

size fits all" approach that is so often associated with federal government programs.

It is my hope that using the extension model, educational technology centers would represent a public-private partnership with the participation of universities, the private sector, state and local governments, and the federal agencies. In this spirit of partnership, the federal share of funding would be limited to 50 percent, thereby ensuring that all stakeholders would have a financial incentive to making the ETU Centers successful.

Once an ETU Center is established, it will be able to tailor its activities to local needs, and, more importantly, to share ETU Center expertise and experience with local schools. For example, activities may include teacher training for new technologies, or integrating the school's existing technology infrastructure into their curriculum; advising teachers, administrators and school boards on criteria for acquisition, utilization, and support of educational technologies; and advising K-12 schools on the skills required by local industry.

Given our rapidly changing economy, it is vital that both teachers and students not only be comfortable with the leading technologies of today, but also receive periodic training to ensure their ability to teach the next generation of technologies. I am confident this legislation will accomplish both of these important goals, as well as help students develop those skills in demand by industries increasingly reliant on technology.

I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

TRIBUTE TO POLICE CHIEF PETER
W. STEPHAN

HON. DAVE CAMP

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 1, 1999

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to an honorable and noble public servant from Grayling, Mich., Police Chief Peter W. Stephan.

After 41 years of dedicated service, Chief Stephan is retiring. A Grayling native, he began his distinguished career in 1958 as a patrolman for the city. After 14 years, he was promoted to police chief in 1972, marking the beginning of his 27-year tenure.

During his remarkable career, Chief Stephan has held numerous positions of honor including: serving as a member and past president of the Michigan Association of Chiefs of Police, serving as member and president of the Northern Michigan Association of Chiefs of Police, member of the Environmental Crimes Committee, and a member of the Michigan Association of Chiefs of Police Legislative Committee.

Chief Stephan was also instrumental in creating the Crawford County Drug Lab and the Michigan State Police Crime Lab in Grayling.

The achievements and duration of Chief Stephan's career speak for themselves. He is a dedicated community leader, committed to serving and protecting the people of Grayling, ensuring that his city is not just safe, but serves as a model for other communities in Michigan.

Chief Stephan is a shining example of excellence of whom Grayling residents can be

proud. His career is a point of pride for the people of Grayling, who can look to him as an example of a public servant with dignity, pride and exemplary service.

Mr. Speaker, please join me, his family, friends and colleagues in congratulating him.

INTRODUCTION OF THE WORKER
PAYCHECK FAIRNESS ACT

HON. WILLIAM F. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 1, 1999

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the Worker Paycheck Fairness Act. The bill provides a workable, reasonable mechanism for dealing with the issue of organized labor taking dues money from rank-and-file union members—from members who have to pay dues or they cannot keep their jobs. The legislation in no way changes the manner in which unions can spend money, it simply provides union workers the dignity of being able to give their up-front consent to their union before funds having nothing to do with collective bargaining are taken out of their paychecks.

In the six hearings my Committee held the past few Congresses on the issue of compulsory union dues, we heard from worker after worker telling us about the one thing they each want from their union: the basic respect of being asked for permission before the union spends their money for purposes unrelated to labor-management obligations. Most of these employees were upset over finding out their hard-earned dollars were being funneled into political causes or candidates they did not support. However, most of these workers supported their union and still overwhelmingly believe in the value of organized labor. A number of witnesses were stewards in their union. All they wanted was to be able to give their consent before their union spent their money for activities falling outside collective bargaining and which subvert their deeply held ideas and convictions.

The Worker Paycheck Fairness Act, similar to legislation reported to the House last Congress after passing my Committee on Education and the Workforce by voice vote, simply gives workers this right to give their permission and the right to know how their money is spent. This legislation creates a new, federal right implementing the spirit of the Supreme Court's 1988 Beck decision.

In Beck, the Court held that workers cannot be required to pay for activities beyond legitimate union functions. After hearing testimony from dozens of witnesses, including 14 rank-and-file workers, it is clear to the Committee that Beck rights have remained illusory. The witnesses described problems with lack of notice, the necessity under current law of resigning from the union, procedural hurdles, and notably, the incredible indignities they often endure, including harassment, stonewalling, coercion, and intimidation, when they attempt to exercise their rights granted under Beck.

This legislation applies only where unions require workers to pay dues as a condition of keeping their jobs. This mandate is called a "union security agreement," and such agreements are currently legal in 29 states. Simply put, a union security agreement forces a work-

er to pay an agency fee to the union, or the worker has no right to work. This bill is necessary, Mr. Speaker, because unions are taking money from the pockets of employees working under such security agreements and spending it on activities having nothing to do with a union's legitimate activities.

In addition to requiring consent, the Worker Paycheck Fairness Act requires employers whose employees are represented by a union to post a notice telling workers of their right under this legislation to give their consent. It also amends the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 to ensure that workers will know what their money is being spent on. Under this change, unions would have to report expenses by "functional classification" on the LM-forms they are currently required to file annually with the Department of Labor. This change was proposed by the Bush administration in 1992 but eliminated by the Clinton administration.

This legislation also puts real enforcement into place, as those whose rights are violated would be entitled to double damages and attorney's fees and costs—similar to relief available under the Family and Medical Leave Act. Finally, Mr. Speaker, the bill includes a common employment law provision making it illegal for a union to retaliate against or coerce anyone exercising his or her consent rights. This applies to all employees—union members and non-members alike—and under the provision, a union may not discriminate against any worker for giving, or not giving, their consent.

This bill is all the more necessary, Mr. Speaker, because there are those in Congress who are pushing campaign finance reform legislation which purports to codify Beck, but which actually represents a step backwards for working men and women.

Section 501 of the Shays/Meehan reform bill, H.R. 417, entitled "Codification of Beck Decision," does nothing of the sort. Section 501 is a sugar-coated placebo that diminishes the Beck decision and does nothing to correct the current injustices in our federal labor law relating to unions' use of their members' hard-earned paychecks. My Committee's many hearings have shown that the current law in this area does not work because it does not adequately protect workers. A close reading of Section 501 shows not only that the provision does not codify Beck, but that it is in fact a step backwards from codifying current law. Section 501 is so favorable to unions that organized labor could not have done a better job drafting it themselves.

First, Section 501 provides absolutely no notice of rights to members of the union—it applies only to non-members. Second, Section 501 redefines the dues payments that may be objected to, by limiting such to "expenditures in connection with a Federal, State, or local election or in connection with efforts to influence legislation unrelated to collective bargaining." This definition not only infers that there may be other types of political expenditures to which workers cannot object—a perversion of Beck—but it also ignores Beck's holding that workers may object to any dues payments for any union activities not directly related to collective bargaining activities. Section 501 would cut back even further on the already illusory rights workers supposedly have today under Beck.

If Congress is truly going to try to deal with the issue of organized labor taking dues