

and conditions of any existing right-of-way, easement, lease, license, or permit on lands transferred by subsection (a), except that such lands shall be administered by the Forest Service. Reissuance of any authorization shall be in accordance with the laws and regulations generally applying to the Forest Service, and the change of jurisdiction over such lands resulting from the enactment of this Act shall not constitute a ground for the denial of renewal or reissuance of such authorization.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 1874, the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1220

#### SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EVERETT). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

#### RESTRICTIONS ON POLITICAL ADVOCACY MISGUIDED AND MISPLACED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, later this week the House will take up consideration of the appropriations bill for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services and Education. I want to call my colleagues' attention to the fact that not included in this appropriations bill are some 13 pages of legislation, something we are not supposed to do on appropriations bills.

The topic of this 13-page legislative provision is "Political Advocacy." It flies directly in the face of the first amendment to the Constitution which says that this body, the Congress, shall make no law concerning free speech, freedom of association, or the right to petition the Government. But that is precisely what this 13-page piece of legislation, buried in this appropriations bill, will do.

Mr. Speaker, the subtitle of this title says, "Prohibition on the Use of Federal Funds for Political Advocacy." As it happens, of course, that is already illegal. The real sweep of this legislative proposal has very little to do with Federal funds. What it does have to do with is your use of your own funds. Every single American citizen, non-profit organization, recipient of a Fed-

eral research grant likely is going to be swept into the impact of this incredible and chilling piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, if you look at the definition of "political advocacy," which is one of the principal operative concepts in this bill, it includes virtually everything that you might have thought was protected speech under the first amendment to the Constitution. Even an inkind contribution to a political campaign; even the purchase of something that has nothing to do with politics, if the person or the organization you are purchasing it from happens to have used more than 15 percent of its resources on political advocacy. Again, political advocacy includes just about anything having to do with trying to affect the political debate in this country not just at the Federal level, but at the State and local levels as well.

Mr. Speaker, the other principal concept that makes this such an overarching and intrusive provision has to do with the definition of grant, because it is only grantees, recipients of grants, that are swept into this new regime of accounting for political speech. But again, if you look at the definition of grant, it is not just what you might think in a commonsensical way; that is, the provision of funds to somebody directly from the Federal Government. No, it is much broader than that. It includes anything of value provided, not given, but provided, to any person or organization.

So if you consider, as absurd as it may seem, that this political advocacy restriction applies to anyone who gets a grant, it will impact, for instance, the following kinds of people: Disaster victims getting emergency housing assistance grants; nurses who may have received a national research service award; low-income tenants receiving section 8 housing grants; researchers receiving money from the National Institutes of Health or the National Science Foundation; and, Indian tribes. Now, State and local governments are excluded, but not Indian tribes, for instance, getting grants for economic development activities.

So it is incredibly far reaching and intrusive, and it not only affects what you can do with public money, but it affects what you can do with your own money. If you fall into this trap, and almost all of us will, you could not spend more than 5 percent of your own money on any of these political advocacy activities, State, Federal, local, anything at all, or you would be disqualified from getting any kind of Federal grant, again broadly defined, over a period of 5 years.

Mr. MILLER of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SKAGGS. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MILLER of California. I thank the gentleman for taking his time in pointing out what is an incredible amendment to the bill that we will be asked to vote on.

Mr. Speaker, let me ask the gentleman from Colorado a question. As

the gentleman just described it, as I understand it, if you are a big farmer in the central valley of California and you are receiving a water subsidy, or you are a timber company and you are receiving hundreds of millions of dollars in subsidies in road building or water subsidies, or if you are a mining company and you have received land under a grant from the Federal Government, or if you are an oil company and you are receiving royalty subsidies or tax subsidies, you can come here and lobby all you want to increase those subsidies, to reduce them or to change the law. But if you are a public interest group and you have received any Federal money, you then have a limitation on money that you have privately raised or the private sector has participated with you; is that correct?

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, actually, this goes even farther and includes some of the groups that the gentleman from California mentioned.

Now, it would not affect defense contractors, for instance, but the way I read it, somebody getting Burec water at a subsidized rate would indeed be swept under the provisions of this proposal.

#### PROTECTING AMERICAN WORKERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, later this week the House will be considering the Labor and Health and Human Services appropriations bill, and this bill will have provisions in it that really punish working Americans and working families in this country.

We now believe that when we send a member of our family out into the workplace in this country, that they have a reasonable expectation, and we have a reasonable expectation, that our children or our spouse will go to work in a relatively safe workplace, and that that workplace will meet certain standards as to its obligations to members of our family as they go to work.

Mr. Speaker, that is because of OSHA and the laws of general duty and obligations that says, an employer has an obligation to provide a safe workplace, but also because of the many standards that OSHA has developed to make the construction trades safer; that make the mining industry, in the case of MSHA, safer; that make the chemical industry safer, and it has made the petroleum industry safer, throughout the American economy. We have done this all at the same time that productivity has increased dramatically in this country.

So it is not to suggest that OSHA, as others have, that somehow they have to be curtailed because they curtail productivity, because there is just no evidence that that is in fact the case.