at $4 million. Four million dollars. That is just the average. In 1994, nearly $35 million was spent between the two general election candidates in California alone. Nearly $27 million was spent by the candidates in the Virginia Senate race.

So unless you win the Powerball drawing, or strike oil in your backyard or are an incumbent Member of Congress, you are an automatic longshot to be even considered a credible candidate for the United States Senate.

That is not expanding participation. That is not encouraging democracy. That is sending out a clear message that unless you are well-financed or well-connected, you should not be running for the United States Senate.

Finally, the time consumed raising contributions for reelection efforts is time taken away from legislative responsibilities of incumbents. Members of Congress should not have to chose between those responsibilities or making phone calls to potential contributors.

What we need to do is to return to a simple proposition: That is, money should not determine the outcome of elections. Elections should be decided by issues and ideas, not checkbooks and campaign coffers. That does not mean that campaign contributions have no place in our election system. It simply means that all candidates should have a legitimate and reasonable opportunity to get their message out to the electorate in their States.

I have reached that conclusion, the Senator from Arizona has reached that conclusion and the majority of this body has reached that conclusion.

Mr. President, we all know that Congress is not held in very high regard by the American people. They are angry, they are cynical and to a large extent they have lost faith in their Government. All of these feelings have sprung from a common belief that is shared by so many of our constituents—a belief that I find deeply troubling—that the Congress simply does not represent them anymore.

They see the television news accounts of Members of Congress relaxing on a beach vacation paid for by lobbyists. They find out that their Representatives are receiving tens of thousands of dollars from this interest group or that interest group, and they have begun to wonder if the average American really has any sort of voice in Washington DC. They feel alienated, they feel disconnected and soon they become distrustful.

A few weeks ago, thousands of Americans who have been frustrated by both parties' inability to produce meaningful political reform met at the United We Stand America Convention in Dallas.

Politician after politician, from both parties, ranging from the distinguished Senate majority leader to the general chairman of the Democratic National Committee, stood at the lectern in Dallas and railed for campaign finance reform. Why? As one attendee at this convention framed it:

When I look at a politician, I wonder who really owns him. I do not see them as people with their own ideas. I think the people who are financing them tell them what to think.

That viewpoint, Mr. President—one that I believe is shared by millions and millions of other Americans—is precisely why we are in such need of immediate and meaningful campaign finance reform.

Whether it is showering Members of Congress with free gifts, meals or vacation trips, or funneling huge campaign contributions to incumbent Members, it has become clear in the minds of the American people—and justifiably so—that the key to gaining access and influence on Capitol Hill is money.

And that is what our election system has become all about—money. Candidates are judged first and foremost not on their positions on the issues, not by their experience or capabilities but by their ability to raise the millions of dollars that are needed in today's climate to run an effective congressional campaign.

The bill we are introducing today will return our campaign system to the people we represent. If an individual wants to run for the United States Senate and can prove that their ideas and viewpoints represent a broad base of support, they will have the opportunity to do so.

I have said many times that we should not have a campaign finance system that favors challengers or incumbents, or candidates from either party. The bill we are introducing today represents the comprehensive, bipartisan reform that the American people have been demanding for years.

This bill represents a compromise that can be supported by Senators from across the ideological spectrum. It is not perfect and it includes provisions which I and others might not support standing alone. Each of us has swallowed hard in some areas to put together a responsible, bipartisan proposal. Taken as a whole and on balance, it is a vast improvement over our current system which can be described as unfair at best and chaotic at worst.

Finally and very briefly, the question I am getting is: Why do you think this is going to succeed? This has been tried time and again.

Well, I can understand that sentiment. Campaign finance reform is not even mentioned in the Republican Contract With America. It is not even there. But there is still a strong feeling that this should be done. Even though there is a disconnect between what the Senator from Arizona has said when he points out people believe this should be done but they do not think it can be done, it will not happen, I think there are signs it will happen.

First, this is the first bipartisan effort of its kind for 10 years. That is very important.

Second, I think the gift ban effort showed that there is a willingness on reform issues to cross party lines, to sometimes not agree with the leadership, and to move on a bipartisan basis to change the system.

Third, you cannot help but notice that at the conference in Dallas run by Mr. Perot, even though it may not have been expected, one of the leading topics was the need for campaign finance reform. And in the first speech given at that conference by our former colleague, Senator Boren said that the conference should go on record in favor of the McCain-Feingold bill.

I also noticed that even before we introduced the bill today, we have already had editorial endorsements across the country. It is rare to receive editorial endorsements on a piece of legislation before you even introduce it, but this bill has already merited it. We also understand that at least a notice will go out today that a couple of our colleagues in the House on a bipartisan basis will introduce this same bill in the House. So there is reason to believe that it will not just be an effort in the Senate.

Let me finally say I think the most telling proof that this thing can work is the vote we took in July. I came to the floor of the Senate and simply brought up a sense-of-the-Senate resolution along with Senator MCCAIN that said we ought to consider campaign finance reform during the 104th Congress. I expected that this would just be accepted, that people would say, ''Fine. Let's deal with that later.'' But the majority leader, a person who has enormous respect in this body from every Member, came down to the floor and indicated that he was not sure there could be a bipartisan effort, and he moved to table my amendment to not have campaign finance reform put on the agenda.

Mr. President, he lost that vote. He almost never loses a vote out here. He has a tremendously high success record. But 13 Republicans joined with various Democrats to say on a 57–41 vote that, yes, during the 104th Congress we have to clean up this money mess that is in Washington. We have to stop this race to raise all this money out here that takes us away from our constituents.

I think that is a good sign. It is a sign that both parties want to work together. And all I can say in conclusion is the thing I especially like about working with the Senator from Arizona is he does not just like introducing bills; he likes to win. This is an effort to pass a bill—not talk about it, pass a bill—send it to the President, and to have by January 1, 1997, a whole different way of electing Senators.

So I thank the Senator from Arizona very much, and I look forward to this effort.

Mr. McCAIN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COVERDELL). The Chair recognizes the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, I send this legislation to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

Mr. McCAIN. Thank you, Mr. President. I just want to congratulate the Senator from Wisconsin for a very fine statement. I hope this is the beginning of a process that can be completed. I believe we have clearly stated that we are interested in a bipartisan effort in this area. We are not interested in seeking political advantage or campaign advantage for either party. We are interested in leveling the playing field for incumbents and challengers, which is clearly not the case today. I appreciate the effort of the Senator from Wisconsin and I have grown to appreciate not only his dedication but his tenacity.

Mr. President, I note the presence of the Senator from Maryland in the Chamber, so I will yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. President, I appreciate the opportunity to join my colleagues, Senators MCCAIN and FEINGOLD, in the introduction of the Senate Campaign Finance Reform Act of 1995.

It is well known that the American people have very little faith in their elected representatives. It is a travesty that the commonly held presumption is that Members of Congress are bought and controlled by special interests.

Another problem that affects the reputation and quality of our representative government is that once someone gets elected, they have a significant advantage in subsequent elections.

Congress needs to move away from professionalism and more toward a citizen legislature. It should be more open, instead of more closed. And that's because of the role that money plays. Unless a candidate has access to large sums of money he or she is pretty much cut out of the process. This leaves the field to the professional politicians.

This legislation will do several things. First, it will help level the playing field and help reduce the advantage that incumbents have. And it will bring down the built-in advantage of individual wealth. Second, it will reduce the reliance on private donations.

The new provisions which is the largest step in a new direction is the one that requires that most of a candidate's money must be raised in his or her own State. For myself, I'd probably be in favor of even higher requirements on this.

The most important element in all this is what passage of this legislation would do to improve public confidence. The public is extremely cynical and skeptical of the process of our Congress and our Government. We need to do everything we can to turn that around. Much of the public's concern has to do with the role of money in our process. This would be a step in a downplaying the importance of money in electing our officials and in what is perceived to be its effect on the decisions officials make after their election.

Much of the public perception of the process is justified. We have got to

start doing everything we can to enhance the stature and the confidence that people have in the Congress. Otherwise, we are not going to be able to exert the leadership we need to in other legislative areas. Right now we've got feet of clay, and it makes the rest of the body politic weak. Until we do something about these fundamental parts of the political process, Congress is not going to have the strength to sustain itself when we make the tough decisions on fiscal matters, and other important areas such as welfare, tax reform, health care, and crime.

This proposal will help level the playing field, open up the process, and do away with some of the advantages of incumbency. It will reduce the amount of time a candidate and office holder will have to spend on fundraising. It will reduce the role of money and reduce the reliance on private political contributions. And most importantly, it will help renew public confidence.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I am delighted to be an original cosponsor of the bipartisan legislation introduced today by Senators FEINGOLD and MCCAIN, to provide for broad, sweeping reform of the way we conduct and finance congressional elections.

I have been proud to work with my colleagues from Arizona and Wisconsin on a number of political reform issues, and was very pleased to celebrate a major victory with them as allies on the gift ban, passed just before the recess. After several years of struggle and controversy in the face of strong and persistent resistance by certain of my colleagues, including last year's filibuster by our Republican colleagues, it was a major victory for reformers. And in my conversations with people back in my State, they recognized its importance and said that it gave them renewed hope that we in Congress might respond to growing demands for political reform at the grassroots.

But the gift ban, and the passage of lobbying reform, are only two key elements of the political reform agenda. The more significant reform, in my mind, and the one that will have even more far-reaching consequences for stemming the tide of special interest influence in the political process, is the effort to profoundly reshape the way we finance and conduct political campaigns in this country.

For many years, I and others have pushed forward here in the Senate a number of campaign finance reform bills, only to see them die in the face of near-unanimous Republican opposition, including a sustained filibuster against last year's bill. I hope that as this bill evolves, it will serve as the basis for the grand bipartisan compromise on this issue that has so far eluded us. For that to happen, each side will have to consider giving up certain advantages that many believe the current system now offers. Americans are looking for that kind of cooperation and compromise on political reform. They believe it's long overdue.

On the first day of this Congress, I reintroduced S. 116, my comprehensive campaign reform legislation, which I believe should serve as a model for real, thoroughgoing reform of our campaign finance system. I said at the time that I hoped we would move forward quickly on real reform, despite the persistent opposition of most of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. That bill has been bottled up by the Governmental Affairs Committee, which has thus far refused to even hold hearings on campaign reform.

There have been a number of other campaign reform bills introduced this year, including the version of last year's comprehensive bill introduced by Minority Leader DASCHLE. None of them have received serious consideration by the committees on jurisdiction either. I hope that additional elements of my bill will be incorporated into the final version of this bill if it moves forward.

This bill is not perfect. Some of its provisions I don't support. But even with its warts, I have decided to be an original cosponsor in the hope that it might provide a vehicle for real, bipartisan reform efforts this year. It does provide many of the central elements of any significant reform plan. Its enactment would go a long way toward restoring integrity to our political process.

Perhaps most important, it would impose strict limits on the amounts that candidates could spend in their campaigns. That is critical if we are to address the huge amount of big money that pours into campaigns, often from well-heeled special interests. As with my bill, and others, the formula would be based on the voting age population in each State. Candidates who agree to abide by the limit would receive free broadcast time, reduced postage rates, and broadcast discounts as incentives for them to participate.

It also contains tough new provisions to ban special interests from bundling contributions, bans contributions from political action committees—with backup limits should the ban be found unconstitutional by the courts—bans incumbent use of taxpayer-paid mass mailings in an election year, imposes tough new limits on so-called soft money contributions that can be used to circumvent Federal financing rules, and prohibits the personal use of campaign funds.

Finally, it places a premium on contributions from a Member's own home State, in an effort to ensure that Senators are more accountable to those who elected them than to big-money special interests. It requires that a substantial majority of funds come from one's State, and that would be another big step toward reform. While it is true that this specific provision has often been seen historically as being harder on Democrats than Republicans, I believe this is an important principle that should be preserved in some form as this bill moves forward.

As I have said, there are some real problems with this bill, and both of its primary sponsors have acknowledged that. I will only identify a few. For example, if a noncomplying candidate refuses to abide by spending limits, the bill allows an increase in contribution limits for the complying candidate, as a deterrent to nonparticipation. I am very troubled by this provision, because I think it could, in some circumstances, increase individual contribution limits, rather than decrease them, as I would prefer. Last year I offered several amendments to reduce substantially individual contribution limits. I continue to believe that this is the way to go, coupled with other incentives. I hope that we will ultimately provide for another way to offer carrots, and wield sticks, to encourage candidates to comply with spending limits.

In addition, the bill provides for a limit on personal funds spent in a campaign to $250,000. I believe this is much too high, which is why I offered an amendment last Congress, approved overwhelmingly by the Senate, to cut this limit down to $25,000. I believe that is where the limit should be set, and I intend to work with my colleagues to reduce that limit.

In short, while this measure is not as comprehensive as earlier versions of campaign legislation which I have authored or supported in the past, it would go a very long way toward real reform. I think that as the bill moves forward, it can be improved upon, and I intend to work to do that. But I commend Senators FEINGOLD and MCCAIN for their effort, and I hope the introduction of this bill will help to move us as soon as possible toward a major overhaul of the campaign finance system, which has eluded us for so many years.

By Mrs. BOXER:

S. 1220. A bill to provide that Members of Congress shall not be paid during Federal Government shutdowns; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN LEGISLATION

● Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, today I am introducing legislation that I believe is fair and necessary.

This bill says that if the Congress fails to do its work and cannot reach agreement on the Federal budget—and the Federal Government cannot pay its bills—Members of Congress will not receive pay.

Americans are being told every day that we may come to a train wreck over the budget. Certainly, we have major differences among Members of Congress and the President over what our national priorities should be. Some in Congress favor a huge tax cut for the rich paid for by crippling the Medicare system. I think that is cruel and unfair, and I am going to fight it. But even if we cannot agree on priorities,

all Members of Congress should agree that we must pass the budget on time and enable the Government to continue operating.

I believe this legislation is important for two key reasons:

First, it will help avert the predicted Government shutdown because—with their personal paychecks on the line—Members will understand the fear and uncertainty now being felt by the millions of Americans who rely on Government services—from small businesses with Federal contracts to farmers to veterans to senior citizens to those who hold U.S. Government bonds.

Second, it codifies a principle that all other workers in America live by: If you don't do your job, you shouldn't get paid. One of Congress' most important functions is to pass the Nation's budget. If we fail in that critically important task, it simply makes sense that our pay should be docked.

This legislation would require that pay for Members of Congress be docked if either there is a lapse in appropriations for any Federal department or agency or the Federal debt ceiling is reached.

I am very pleased that a companion measure is being introduced in the House of Representatives today by Congressman DICK DURBIN.

I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 1220

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

SECTION 1. PAY OF MEMBERS OF CONGRESS DURING GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWNS.

No Member of Congress may receive basic pay for any period in which—

(1) there is a lapse in appropriations for any Federal agency or department as a result of a failure to enact a regular appropriations bill or continuing resolution; or

(2) the Federal Government is unable to make payments or meet obligations because the public debt limit under section 3101 of title 31, United States Code has been reached.

SEC. 2. RETROACTIVE PAY PROHIBITED.

No pay forfeited in accordance with section 1 may be paid retroactively.●

By Mrs. KASSEBAUM (for herself and Mr. JEFFORDS):

S. 1221. A bill to authorize appropriations for the Legal Services Corporation Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

LEGAL SERVICES REAUTHORIZATION LEGISLATION

● Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Mr. President, I introduce legislation along with Senator JEFFORDS to reauthorize the Legal Services Corporation [LSC] Act.

Through this federally established corporation, thousands of low income Americans have access to our legal system. Clients seek assistance with landlord-tenant disputes, domestic violence cases, writing of wills, and other civil matters. Sometimes the cases need to be litigated, but frequently, the clients simply need legal counseling.

Regrettably, Legal Services has been plagued with controversy over the last decade. Critics have charged, with some validity, that Legal Services attorneys have acted as advocates for political causes, such as welfare reform and state redistricting cases. As a result, LSC has not been reauthorized since 1977.

Today, I am introducing a Senate companion bill to H.R. 1806, legislation introduced by Representatives MCCOLLUM and STENHOLM in the House of Representatives. I want to give Representatives MCCOLLUM and STENHOLM credit for their hard work in putting this bill together, and for their dedication to assuring that low income Americans retain access to our legal system.

The legislation being introduced today addresses the concerns that have been expressed over the past several years by limiting the types of activities that Legal Services attorneys can handle. For instance, under the bill, Legal Services attorneys cannot represent tenants being evicted from public housing projects for drug dealing. In addition, attorneys will not be representing incarcerated individuals on prisoner rights cases.

The legislation also has new accountability provisions. Lawyers will be required to keep time sheets so federal auditors can monitor the types of cases being handled. New litigation safeguards will be implemented to protect against the filing of frivolous class action law suits. And we will require LSC grantees to bid competitively for their LSC contracts.

Mr. President, Legal Services is an important program. I urge my colleagues to support the legislation being introduced today, and ask unanimous consent that the full text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 1221

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS; REFERENCE.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Legal Services Reform Act of 1995''.

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

(c) REFERENCE.—Whenever in this Act an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to or repeal of a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to section or other provision of the Legal Services Corporation Act (42 U.S.C. 2996 and following).

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Section 1001 (42 U.S.C. 2996) is amended to read as follows:

''FINDINGS

''SEC. 1001. The Congress finds the following:

''(1) There is a need to encourage equal access to the system of justice in the United States for individuals seeking redress of grievances.

''(2) There is a need to encourage the provision of high quality legal assistance for those who would otherwise be unable to afford legal counsel.

''(3) Encouraging the provision of legal assistance to those who face an economic barrier to legal counsel will serve the ends of justice consistent with the purposes of the Legal Services Corporation Act.

''(4) It is not the purpose of the Legal Services Corporation Act to meet all the legal needs of all potentially eligible clients, but instead to be a catalyst to encourage the legal profession and others to meet their responsibilities to the poor and to maximize access of the poor to justice.

''(5) For many citizens the availability of legal services has reaffirmed faith in our government of laws.

''(6) To preserve its strength, the legal services program must be made completely free from the influence of political pressures and completely free of lobbying and political activity.

''(7) There are over 2,000 non-profit organizations advocating on behalf of the poor throughout the United States and it is not appropriate for funds regulated under the Legal Services Corporation Act to be expended lobbying for or against positions taken by those groups.

''(8) Attorneys providing legal assistance must protect the best interests of their clients in keeping with the Code of Professional Responsibility, the Canon of Ethics, and the high standards of the legal profession.

SEC. 3. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Subsection (a) of section 1010 (42 U.S.C. 2996i) is amended to read as follows:

''(a) There are authorized to be appropriated for the purposes of carrying out the activities of the Corporation—

''(1) $278,000,000 for fiscal year 1996,

''(2) $278,000,000 for fiscal year 1997

''(3) $278,000,000 for fiscal year 1998,

''(4) $278,000,000 for fiscal year 1999, and

''(5) $278,000,000 for fiscal year 2000.''.

SEC. 4. PROHIBITION ON REDISTRICTING ACTIVITY.

Section 1007(b) (42 U.S.C. 2996f(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (9), by striking ''or'' after the semicolon;

(2) in paragraph (10), by striking the period and inserting ''; or''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(11) to—

''(A) advocate or oppose, or contribute or make available any funds, personnel, or equipment for use in advocating or opposing, any plan or proposal, or

''(B) represent any party or participate in any other way in litigation,

that is intended to or has the effect of altering, revising, or reapportioning a legislative, judicial, or elective district at any level of government, including influencing the timing or manner of the taking of a census.''.

SEC. 5. PROTECTION AGAINST THEFT AND FRAUD.

Section 1005 (42 U.S.C. 2996d) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(h) For purposes of sections 286, 287, 641, 1001, and 1002 of title 18, United States Code, the Corporation shall be considered to be a department or agency of the United States Government.

''(i) For purposes of sections 3729 through 3733 of title 31, United States Code, the term ''United States Government'' shall include the Corporation, except that actions that are authorized by section 3730(b) of such title to be brought by persons may not be brought against the Corporation, any recipient, subrecipient, grantee, or contractor of the Corporation, or any employee thereof.

''(j) For purposes of section 1516 of title 18, United States Code—

''(1) the term 'Federal auditor' shall include any auditor employed or retained on a contractual basis by the Corporation,

''(2) the term 'contract' shall include any grant or contract made by the Corporation, and

''(3) the term 'person', as used in subsection (a) of such section, shall include any grantee or contractor receiving financial assistance under section 1006(a)(1).

''(k) Funds provided by the Corporation under section 1006 shall be deemed to be Federal appropriations when used by a contractor, grantee, subcontractor, or subgrantee of the Corporation.

''(1) For purposes of section 666 of title 18, United States Code, funds provided by the Corporation shall be deemed to be benefits under a Federal program involving a grant or contract.''.

SEC. 6. SOLICITATION.

Section 1007 (42 U.S.C. 2996f) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(i) Any recipient, and any employee of a recipient, who has given in-person unsolicited advice to a nonattorney that such nonattorney should obtain counsel or take legal action shall not accept employment resulting from that advice, or refer that nonattorney to another recipient or employee of a recipient, except that—

''(1) an attorney may accept employment by a close friend, relative, former client (if the advice given is germane to the previous employment by the client), or person whom the attorney reasonably believes to be a client because the attorney is currently handling an active legal matter or case for that specific person;

''(2) an attorney may accept employment that results from the attorney's participation in activities designed to educate nonattorneys to recognize legal problems, to make intelligent selection of counsel, or to utilize available legal services if such activities are conducted or sponsored by a qualified legal assistance organization;

''(3) without affecting that attorney's right to accept employment, an attorney may speak publicly or write for publication on legal topics so long as such attorney does not emphasize the attorney's own professional experience or reputation and does not undertake to give individual advice in such speech or publication; and

''(4) if success in asserting rights or defenses of a client in litigation in the nature of class action is dependent upon the joinder of others, an attorney may accept, but shall not seek, employment from those contacted for the purpose of obtaining that joinder.''.

SEC. 7. PROCEDURAL SAFEGUARDS FOR LITIGATION.

Section 1007 (42 U.S.C. 2996f), as amended by section 6 of this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''(j)(1) No recipient or employee of a recipient may file a complaint or otherwise pursue litigation against a defendant unless—

''(A) all plaintiffs have been specifically identified, by name, in any complaint filed for purposes of litigation, except to the extent that a court of competent jurisdiction has granted leave to protect the identity of any plaintiff; and

''(B) a statement or statements of facts written in English and, if necessary, in a language which the plaintiffs understand, which enumerate the particular facts known to the plaintiffs on which the complaint is based, have been signed by the plaintiffs (including named plaintiffs in a class action), are kept on file by the recipient, and are made available to any Federal department or agency that is auditing the activities of the Corporation or any recipient, and to any auditor receiving Federal funds to conduct such auditing, including any auditor or monitor of the Corporation.

Other parties shall have access to the statement of facts referred to in subparagraph (B) only through the discovery process after litigation has begun.

''(2) No recipient or employee of a recipient may engage in precomplaint settlement negotiations with a prospective defendant unless—

''(A) all plaintiffs have been specifically identified, except to the extent that a court of competent jurisdiction has granted leave to protect the identity of any plaintiff; and

''(B) a statement or statements of facts written in English and, if necessary, in a language which the plaintiffs understand, which enumerate the particular facts known to the plaintiffs on which the complaint will be based if such negotiations fail, have been signed by all plaintiffs (including named plaintiffs in a class action), are kept on file by the recipient, and are made available to all prospective defendants or such defendants' counsel, to any Federal department or agency that is auditing the activities of the Corporation or any such recipient, and to any auditor receiving Federal funds to conduct such auditing, including any auditor or monitor of the Corporation.

''(3)(A) Subject to subparagraph (B), any Federal district court of competent jurisdiction, after notice to potential parties to litigation referred to in paragraph (1) or to negotiations described in paragraph (2) and after an opportunity for a hearing, may enjoin the disclosure of the identity of any potential plaintiff pending the outcome of such litigation or negotiations, upon the establishment of reasonable cause to believe that such an injunction is necessary to prevent probable, serious harm to such potential plaintiff.

''(B) Notwithstanding subparagraph (A), the court shall, in a case in which subparagraph (A) applies, order the disclosure of the identity of any potential plaintiff to counsel for potential defendants upon the condition that counsel for potential defendants not disclose the identity of such potential plaintiff (other than to investigators or paralegals hired by such counsel), unless authorized in writing by such potential plaintiff's counsel or the court.

''(C) In a case in which paragraph (1) applies, counsel for potential defendants and the recipient or employee counsel of the recipient may execute an agreement, in lieu of seeking a court order under subparagraph (A), government disclosure of the identity of any potential plaintiff.

''(D) The court may punish as a contempt of court any violation of an order of the court under subparagraph (A) or (B)—or of an agreement under subparagraph (C).

''(4) Any funds received from a defendant by a recipient on behalf of a class of eligible clients shall be placed in an escrow account until the funds may be paid to such clients. Any such funds which are not disbursed to clients within one year of the date on which such funds were received shall be returned to the defendant.''.

SEC. 8. LOBBYING.

Section 1007(a)(5) (42 U.S.C. 2996f(a)(5)) is amended to read as follows:

''(5) ensure that no funds made available to recipients are used at any time, directly or indirectly—

''(A) to influence the issuance, amendment, or revocation of any executive order or similar promulgation by any Federal, State or local agency, or to undertake to influence the passage or defeat of any legislation by the Congress of the United States, or by any State or local legislative body, or State proposals made by initiative petition or referendum, except to the extent that a governmental agency, a legislative body, a committee, or a member thereof is considering a measure directly affecting the recipient or the Corporation;

''(B) to pay for any publicity or propaganda intended or designed to support or defeat legislation pending before the Congress or State or local legislative bodies or intended or designed to influence any decision by a Federal, State, or local agency;

''(C) to pay for any personal service, advertisement, telegram, telephone communications, letter, printed or written matter, or other device, intended or designed to influence any decision by a Federal, State, or local agency, except when legal assistance is provided by an employee of a recipient to an eligible client on a particular application, claim, or case, which directly involves the client's legal rights or responsibilities and which does not involve the issuance, amendment, or revocation of any agency promulgation described in subparagraph (A);

''(D) to pay for any personal service, advertisement, telegram, telephone communication, letter, printed or written matter, or any other device intended or designed to influence any Member of Congress or any other Federal, State, or local elected official—

''(i) to favor or oppose any referendum, initiative, constitutional amendment, or any similar procedures of the Congress, any State legislature, any local council, or any similar governing body acting in a legislative capacity,

''(ii) to favor or oppose an authorization or appropriation directly affecting the authority, function, or funding of the recipient or the Corporation, or

''(iii) to influence the conduct of oversight proceedings of a recipient or the Corporation; or

''(E) to pay for any personal service, advertisement, telegram, telephone communication, letter, printed or written matter, or any other device intended or designed to influence any Member of Congress or any other Federal, State, or local elected official to favor or oppose any Act, bill, resolution, or similar legislation;

and ensure that no funds made available to recipients are used to pay for any administrative or related costs associated with an activity prohibited in subparagraph (A), (B), (C), (D), or (E);''.

SEC. 9. TIMEKEEPING.

Section 1008(b) (42 U.S.C. 2996g(b)) is amended—

(1) by inserting ''(1)'' after ''(b)''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) The Corporation shall require each recipient to maintain records of time spent on the cases or matters with respect to which that recipient is engaged in activities. Pursuant to such requirements, each employee of such recipient who is an attorney or paralegal shall record, by the name of the case or matter, at the time such employee engages in an activity regarding such case or matter, the type (as defined by the Corporation) of case or matter, the time spent on the activity, and the source of funds to be charged for the activity.''.

SEC. 10. AUTHORITY OF LOCAL GOVERNING BOARDS.

Section 1007(c) (42 U.S.C. 2996f(c)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''(1)'' and ''(2)'' and inserting ''(A)'' and ''(B)'', respectively;

(2) by inserting ''(1)'' after ''(c)''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) The board of directors of any nonprofit organization that is—

''(A) chartered under the laws of one of the States, a purpose of which is furnishing legal assistance to eligible clients, and

''(B) receiving funds made available by or through the Corporation,

shall set specific priorities pursuant to section 1007(a)(2)(C) for the types of matters and cases to which the staff of the nonprofit organization shall devote its time and resources. The staff of such organization shall not undertake cases or matters other than in accordance with the specific priorities set by its board of directors, except in emergency situations defined by such board. The staff of such organization shall report, to the board of directors of the organization on a quarterly basis and to the Corporation on an annual basis, all cases undertaken other than in accordance with such priorities. The Corporation shall promulgate a suggested list of priorities which boards of directors may use in setting priorities under this paragraph.''.

SEC. 11. REGULATION OF NONPUBLIC RESOURCES.

Section 1010(c) (42 U.S.C. 2996i(c)) is amended to read as follows:

''(c)(1) Any non-Federal funds received by the Corporation, and any funds received by any recipient from any source other than the Corporation, shall be accounted for and reported as receipts and disbursements separate and distinct from Corporation funds. Any funds so received, including funds derived from Interest on Lawyers Trust Accounts, may not be expended by recipients for any purpose prohibited by this title or the Legal Services Reform Act of 1995. The Corporation shall not accept any non-Federal funds, and any recipient shall not accept funds from any source other than the Corporation, unless the Corporation or the recipient, as the case may be, notifies in writing the source of such funds that the funds may not be expended for any purpose prohibited by this title or the Legal Services Reform Act of 1995.

''(2) Paragraph (1) shall not prevent recipients from—

''(A) receiving Indian tribal funds (including funds from private nonprofit organizations for the benefit of Indians or Indian tribes) and expending them in accordance with the specific purposes for which they are provided; or

''(B) using funds received from a source other than the Corporation to provide legal assistance to a client who is not an eligible client if such funds are used for the specific purposes for which such funds were received, except that such funds may not be expended by recipients for any purpose prohibited by this title or the Legal Services Reform Act of 1995 (other than any requirement regarding the eligibility of clients).''.

SEC. 12. CERTAIN EVICTION PROCEEDINGS.

Section 1007 (42. U.S.C. 2996f), as amended by sections 6 and 7 of this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''(k)(1) No funds made available by or through the Corporation may be used for defending a person in a proceeding to evict that person from a public housing project if the person has been charged with the illegal sale or distribution of a controlled substance and if the eviction proceeding is brought by a public housing agency because the illegal drug activity of that person threatens the health or safety of other tenants residing in the public housing project or employees of the public housing agency.

''(2) As used in this subsection—

''(A) the term 'controlled substance' has the meaning given that term in section 102 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 802); and

''(B) the terms 'public housing project' and 'public housing agency' have the meanings given those terms in section 3 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437a).''.

SEC. 13. IMPLEMENTATION OF COMPETITION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1007 (42 U.S.C. 2996f), as amended by sections 6, 7, and 12 of this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''(l)(1) All grants and contracts awarded by the Corporation for the provision or support of legal assistance to eligible clients under this title shall be awarded under a competitive bidding system.

''(2) Rights under sections 1007(a)(9) and 1011 shall not apply to the termination or denial of financial assistance under this title as a result of the competitive award of any grant or contract under paragraph (1), and the expiration of any grant or contract under this title as a result of such competitive award shall not be treated as a termination or denial of refunding under section 1007(a)(9) or 1011.

''(3) For purposes of this subsection, the term 'competitive bidding' means a system established by regulations issued by the Corporation which provide for the award of grants and contracts on the basis of merit to persons, organizations, and entities described in section 1006(a) who apply for such awards in competition with others under promulgated criteria. The Corporation shall ensure that the system incorporates the following:

''(A) The competitive bidding system shall commence no later than one year after the date of enactment of this provision and all previously awarded grants and contracts shall be set aside and subjected to this system within one year thereafter.

''(B) All awards of grants and contracts made under this system shall be subject to periodic review and renewed with the opportunity for others to compete for the award, and in no event shall any award be granted for a period longer than 5 years.

''(C) Timely notice for the submission of applications for awards shall be published in periodicals of local and State bar associations and in at least one daily newspaper of general circulation in the area to be served by the award recipient.

''(D) The selection criteria shall include but not be limited to the demonstration of a full understanding of the basic legal needs of the eligible clients to be served and a demonstration of the capability of serving those needs; the reputations of the principals of the applicant; the quality, feasibility, and cost effectiveness of plans submitted by the applicant for the delivery of legal assistance to the eligible clients to be served; a demonstration of willingness to abide by the restrictions placed on those awarded grants and contracts by the Corporation; and, if an applicant has previously received an award from the Corporation, the experiences of the Corporation with the applicant.

''(E) No previous recipient of an award of a grant or contract may be given any preference.

''(m)(1) The Corporation shall define service areas and funds available for each service area shall be on a per capita basis pursuant to the number of poor people determined by the Bureau of the Census to be within that area. Funds for a service area may be distributed by the Corporation to one or more recipients as defined in section 1006(a).

''(2) The amount of the grants from the Corporation and of the contracts entered into by the Corporation under section 1006(a)(1) shall be an equal figure per poor person for all geographic areas, based on the most recent decennial census of population conducted pursuant to section 141 of title 13, United States Code, regardless of the level of funding for any such geographic area before the enactment of the Legal Services Reform Act of 1995.

''(3) Beginning with the fiscal year beginning after the results of the most recent decennial census have been reported to the President under section 141(b) of title 13, United States Code, funding of geographic areas served by recipients shall be redetermined, in accordance with paragraph (2), based on the per capita poverty population in each such geographic area under that decennial census.''.

(b) REQUIREMENTS OF RECIPIENTS.—Section 1007(c) (42 U.S.C. 2996f(c)), as amended by section 10 of this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''(3) Funds appropriated for the Corporation may not be used by the Corporation in making grants or entering into contracts for legal assistance unless the Corporation ensures that the recipient is either—

''(A) a private attorney or attorneys,

''(B) State and local governments or substate regional planning and coordination agencies which are composed of substate areas whose governing board is controlled by locally elected officials, or

''(C) a qualified nonprofit organization chartered under the laws of one of the States—

''(i) a purpose of which is furnishing legal assistance to eligible clients, and

''(ii) the majority of the board of directors or other governing body of which is comprised of attorneys who are admitted to practice in one of the States and are approved to serve on such board or body by the governing bodies of State, county, or municipal bar associations the membership of which represents a majority of the attorneys practicing law in the locality in which the organization is to provide legal assistance.

The approval described in subparagraph (B)(ii) may be given to more than one group of directors.''.

SEC. 14. POWERS, RESEARCH, AND ATTORNEYS' FEES.

(a) POWERS.—Section 1006(a)(1)(A)(ii) is amended to read as follows:

''(ii) State and local governments or substate regional planning and coordination agencies which are composed of substate areas whose governing board is controlled by locally elected officials,''.

(b) RESEARCH.—Section 1006(a) (42 U.S.C. 2996e(a)) is amended by inserting ''and'' at the end of paragraph (1), by striking ''; and'' at the end of paragraph (2) and inserting a period, and by striking paragraph (3).

(c) ATTORNEYS' FEES.—Section 1006 (42 U.S.C. 2996e(f)) is amended by striking subsection (f) and inserting the following:

''(f)(1) A recipient, or any client of such recipient, may not claim or collect attorneys' fees from nongovernmental parties to litigation initiated by such client with the assistance of such recipient.

''(2) The Corporation shall create a fund to pay defendants or clients under paragraphs (3). In addition to any other amounts appropriated to the Corporation, there is authorized to be appropriated to such fund for each fiscal year such sums as may be necessary.

''(3) If a Federal court has found an action commenced by a plaintiff with the assistance of a recipient involves a violation of Rule 11 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, or if the president of the Corporation finds that an action commenced by a plaintiff with the assistance of a recipient in any court involves a violation of the standards of Rule 11, or was commenced for the purpose of retaliation or harassment, the president of the Corporation shall, upon application by the defendant, award from the Fund all reasonable costs and attorneys' fees incurred by the defendant in defending the action.

''(g)(1) The Board, within 90 days after the date of the enactment of the Legal Services Reform Act of 1995, shall issue regulations to provide for the distribution of attorneys' fees received by a recipient, in accordance with paragraph (2).

''(2) Such fees shall be transferred to the Corporation and the Corporation shall distribute such fees among its grantees for the direct delivery of legal assistance, except that, subject to approval by the Corporation—

''(A) a recipient shall not be required to transfer fees or other compensation received as a result of a mandated court appointment;

''(B) a recipient may retain reasonable costs customarily allowed in litigation against an unsuccessful party; and

''(C) a recipient may retain the actual cost of bringing the action, including the proportion of the compensation of each attorney involved in the action which is attributable to that action.''.

SEC. 15. ABORTION.

(a) PROHIBITION.—Section 1007 (42 U.S.C. 2996f), as amended by sections 6, 7, 12, and 13 of this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''(n) No funds made available to any recipient from any source may be used to participate in any litigation with respect to abortion.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 1007(b) (42 U.S.C. 2996f(b)), as amended by section 4, is amended by striking paragraph (8) and redesignating paragraphs (9), (10), and (11) as paragraphs (8), (9), and (10), respectively.

SEC. 16. CLASS ACTIONS.

Section 1006(d)(5) (42 U.S.C. 2996e(d)(5)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''No'' and inserting ''(A) Subject to subparagraph (B), no''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(B) No recipient or employee of a recipient may bring a class action suit against the Federal Government or any State or local government unless—

''(i) the governing body of the recipient has expressly approved the filing of such an action;

''(ii) the class relief which is the subject of such an action is sought for the primary benefit of individuals who are eligible for legal assistance under this title; and

''(iii) before filing such an action, the project director of the recipient determines that the government entity is not likely to change the policy or practice in question, that the policy or practice will continue to adversely affect eligible clients, that the recipient has given notice of its intention to seek class relief, and that responsible efforts to resolve without litigation the adverse effects of the policy or practice have not been successful or would be adverse to the interest of the clients.''.

SEC. 17. RESTRICTIONS ON USE OF FUNDS FOR LEGAL ASSISTANCE TO ALIENS.

Section 1007 (42 U.S.C. 2996f), as amended by sections 6, 7, 12, 13, and 15 of this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''(o) No funds made available to any recipient from any source may be expended to provide legal assistance for or on behalf of any alien unless the alien is present in the United States and is—

''(1) an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence as defined in section 101(a)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(20));

''(2) an alien who is either married to a United States citizen or is a parent or an unmarried child under the age of 21 years of such a citizen and who has filed an application for adjustment of status to permanent resident under the Immigration and Nationality Act, and such application has not been rejected;

''(3) an alien who is lawfully present in the United States pursuant to an admission under section 207 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1157, relating to refugee admissions) or who has been granted asylum by the Attorney General under such Act;

''(4) an alien who is lawfully present in the United States as a result of the Attorney General's withholding of deportation pursuant to section 243(h) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1253(h)); or

''(5) an alien to whom section 305 of the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986 applies, but only to the extent that the legal assistance provided is that described in that section.

An alien who is lawfully present in the United States as a result of being granted conditional entry pursuant to section 203(a)(7) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 11553(a)(7)) before April 1, 1980, because of persecution or fear of persecution on account of race, religion, or political opinion or because of being uprooted by catastrophic natural calamity shall be deemed to be an alien described in paragraph (3).''.

SEC. 18. TRAINING.

Section 1007(b)(6) (42 U.S.C. 2996f(b)(6)) is amended to read as follows:

''(6) to support or conduct training programs for the purpose of advocating particular public policies or encouraging political activities, labor or antilabor activities, boycotts, picketing, strikes, or demonstrations, including the dissemination of information about such policies or activities, except that this paragraph shall not be construed to prohibit the training of attorneys or paralegal personnel necessary to prepare them to provide adequate legal assistance to eligible clients, to advise any eligible client as to the nature of the legislative process, or to inform any eligible client of the client's rights under any statute, order, or regulation;''.

SEC. 19. COPAYMENTS.

Section 1007 (42 U.S.C. 2996f), as amended by sections 6, 7, 12, 13, 15, and 17 of this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''(p) The Corporation shall undertake one or more demonstration projects in order to study the feasibility of using client copayments to assist in setting the service priorities of its programs. Based on these projects and such other information as it considers appropriate, the Corporation may adopt a permanent system of client copayments for some or all of its programs of legal assistance.''.

SEC. 20. FEE-GENERATING CASES.

(a) REPRESENTATION IN FEE-GENERATING CASE.—Paragraph (1) of section 1007(b) (42 U.S.C. 2996f(b)) is amended to read as follows:

''(1) to provide legal assistance with respect to any fee-generating case, except that this paragraph does not preclude representation of otherwise eligible clients in cases in which the client seeks benefits under titles II or XVI of the Social Security Act;''.

(b) DEFINITION.—Section 1007(b) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''For purposes of paragraph (1), the term 'fee-generating case' means any case which if undertaken on behalf of an eligible client by an attorney in private practice may reasonably be expected to result in a fee for legal services from an award to a client from public funds, from the opposing party, or from any other source.''.

SEC. 21. WELFARE REFORM.

Section 1007(b) (42 U.S.C. 2996f(b)), as amended by section 15(b), is amended—

(1) by striking ''or'' at the end of paragraph (9),

(2) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (10) and inserting a semicolon, and

(3) by adding after paragraph (10) the following:

''(11) to provide legal representation for any person or participate in any other way in litigation, lobbying, or rulemaking involving efforts to reform a State or Federal welfare system, except that this paragraph does not preclude a recipient from representing an individual client who seeking specific relief from a welfare agency where such relief does not involve an effort to amend or otherwise challenge existing law; or''.

SEC. 22. PRISONER LITIGATION.

Section 1007(b) (42 U.S.C. 2996f(b)), as amended by section 21, is amended by adding after paragraph (11) the following:

''(12) to provide legal representation in litigation on behalf of a local, State, or Federal prisoner.''.

SEC. 23. APPOINTMENT OR CORPORATION PRESIDENT.

Section 1005 (42 U.S.C. 2996d) is amended in subsection (a)—

(1) by striking ''The Board shall'' and inserting ''The President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall'';

(2) by adding ''who shall serve at the pleasure of the President'' after ''the president of the Corporation,'';

(3) by striking ''as the Board'' and inserting ''as the President''; and

(4) by striking ''by the Board'' and inserting ''by the President''.

SEC. 24. EVASION.

The Legal Services Corporation Act is amended—

(1) by redesignating sections 1013 and 1014 as sections 1014 and 1015, respectively; and

(2) by inserting after section 1012 the following new section:

''EVASION

''SEC. 1013. Any attempt, such as the creation or use of 'alternative corporations', to avoid or otherwise evade the provisions of this title or the Legal Services Reform Act of 1995 is prohibited.''.

SEC. 25. PAY FOR OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE CORPORATION.

Section 1005(d) (42 U.S.C. 2996d(d)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''V'' and inserting ''III''; and

(2) by striking ''5316'' and inserting ''3514''.

SEC. 26. LOCATION OF PRINCIPAL OFFICE.

Section 1003(b) (42 U.S.C. 2996b(b)) is amended by striking ''District of Columbia''

and inserting ''Washington D.C. metropolitan area''.

SEC. 27. DEFINITION.

As used in section 1009(d) of Legal Services Corporation Act, the term ''attorney client privilege'' protects only a communication made in confidence to an attorney by a client for the purpose of seeking legal advice. Claims of such privilege and claims of confidentiality do not, except to the extent provided by court order, protect from disclosure to any Federal department or agency that is auditing the activities of the Legal Services Corporation or any recipient (as defined in section 1002 of the Legal Services Corporation Act), or to any auditor receiving Federal funds to conduct such auditing, including any auditor or monitor of the Corporation, the names of plaintiffs that are a matter of public record or documents which have been seen by third parties, including all financial books and records. The Corporation shall not disclose any such information, except to the Inspector General of the Corporation, to Federal or State law enforcement, judicial, or other officials, or to officials of appropriate bar associations for the purpose of conducting investigations of violations of rules of professional conduct.●

By Mr. FAIRCLOTH:

S. 1222. A bill to prevent the creation of an international bailout fund within the International Monetary Fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND LEGISLATION

● Mr. FAIRCLOTH. Mr. President, I have spoken on a number of occasions in opposition to the United States bailout of Mexico. To date, the United States has provided $12.5 billion for Mexico to prop up the Mexican peso. I remain skeptical that the United States will ever have this money repaid.

The Banking Committee held hearings approximately 2 months ago in which a number of Mexican citizens, some of them prominent political opposition leaders, said that we would never be repaid.

What is particularly bothersome about the Mexico debacle is that the United States taxpayer is guaranteeing repayment to investors in Mexican bonds who at the time were earning extraordinary returns, some 30 percent to 40 percent on Mexico bonds. These investors were aware of the risks.

As a reponse to this crisis, the administration, along with the International Monetary Fund [IMF], is now considering the establishment of an international fund to bail out other countries that find themselves in the same position as Mexico. The administration calls this an Emergency Financing Mechanism—but the truth is that it's another bailout on an international scale.

The most troubling aspect of this is that the new fund will create a moral hazard for other countries. What will stop a country from pursuing reckless economic policies, from going deeper into debt—knowing that if they fail, the newly created fund stands ready for a bailout. What will prevent investors from investing in the most risky Government bonds—with full knowledge that the IMF stands ready for an emergency bailout.

I think this is a bad idea, and I think the United States and the International Monetary Fund [IMF] should abandon further discussions about its creation.

Unfortunately, I am not sure this administration will back away from this proposal. For this reason, I am introducing legislation today that will stop the creation of any new international bailout fund.

The bill will prevent any funds from being used, directly or indirectly, for the creation of this new international fund.

Mr. President, our own country is going into debt approximately $800 million a day. We simply cannot afford to be bailing out foreign countries that have pursued poor economic policies. It is bad enough that we have spent $12.5 billion on Mexico. After this, we should say no more to Mexico, and no more to any other country.

If the United States keeps up this spending pattern, who is going to bail out this country? We sent a troubling signal to the world that we were not going to get our economic house in order when the Senate refused to pass a balanced budget amendment, and the dollar declined as a result. I know for certain that we will never balance the budget if we continue policies like bailing out Mexico.

Mr. President, in conclusion, if the United States is serious about balancing our budget—and about avoiding other debacles like Mexico, we will move quickly to stop the creation of this new fund. I would urge the Senate to move forward on this legislation.●

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 356

At the request of Mr. SHELBY, the name of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] was added as a cosponsor of S. 356, a bill to amend title 4, United States Code, to declare English as the official language of the Government of the United States.

S. 434

At the request of Mr. KOHL, the name of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. COCHRAN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 434, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the deductibility of business meal expenses for individuals who are subject to Federal limitations on hours of service.

S. 490

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. INHOFE] was added as a cosponsor of S. 490, a bill to amend the Clean Air Act to exempt agriculture-related facilities from certain permitting requirements, and for other purposes.

S. 772

At the request of Mrs. HUTCHISON, the name of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBB] was added as a cosponsor of S. 772, a bill to provide for an assessment of the violence broadcast on television, and for other purposes.

S. 955

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BRADLEY] was added as a cosponsor of S. 955, a bill to clarify the scope of coverage and amount of payment under the medicare program of items and services associated with the use in the furnishing of inpatient hospital services of certain medical devices approved for investigational use.

S. 1000

At the request of Mr. BURNS, the names of the Senator from Texas [Mrs. HUTCHISON], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. BROWN], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. LUGAR] were added as cosponsors of S. 1000, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that the depreciation rules which apply for regular tax purposes shall also apply for alternative minimum tax purposes, to allow a portion of the tentative minimum tax to be offset by the minimum tax credit, and for other purposes.

S. 1009

At the request of Mr. D'AMATO, the name of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BRYAN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1009, a bill to prohibit the fraudulent production, sale, transportation, or possession of fictitious items purporting to be valid financial instruments of the United States, foreign governments, States, political subdivisions, or private organizations, to increase the penalties for counterfeiting violations, and for other purposes.

S. 1025

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, his name was withdrawn as a cosponsor of S. 1025, a bill to provide for the exchange of certain federally owned lands and mineral interests therein, and for other purposes.

S. 1028

At the request of Mrs. KASSEBAUM, the name of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1028, a bill to provide increased access to health care benefits, to provide increased portability of health care benefits, to provide increased security of health care benefits, to increase the purchasing power of individuals and small employers, and for other purposes.

SENATE RESOLUTION 133

At the request of Mr. HELMS, the name of the Senator from Montana [Mr. BURNS] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Resolution 133, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the primary safeguard for the well-being and protection of children is the family, and that, because the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child could undermine the rights of the family, the President should not sign and transmit it to the Senate.

SENATE RESOLUTION 149

At the request of Mr. AKAKA, the name of the Senator from Utah [Mr.