

aircraft with it, being able to attack mobile targets and also go after Scud launchers, that is a new capability that only the B-2 would have. To me this kind of revolutionary conventional capability is exactly what the country needs.

So I hope my colleagues tomorrow will defeat the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] to take out the money for the B-2. I believe that this Stealth bomber is exactly what we need for the future, and I urge my colleagues to continue to support this important weapons system as we did on the defense authorization bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EVERETT). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. THURMAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mrs. THURMAN addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California [Ms. LOFGREN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. LOFGREN addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

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

[Mr. LEWIS of Georgia addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 4 p.m.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 4 p.m.

□ 1600

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington) at 4 p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF THE AMENDMENT PROCESS FOR THE INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1996

(Mr. SOLOMON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purposes of making an announcement.

The Rules Committee is planning to meet tomorrow, September 7, to report a rule for the consideration of H.R.

1655, the Intelligence Authorization Act for fiscal year 1996.

The chairman of the Intelligence Committee has requested a rule which would require that amendments be preprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. If this request is granted, and I believe it will be, amendments to be preprinted would need to be signed by the Member and submitted at the Speaker's table.

The amendments would still need to be consistent with House rules and would be given no special protection by being printed.

Members should use the Office of Legislative Counsel to ensure that their amendments are properly drafted and should check with the Office of the Parliamentarian to be certain their amendments comply with the rules of the House.

It is not necessary to submit amendments to the Rules Committee or to testify as long as the amendments comply with the House rules.

SUNDRY MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Edwin Thomas, one of his secretaries.

WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 1854, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 206 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 206

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 1854) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes. All points of order against the conference report and against its consideration are waived.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. DIAZ-BALART] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded as for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring forth the first of the 13 appropriations bills that has made it through the conference process. This rule is very simple—it merely waives points of order against the consideration of the conference report. Specifically, the rule contains waivers for three items that go beyond the scope of the conference, thereby waiving clause 3 of rule XXVIII. There are also a few legislative

items which necessitate a waiver of clause 2 of rule XX.

There was very little discussion at the hearing to grant the rule and I do not believe there should be much controversy surrounding it.

Before the district work period, I read press accounts that the President may be considering a veto of this conference report, not because he disagrees with any of its substance, but rather because it is the first of the necessary 13 spending measures to reach his desk, and he may, apparently, wish to protest against some other bills that he does not have substantive objections to.

I think that action by the President would be very unfortunate—but we need to proceed with the responsibilities that we have, like passing the appropriations bills. And with this bill we are setting the example of moving toward a balanced budget by reducing our own budget first. As a Member of Congress who serves on both of the Speaker-appointed committees, and in my role on the Committee on House Oversight, I am very proud of the reforms achieved in H.R. 1854 and retained in this conference report, based on the recommendations by House Oversight. We had some tough choices to make, but getting our own House in order and cutting our own budget was a necessary and important first step in the long and difficult road toward achieving a balanced Federal budget.

Mr. Speaker, as you will recall from the House's consideration of this bill in June, H.R. 1854 incorporates House Oversight plans to greatly reform the internal workings of the House of Representatives, and over the next few months alone, save the taxpayers \$7 million by streamlining operations. This bill is below the subcommittee's 602(B) allocation and is over 8 percent below last year's spending level. Additionally, H.R. 1854 eliminates, consolidates and reduces, and paves the way for the privatization of some functions that may be less costly when performed by the private sector.

I would like to commend Chairman THOMAS, Chairman PACKARD, Ranking Member FAZIO and of course Chairman LIVINGSTON, for their excellent work in bringing this conference report forward.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 206 is necessary to preserve the agreements reached in conference on legislative branch appropriations I urge adoption of both the rule and the conference report.

RULE FOR LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATION CONFERENCE REPORT SPECIFIC WAIVERS INCLUDED IN THE GENERAL WAIVER

ITEMS BEYOND THE SCOPE OF CONFERENCE (CLAUSE 3, RULE XXVIII)

Amendment #10 adds new features to the Senate proposal for 60 days of severance pay for employees of the Office of Technology Assessment (OTA), such as entitlement to health benefits. The House had no comparable provision.

Amendment #34 includes a provision directing the Public Printer to propose a

means to create cost incentives for publishing agencies, including Congress, to migrate from print-on paper products to electronic format. This is a different approach from that recommended by the House. There was no Senate provision on this subject.

Amendment #55 drops a Senate provision regarding reductions in facility energy costs. There was no comparable House provision. Then three new provisions were inserted as follows: (1) to specify the law enforcement authority of the House Sergeant at Arms, (2) to clarify existing authority of the Committee on House Oversight to consolidate representational allowances of House Members, and (3) to establish an account to pay settlements under the Congressional Accountability Act and to require that specified Congressional agencies submit proposals to reduce facility energy costs.

LEGISLATIVE ITEMS ON AN APPROPRIATION CONFERENCE REPORT (CLAUSE 2, RULE XX)—EXAMPLE

Amendment #10 establishes a new procedure for the phase out of OTA employees.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, while I may not agree with the priorities established in the conference report to accompany the fiscal year 1996 legislative branch appropriation, I support this rule. I will, however, oppose the previous question.

As we have in years past, the Committee on Rules has recommended a rule which waives all points of order against the consideration of the conference report. The Democratic members of the Rules Committee concur that these waivers should be granted.

Mr. Speaker, I am concerned that the conference report is penny wise and pound foolish with regard to the continued existence of the Office of Technology Assessment. We all agree that every part of the Government needs to be carefully examined and subjected to cuts, it does not make a great deal of sense to me to abolish a congressional support agency which has provided us with invaluable information about science and technology. The work of the OTA has been supported on a bipartisan basis, and in fact, in July, the House voted 228 to 201 to continue the functions of this agency. Yet, the conference agreement contains a provision which terminates OTA. It is my view the abolition of such an information source is really counterproductive and the loss of this office will be one we in the Congress will live to regret.

Mr. Speaker, while I support this rule, I will support the proposition of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BRYANT] to defeat the previous question in order to allow the House to consider lobby reform and a gift ban. As we all know, the Senate has now adopted such a ban and it is high time that the House be afforded an opportunity to vote on this good government issue. This proposition is identical to the Senate passed lobby reform and gift ban adapted to apply to House rules. The Bryant proposal is not anything new and different, it is merely an opportunity to do for the House what the

Senate has already wisely and prudently imposed upon themselves. For that reason, I will support Mr. BRYANT and his proposed amendment to this rule.

I would ask that the amendment to the rule be printed in the RECORD at this point. The amendment would adopt the text of a concurrent resolution providing lobby and gift reform, and I would ask that the text of House Concurrent Resolution 99 also be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The material referred to is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO RULE ON H.R. 1854

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH CONFERENCE REPORT

"Section 2. Upon the adoption of this resolution, the House shall be considered to have adopted a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 99) directing the Clerk of the House to correct the enrollment of H.R. 1854.

"Section 3. The Clerk of the House of Representatives shall not send to the Senate a message informing the Senate of the adoption by the House of the conference report on H.R. 1854 until the House receives a message from the Senate informing the House of the adoption of a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 99) directing the Clerk of the House to correct the enrollment of H.R. 1854."

H. CON. RES. 99

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That in the enrollment of the bill (H.R. 1854) entitled, "An Act making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes", the Clerk of the House shall make the following correction:

At the end of title III add the following:

TITLE IV—LOBBYING DISCLOSURE

SEC. 401. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the "Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995".

SEC. 402. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds that—

(1) responsible representative Government requires public awareness of the efforts of paid lobbyists to influence the public decisionmaking process in both the legislative and executive branches of the Federal Government;

(2) existing lobbying disclosure statutes have been ineffective because of unclear statutory language, weak administrative and enforcement provisions, and an absence of clear guidance as to who is required to register and what they are required to disclose; and

(3) the effective public disclosure of the identity and extent of the efforts of paid lobbyists to influence Federal officials in the conduct of Government actions will increase public confidence in the integrity of Government.

SEC. 403. DEFINITIONS.

As used in this title:

(1) AGENCY.—The term "agency" has the meaning given that term in section 551(1) of title 5, United States Code.

(2) CLIENT.—The term "client" means any person or entity that employs or retains another person for financial or other compensation to conduct lobbying activities on behalf of that person or entity. A person or entity whose employees act as lobbyists on its own behalf is both a client and an employer of such employees. In the case of a coalition or association that employs or retains other persons to conduct lobbying activities, the client is the coalition or association and not its individual members.

(3) COVERED EXECUTIVE BRANCH OFFICIAL.—The term "covered executive branch official" means—

(A) the President;

(B) the Vice President;

(C) any officer or employee, or any other individual functioning in the capacity of such an officer or employee, in the Executive Office of the President;

(D) any officer or employee serving in a position in level I, II, III, IV, or V of the Executive Schedule, as designated by statute or Executive order;

(E) any member of the uniformed services whose pay grade is at or above O-7 under section 201 of title 37, United States Code; and

(F) any officer or employee serving in a position of a confidential, policy-determining, policy-making, or policy-advocating character described in section 7511(b)(2) of title 5, United States Code.

(4) COVERED LEGISLATIVE BRANCH OFFICIAL.—The term "covered legislative branch official" means—

(A) a Member of Congress;

(B) an elected officer of either House of Congress;

(C) any employee of, or any other individual functioning in the capacity of an employee of—

(i) a Member of Congress;

(ii) a committee of either House of Congress;

(iii) the leadership staff of the House of Representatives or the leadership staff of the Senate;

(iv) a joint committee of Congress; and

(v) a working group or caucus organized to provide legislative services or other assistance to Members of Congress; and

(D) any other legislative branch employee serving in a position described under section 109(13) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.).

(5) EMPLOYEE.—The term "employee" means any individual who is an officer, employee, partner, director, or proprietor of a person or entity, but does not include—

(A) independent contractors; or

(B) volunteers who receive no financial or other compensation from the person or entity for their services.

(6) FOREIGN ENTITY.—The term "foreign entity" means a foreign principal (as defined in section 1(b) of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938 (22 U.S.C. 611(b))).

(7) LOBBYING ACTIVITIES.—The term "lobbying activities" means lobbying contacts and efforts in support of such contacts, including preparation and planning activities, research and other background work that is intended, at the time it is performed, for use in contacts, and coordination with the lobbying activities of others.

(8) LOBBYING CONTACT.—

(A) DEFINITION.—The term "lobbying contact" means any oral or written communication (including an electronic communication) to a covered executive branch official or a covered legislative branch official that is made on behalf of a client with regard to—

(i) the formulation, modification, or adoption of Federal legislation (including legislative proposals);

(ii) the formulation, modification, or adoption of a Federal rule, regulation, Executive order, or any other program, policy, or position of the United States Government;

(iii) the administration or execution of a Federal program or policy (including the negotiation, award, or administration of a Federal contract, grant, loan, permit, or license); or

(iv) the nomination or confirmation of a person for a position subject to confirmation by the Senate.

(B) EXCEPTIONS.—The term "lobbying contact" does not include a communication that is—

(i) made by a public official acting in the public official's official capacity;

(ii) made by a representative of a media organization if the purpose of the communication is gathering and disseminating news and information to the public;

(iii) made in a speech, article, publication or other material that is distributed and made available to the public, or through radio, television, cable television, or other medium of mass communication;

(iv) made on behalf of a government of a foreign country or a foreign political party and disclosed under the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938 (22 U.S.C. 611 et seq.);

(v) a request for a meeting, a request for the status of an action, or any other similar administrative request, if the request does not include an attempt to influence a covered executive branch official or a covered legislative branch official;

(vi) made in the course of participation in an advisory committee subject to the Federal Advisory Committee Act;

(vii) testimony given before a committee, subcommittee, or task force of the Congress, or submitted for inclusion in the public record of a hearing conducted by such committee, subcommittee, or task force;

(viii) information provided in writing in response to an oral or written request by a covered executive branch official or a covered legislative branch official for specific information;

(ix) required by subpoena, civil investigative demand, or otherwise compelled by statute, regulation, or other action of the Congress or an agency;

(x) made in response to a notice in the Federal Register, Commerce Business Daily, or other similar publication soliciting communications from the public and directed to the agency official specifically designated in the notice to receive such communications;

(xi) not possible to report without disclosing information, the unauthorized disclosure of which is prohibited by law;

(xii) made to an official in an agency with regard to—

(I) a judicial proceeding or a criminal or civil law enforcement inquiry, investigation, or proceeding; or

(II) a filing or proceeding that the Government is specifically required by statute or regulation to maintain or conduct on a confidential basis,

if that agency is charged with responsibility for such proceeding, inquiry, investigation, or filing;

(xiii) made in compliance with written agency procedures regarding an adjudication conducted by the agency under section 554 of title 5, United States Code, or substantially similar provisions;

(xiv) a written comment filed in the course of a public proceeding or any other communication that is made on the record in a public proceeding;

(xv) a petition for agency action made in writing and required to be a matter of public record pursuant to established agency procedures;

(xvi) made on behalf of an individual with regard to that individual's benefits, employment, or other personal matters involving only that individual, except that this clause does not apply to any communication with—

(I) a covered executive branch official, or

(II) a covered legislative branch official (other than the individual's elected Members of Congress or employees who work under such Members' direct supervision),

with respect to the formulation, modification, or adoption of private legislation for the relief of that individual;

(xvii) a disclosure by an individual that is protected under the amendments made by the Whistleblower Protection Act of 1989,

under the Inspector General Act of 1978, or under another provision of law;

(xviii) made by—

(I) a church, its integrated auxiliary, or a convention or association of churches that is exempt from filing a Federal income tax return under paragraph 2(A)(i) of section 6033(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, or

(II) a religious order that is exempt from filing a Federal income tax return under paragraph 2(A)(iii) of such section 6033(a); and

(xix) between—

(I) officials of a self-regulatory organization (as defined in section 3(a)(26) of the Securities Exchange Act) that is registered with or established by the Securities and Exchange Commission as required by that Act or a similar organization that is designated by or registered with the Commodities Future Trading Commission as provided under the Commodity Exchange Act; and

(II) the Securities and Exchange Commission or the Commodities Future Trading Commission, respectively;

relating to the regulatory responsibilities of such organization under that Act.

(9) LOBBYING FIRM.—The term "lobbying firm" means a person or entity that has 1 or more employees who are lobbyists on behalf of a client other than that person or entity. The term also includes a self-employed individual who is a lobbyist.

(10) LOBBYIST.—The term "lobbyist" means any individual who is employed or retained by a client for financial or other compensation for services that include more than one lobbying contact, other than an individual whose lobbying activities constitute less than 20 percent of the time engaged in the services provided by such individual to that client over a six month period.

(11) MEDIA ORGANIZATION.—The term "media organization" means a person or entity engaged in disseminating information to the general public through a newspaper, magazine, other publication, radio, television, cable television, or other medium of mass communication.

(12) MEMBER OF CONGRESS.—The term "Member of Congress" means a Senator or a Representative in, or Delegate or Resident Commissioner to, the Congress.

(13) ORGANIZATION.—The term "organization" means a person or entity other than an individual.

(14) PERSON OR ENTITY.—The term "person or entity" means any individual, corporation, company, foundation, association, labor organization, firm, partnership, society, joint stock company, group of organizations, or State or local government.

(15) PUBLIC OFFICIAL.—The term "public official" means any elected official, appointed official, or employee of—

(A) a Federal, State, or local unit of government in the United States other than—

(i) a college or university;

(ii) a government-sponsored enterprise (as defined in section 3(8) of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974);

(iii) a public utility that provides gas, electricity, water, or communications;

(iv) a guaranty agency (as defined in section 435(j) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1085(j))), including any affiliate of such an agency; or

(v) an agency of any State functioning as a student loan secondary market pursuant to section 435(d)(1)(F) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1085(d)(1)(F));

(B) a Government corporation (as defined in section 9101 of title 31, United States Code);

(C) an organization of State or local elected or appointed officials other than officials

of an entity described in clause (i), (ii), (iii), (iv), or (v) of subparagraph (A);

(D) an Indian tribe (as defined in section 4(e) of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450b(e));

(E) a national or State political party or any organizational unit thereof; or

(F) a national, regional, or local unit of any foreign government.

(16) STATE.—The term "State" means each of the several States, the District of Columbia, and any commonwealth, territory, or possession of the United States.

SEC. 404. REGISTRATION OF LOBBYISTS.

(a) REGISTRATION.—

(1) GENERAL RULE.—No later than 45 days after a lobbyist first makes a lobbying contact or is employed or retained to make a lobbying contact, whichever is earlier, such lobbyist (or, as provided under paragraph (2), the organization employing such lobbyist), shall register with the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives.

(2) EMPLOYER FILING.—Any organization that has 1 or more employees who are lobbyists shall file a single registration under this section on behalf of such employees for each client on whose behalf the employees act as lobbyists.

(3) EXEMPTION.—

(A) GENERAL RULE.—Notwithstanding paragraphs (1) and (2), a person or entity whose—

(i) total income for matters related to lobbying activities on behalf of a particular client (in the case of a lobbying firm) does not exceed and is not expected to exceed \$5,000; or

(ii) total expenses in connection with lobbying activities (in the case of an organization whose employees engage in lobbying activities on its own behalf) do not exceed or are not expected to exceed \$20,000,

(as estimated under section 405) in the semi-annual period described in section 405(a) during which the registration would be made is not required to register under subsection (a) with respect to such client.

(B) ADJUSTMENT.—The dollar amounts in subparagraph (A) shall be adjusted—

(i) on January 1, 1997, to reflect changes in the Consumer Price Index (as determined by the Secretary of Labor) since the date of enactment of this Act; and

(ii) on January 1 of each fourth year occurring after January 1, 1997, to reflect changes in the Consumer Price Index (as determined by the Secretary of Labor) during the preceding 4-year period,

rounded to the nearest \$500.

(b) CONTENTS OF REGISTRATION.—Each registration under this section shall contain—

(1) the name, address, business telephone number, and principal place of business of the registrant, and a general description of its business or activities;

(2) the name, address, and principal place of business of the registrant's client, and a general description of its business or activities (if different from paragraph (1));

(3) the name, address, and principal place of business of any organization, other than the client, that—

(A) contributes more than \$10,000 toward the lobbying activities of the registrant in a semiannual period described in section 405(a); and

(B) in whole or in major part plans, supervises, or controls such lobbying activities.

(4) the name, address, principal place of business, amount of any contribution of more than \$10,000 to the lobbying activities of the registrant, and approximate percentage of equitable ownership in the client (if any) of any foreign entity that—

(A) holds at least 20 percent equitable ownership in the client or any organization identified under paragraph (3);

(B) directly or indirectly, in whole or in major part, plans, supervises, controls, directs, finances, or subsidizes the activities of the client or any organization identified under paragraph (3); or

(C) is an affiliate of the client or any organization identified under paragraph (3) and has a direct interest in the outcome of the lobbying activity;

(5) a statement of—

(A) the general issue areas in which the registrant expects to engage in lobbying activities on behalf of the client; and

(B) to the extent practicable, specific issues that have (as of the date of the registration) already been addressed or are likely to be addressed in lobbying activities; and

(6) the name of each employee of the registrant who has acted or whom the registrant expects to act as a lobbyist on behalf of the client and, if any such employee has served as a covered executive branch official or a covered legislative branch official in the 2 years before the date on which such employee first acted (after the date of enactment of this Act) as a lobbyist on behalf of the client, the position in which such employee served.

(c) GUIDELINES FOR REGISTRATION.—

(1) MULTIPLE CLIENTS.—In the case of a registrant making lobbying contacts on behalf of more than 1 client, a separate registration under this section shall be filed for each such client.

(2) MULTIPLE CONTACTS.—A registrant who makes more than 1 lobbying contact for the same client shall file a single registration covering all such lobbying contacts.

(d) TERMINATION OF REGISTRATION.—A registrant who after registration—

(1) is no longer employed or retained by a client to conduct lobbying activities, and

(2) does not anticipate any additional lobbying activities for such client,

may so notify the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives and terminate its registration.

SEC. 405. REPORTS BY REGISTERED LOBBYISTS.

(a) SEMIANNUAL REPORT.—No later than 45 days after the end of the semiannual period beginning on the first day of each January and the first day of July of each year in which a registrant is registered under section 404, each registrant shall file a report with the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives on its lobbying activities during such semiannual period. A separate report shall be filed for each client of the registrant.

(b) CONTENTS OF REPORT.—Each semiannual report filed under subsection (a) shall contain—

(1) the name of the registrant, the name of the client, and any changes or updates to the information provided in the initial registration;

(2) for each general issue area in which the registrant engaged in lobbying activities on behalf of the client during the semiannual filing period—

(A) a list of the specific issues upon which a lobbyist employed by the registrant engaged in lobbying activities, including, to the maximum extent practicable, a list of bill numbers and references to specific executive branch actions;

(B) a statement of the Houses of Congress and the Federal agencies contacted by lobbyists employed by the registrant on behalf of the client;

(C) a list of the employees of the registrant who acted as lobbyists on behalf of the client; and

(D) a description of the interest, if any, of any foreign entity identified under section

404(b)(4) in the specific issues listed under subparagraph (A).

(3) in the case of a lobbying firm, a good faith estimate of the total amount of all income from the client (including any payments to the registrant by any other person for lobbying activities on behalf of the client) during the semiannual period, other than income for matters that are unrelated to lobbying activities; and

(4) in the case of a registrant engaged in lobbying activities on its own behalf, a good faith estimate of the total expenses that the registrant and its employees incurred in connection with lobbying activities during the semiannual filing period.

(c) ESTIMATES OF INCOME OR EXPENSES.—For purposes of this section, estimates of income or expenses shall be made as follows:

(1) Estimates of amounts in excess of \$10,000 shall be rounded to the nearest \$20,000.

(2) In the event income or expenses do not exceed \$10,000, the registrant shall include a statement that income or expenses totaled less than \$10,000 for the reporting period.

(3) A registrant that reports lobbying expenditures pursuant to section 6033(b)(8) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 may satisfy the requirement to report income or expenses by filing with the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives a copy of the form filed in accordance with section 6033(b)(8).

SEC. 406. DISCLOSURE AND ENFORCEMENT.

The Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives shall—

(1) provide guidance and assistance on the registration and reporting requirements of this title and develop common standards, rules, and procedures for compliance with this title;

(2) review, and, where necessary, verify and inquire to ensure the accuracy, completeness, and timeliness of registration and reports;

(3) develop filing, coding, and cross-indexing systems to carry out the purpose of this title, including—

(A) a publicly available list of all registered lobbyists, lobbying firms, and their clients; and

(B) computerized systems designed to minimize the burden of filing and maximize public access to materials filed under this title;

(4) make available for public inspection and copying at reasonable times the registrations and reports filed under this title;

(5) retain registrations for a period of at least 6 years after they are terminated and reports for a period of at least 6 years after they are filed;

(6) compile and summarize, with respect to each semiannual period, the information contained in registrations and reports filed with respect to such period in a clear and complete manner;

(7) notify any lobbyist or lobbying firm in writing that may be in noncompliance with this title; and

(8) notify the United States Attorney for the District of Columbia that a lobbyist or lobbying firm may be in noncompliance with this title, if the registrant has been notified in writing and has failed to provide an appropriate response within 60 days after notice was given under paragraph (6).

SEC. 407. PENALTIES.

Whoever knowingly fails to—

(1) remedy a defective filing within 60 days after notice of such a defect by the Secretary of the Senate or the Clerk of the House of Representatives; or

(2) comply with any other provision of this title;

shall, upon proof of such knowing violation by a preponderance of the evidence, be sub-

ject to a civil fine of not more than \$50,000, depending on the extent and gravity of the violation.

SEC. 408. RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.

(a) CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS.—Nothing in this title shall be construed to prohibit or interfere with—

(1) the right to petition the government for the redress of grievances;

(2) the right to express a personal opinion; or

(3) the right of association,

protected by the first amendment to the Constitution.

(b) PROHIBITION OF ACTIVITIES.—Nothing in this title shall be construed to prohibit, or to authorize any court to prohibit, lobbying activities or lobbying contacts by any person or entity, regardless of whether such person or entity is in compliance with the requirements of this title.

(c) AUDIT AND INVESTIGATIONS.—Nothing in this title shall be construed to grant general audit or investigative authority to the Secretary of the Senate or the Clerk of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 409. AMENDMENTS TO THE FOREIGN AGENTS REGISTRATION ACT.

The Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938 (22 U.S.C. 611 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 1—

(A) by striking subsection (j);

(B) in subsection (o) by striking “the dissemination of political propaganda and any other activity which the person engaging therein believes will, or which he intends to, prevail upon, indoctrinate, convert, induce, persuade, or in any other way influence” and inserting “any activity that the person engaging in believes will, or that the person intends to, in any way influence”;

(C) in subsection (p) by striking the semicolon and inserting a period; and

(D) by striking subsection (q);

(2) in section 3(g) (22 U.S.C. 613(g)), by striking “established agency proceedings, whether formal or informal.” and inserting “judicial proceedings, criminal or civil law enforcement inquiries, investigations, or proceedings, or agency proceedings required by statute or regulation to be conducted on the record.”;

(3) in section 3 (22 U.S.C. 613) by adding at the end the following:

“(h) Any agent of a person described in section 1(b)(2) or an entity described in section 1(b)(3) if the agent is required to register and does register under the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 in connection with the agent’s representation of such person or entity.”;

(4) in section 4(a) (22 U.S.C. 614(a))—

(A) by striking “political propaganda” and inserting “informational materials”; and

(B) by striking “and a statement, duly signed by or on behalf of such an agent, setting forth full information as to the places, times, and extent of such transmittal”;

(5) in section 4(b) (22 U.S.C. 614(b))—

(A) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking “political propaganda” and inserting “informational materials”; and

(B) by striking “(i) in the form of prints, or” and all that follows through the end of the subsection and inserting “without placing in such informational materials a conspicuous statement that the materials are distributed by the agent on behalf of the foreign principal, and that additional information is on file with the Department of Justice, Washington, District of Columbia. The Attorney General may by rule define what constitutes a conspicuous statement for the purposes of this subsection.”;

(6) in section 4(c) (22 U.S.C. 614(c)), by striking “political propaganda” and inserting “informational materials”;

(7) in section 6 (22 U.S.C. 616)—

(A) in subsection (a) by striking "and all statements concerning the distribution of political propaganda";

(B) in subsection (b) by striking "and one copy of every item of political propaganda"; and

(C) in subsection (c) by striking "copies of political propaganda,";

(8) in section 8 (22 U.S.C. 618)—

(A) in subsection (a)(2) by striking "or in any statement under section 4(a) hereof concerning the distribution of political propaganda"; and

(B) by striking subsection (d); and

(9) in section 11 (22 U.S.C. 621) by striking "including the nature, sources, and content of political propaganda disseminated or distributed".

SEC. 410. AMENDMENTS TO THE BYRD AMENDMENT.

(a) REVISED CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS.—Section 1352(b) of title 31, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2) by striking subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) and inserting the following:

"(A) the name of any registrant under the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 who has made lobbying contacts on behalf of the person with respect to that Federal contract, grant, loan, or cooperative agreement; and

"(B) a certification that the person making the declaration has not made, and will not make, any payment prohibited by subsection (a).";

(2) in paragraph (3) by striking all that follows "loan shall contain" and inserting "the name of any registrant under the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 who has made lobbying contacts on behalf of the person in connection with that loan insurance or guarantee."; and

(3) by striking paragraph (6) and redesignating paragraph (7) as paragraph (6).

(b) REMOVAL OF OBSOLETE REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—Section 1352 of title 31, United States Code, is further amended—

(1) by striking subsection (d); and

(2) by redesignating subsections (e), (f), (g), and (h) as subsections (d), (e), (f), and (g), respectively.

SEC. 411. REPEAL OF CERTAIN LOBBYING PROVISIONS.

(a) REPEAL OF THE FEDERAL REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT.—The Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act (2 U.S.C. 261 et seq.) is repealed.

(b) REPEAL OF PROVISIONS RELATING TO HOUSING LOBBYIST ACTIVITIES.—

(1) Section 13 of the Department of Housing and Urban Development Act (42 U.S.C. 3537b) is repealed.

(2) Section 536(d) of the Housing Act of 1949 (42 U.S.C. 1490p(d)) is repealed.

SEC. 412. CONFORMING AMENDMENTS TO OTHER STATUTES.

(a) AMENDMENT TO COMPETITIVENESS POLICY COUNCIL ACT.—Section 5206(e) of the Competitiveness Policy Council Act (15 U.S.C. 4804(e)) is amended by inserting "or a lobbyist for a foreign entity (as the terms 'lobbyist' and 'foreign entity' are defined under section 3 of the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995)" after "an agent for a foreign principal".

(b) AMENDMENTS TO TITLE 18, UNITED STATES CODE.—Section 219(a) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting "or a lobbyist required to register under the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 in connection with the representation of a foreign entity, as defined in section 3(7) of that Act" after "an agent of a foreign principal required to register under the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938"; and

(2) by striking out "as amended".

(c) AMENDMENT TO FOREIGN SERVICE ACT OF 1980.—Section 602(c) of the Foreign Service

Act of 1980 (22 U.S.C. 4002(c)) is amended by inserting "or a lobbyist for a foreign entity (as defined in section 3(7) of the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995)" after "an agent of a foreign principal (as defined by section 1(b) of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938)".

SEC. 413. IDENTIFICATION OF CLIENTS AND COVERED OFFICIALS.

(a) ORAL LOBBYING CONTACTS.—Any person or entity that makes an oral lobbying contact with a covered legislative branch official or a covered executive branch official shall, on the request of the official at the time of the lobbying contact—

(1) state whether the person or entity is registered under this Act and identify the client on whose behalf the lobbying contact is made; and

(2) state whether such client is a foreign entity and identify any foreign entity required to be disclosed under section 404(b)(4) that has a direct interest in the outcome of the lobbying activity.

(b) WRITTEN LOBBYING CONTACTS.—Any person or entity registered under this Act that makes a written lobbying contact (including an electronic communication) with a covered legislative branch official or a covered executive branch official shall—

(1) if the client on whose behalf the lobbying contact was made is a foreign entity, identify such client, state that the client is considered a foreign entity under this Act, and state whether the person making the lobbying contact is registered on behalf of that client under section 4; and

(2) identify any other foreign entity identified pursuant to section 404(b)(4) that has a direct interest in the outcome of the lobbying activity.

(c) IDENTIFICATION AS COVERED OFFICIAL.—Upon request by a person or entity making a lobbying contact, the individual who is contacted or the office employing that individual shall indicate whether or not the individual is a covered legislative branch official or a covered executive branch official.

SEC. 414. ESTIMATES BASED ON TAX REPORTING SYSTEM.

(a) ENTITIES COVERED BY SECTION 6033(b) OF THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1986.—A registrant that is required to report and does report lobbying expenditures pursuant to section 6033(b)(8) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 may—

(1) make a good faith estimate (by category of dollar value) of applicable amounts that would be required to be disclosed under such section for the appropriate semiannual period to meet the requirements of sections 404(a)(3), 405(a)(2), and 405(b)(4); and

(2) in lieu of using the definition of "lobbying activities" in section 3(8) of this Act, consider as lobbying activities only those activities that are influencing legislation as defined in section 4911(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(b) ENTITIES COVERED BY SECTION 162(e) OF THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1986.—A registrant that is subject to section 162(e) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 may—

(1) make a good faith estimate (by category of dollar value) of applicable amounts that would not be deductible pursuant to such section for the appropriate semiannual period to meet the requirements of sections 404(a)(3), 405(a)(2), and 405(b)(4); and

(2) in lieu of using the definition of "lobbying activities" in section 403(7) of this Act, consider as lobbying activities only those activities, the costs of which are not deductible pursuant to section 162(e) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(c) DISCLOSURE OF ESTIMATE.—Any registrant that elects to make estimates required by this Act under the procedures au-

thorized by subsection (a) or (b) for reporting or threshold purposes shall—

(1) inform the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives that the registrant has elected to make its estimates under such procedures; and

(2) make all such estimates, in a given calendar year, under such procedures.

(d) STUDY.—Not later than March 31, 1997, the Comptroller General of the United States shall review reporting by registrants under subsections (a) and (b) and report to the Congress—

(1) the differences between the definition of "lobbying activities" in section 403(7) and the definitions of "lobbying expenditures", "influencing legislation", and related terms in sections 162(e) and 4911 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as each are implemented by regulations;

(2) the impact that any such differences may have on filing and reporting under this Act pursuant to this subsection; and

(3) any changes to this Act or to the appropriate sections of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 that the Comptroller General may recommend to harmonize the definitions.

SEC. 415. SEVERABILITY.

If any provision of this title, or the application thereof, is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of this title and the application of such provision to other persons and circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 416. EFFECTIVE DATES.

(a) Except as otherwise provided in this section, this title and the amendments made by this title shall take effect, and shall be effective with respect to calendar years beginning on, January 1, 1996.

(b) The repeals and amendments made under sections 409, 410, and 411 shall take effect as provided under subsection (a), except that such repeals and amendments—

(1) shall not affect any proceeding or suit commenced before the effective date under subsection (a), and in all such proceedings or suits, proceedings shall be had, appeals taken, and judgments rendered in the same manner and with the same effect as if this Act had not been enacted; and

(2) shall not affect the requirements of Federal agencies to compile, publish, and retain information filed or received before the effective date of such repeals and amendments.

TITLE V—CONGRESSIONAL GIFT RULES

SEC. 501. AMENDMENT TO HOUSE RULES.

Clause 4 of rule XLIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives is amended to read as follows:

"4. (a)(1) No Member, officer, or employee of the House of Representatives shall knowingly accept a gift except as provided in this rule.

"(2) A Member, officer, or employee may accept a gift (other than cash or cash equivalent) which the Member, officer, or employee reasonably and in good faith believes to have a value of less than \$50, and a cumulative value from one source during a calendar year of less than \$100. No gift with a value below \$10 shall count toward the \$100 annual limit. No formal recordkeeping is required by this paragraph, but a Member, officer, or employee shall make a good faith effort to comply with this paragraph.

"(b)(1) For the purpose of this rule, the term 'gift' means any gratuity, favor, discount, entertainment, hospitality, loan, forbearance, or other item having monetary value. The term includes gifts of services, training, transportation, lodging, and meals, whether provided in kind, by purchase of a ticket, payment in advance, or reimbursement after the expense has been incurred.

"(2)(A) A gift to a family member of a Member, officer, or employee, or a gift to

any other individual based on that individual's relationship with the Member, officer, or employee, shall be considered a gift to the Member, officer, or employee if it is given with the knowledge and acquiescence of the Member, officer, or employee and the Member, officer, or employee has reason to believe the gift was given because of the official position of the Member, officer, or employee.

"(B) If food or refreshment is provided at the same time and place to both a Member, officer, or employee and the spouse or dependent thereof, only the food or refreshment provided to the Member, officer, or employee shall be treated as a gift for purposes of this rule.

"(c) The restrictions in subparagraph (a) shall not apply to the following:

"(1) Anything for which the Member, officer, or employee pays the market value, or does not use and promptly returns to the donor.

"(2) A contribution, as defined in the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 431 et seq.) that is lawfully made under that Act, or attendance at a fundraising event sponsored by a political organization described in section 527(e) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

"(3) A gift from a relative as described in section 107(2) of title I of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 (Public Law 95-521).

"(4)(A) Anything provided by an individual on the basis of a personal friendship unless the Member, officer, or employee has reason to believe that, under the circumstances, the gift was provided because of the official position of the Member, officer, or employee and not because of the personal friendship.

"(B) In determining whether a gift is provided on the basis of personal friendship, the Member, officer, or employee shall consider the circumstances under which the gift was offered, such as:

"(i) The history of the relationship between the individual giving the gift and the recipient of the gift, including any previous exchange of gifts between such individuals.

"(ii) Whether to the actual knowledge of the Member, officer, or employee the individual who gave the gift personally paid for the gift or sought a tax deduction or business reimbursement for the gift.

"(iii) Whether to the actual knowledge of the Member, officer, or employee the individual who gave the gift also at the same time gave the same or similar gifts to other Members, officers, or employees.

"(5) Except as provided in paragraph 3(c), a contribution or other payment to a legal expense fund established for the benefit of a Member, officer, or employee, that is otherwise lawfully made, if the person making the contribution or payment is identified for the Committee of Standards of Official Conduct and complies with other disclosure requirements established by such Committee.

"(6) Any gift from another Member, officer, or employee of the Senate or the House of Representatives.

"(7) Food, refreshments, lodging, and other benefits—

"(A) resulting from the outside business or employment activities (or other outside activities that are not connected to the duties of the Member, officer, or employee as an officeholder) of the Member, officer, or employee, or the spouse of the Member, officer, or employee, if such benefits have not been offered or enhanced because of the official position of the Member, officer, or employee and are customarily provided to others in similar circumstances;

"(B) customarily provided by a prospective employer in connection with bona fide employment discussions; or

"(C) provided by a political organization described in section 527(e) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 in connection with a fundraising or campaign event sponsored by such an organization.

"(8) Pension and other benefits resulting from continued participation in an employee welfare and benefits plan maintained by a former employer.

"(9) Informational materials that are sent to the office of the Member, officer, or employee in the form of books, articles, periodicals, other written materials, audiotapes, videotapes, or other forms of communication.

"(10) Awards or prizes which are given to competitors in contests or events open to the public, including random drawings.

"(11) Honorary degrees (and associated travel, food, refreshments, and entertainment) and other bona fide, nonmonetary awards presented in recognition of public service (and associated food, refreshments, and entertainment provided in the presentation of such degrees and awards).

"(12) Donations of products from the State that the Member represents that are intended primarily for promotional purposes, such as display or free distribution, and are of minimal value to any individual recipient.

"(13) Training (including food and refreshments furnished to all attendees as an integral part of the training) provided to a Member, officer, or employee, if such training is in the interest of the House of Representatives.

"(14) Bequests, inheritances, and other transfers at death.

"(15) Any item, the receipt of which is authorized by the Foreign Gifts and Decorations Act, the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act, or any other statute.

"(16) Anything which is paid for by the Federal Government, by a State or local government, or secured by the Government under a Government contract.

"(17) A gift of personal hospitality (as defined in section 109(14) of the Ethics in Government Act) of an individual other than a registered lobbyist or agent of a foreign principal.

"(18) Free attendance at a widely attended event permitted pursuant to subparagraph (d).

"(19) Opportunities and benefits which are—

"(A) available to the public or to a class consisting of all Federal employees, whether or not restricted on the basis of geographic consideration;

"(B) offered to members of a group or class in which membership is unrelated to congressional employment;

"(C) offered to members of an organization, such as an employees' association or congressional credit union, in which membership is related to congressional employment and similar opportunities are available to large segments of the public through organizations of similar size;

"(D) offered to any group or class that is not defined in a manner that specifically discriminates among Government employees on the basis of branch of Government or type of responsibility, or on a basis that favors those of higher rank or rate of pay;

"(E) in the form of loans from banks and other financial institutions on terms generally available to the public; or

"(F) in the form of reduced membership or other fees for participation in organization activities offered to all Government employees by professional organizations if the only restrictions on membership relate to professional qualifications.

"(20) A plaque, trophy, or other item that is substantially commemorative in nature

and which is intended solely for presentation.

"(21) Anything for which, in an unusual case, a waiver is granted by the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct.

"(22) Food or refreshments of a nominal value offered other than as a part of a meal.

"(23) An item of little intrinsic value such as a greeting card, baseball cap, or a T-shirt.

"(d)(1) A Member, officer, or employee may accept an offer of free attendance at a widely attended convention, conference, symposium, forum, panel discussion, dinner, viewing, reception, or similar event, provided by the sponsor of the event, if—

"(A) the Member, officer, or employee participates in the event as a speaker or a panel participant, by presenting information related to Congress or matters before Congress, or by performing a ceremonial function appropriate to the Member's, officer's, or employee's official position; or

"(B) attendance at the event is appropriate to the performance of the official duties or representative function of the Member, officer, or employee.

"(2) A Member, officer, or employee who attends an event described in clause (1) may accept a sponsor's unsolicited offer of free attendance at the event for an accompanying individual if others in attendance will generally be similarly accompanied or if such attendance is appropriate to assist in the representation of the House of Representatives.

"(3) A Member, officer, or employee, or the spouse or dependent thereof, may accept a sponsor's unsolicited offer of free attendance at a charity event, except that reimbursement for transportation and lodging may not be accepted in connection with an event that does not meet the standards provided in paragraph 2.

"(4) For purposes of this paragraph, the term 'free attendance' may include waiver of all or part of a conference or other fee, the provision of local transportation, or the provision of food, refreshments, entertainment, and instructional materials furnished to all attendees as an integral part of the event. The term does not include entertainment collateral to the event, nor does it include food or refreshments taken other than in a group setting with all or substantially all other attendees.

"(e) No Member, officer, or employee may accept a gift the value of which exceeds \$250 on the basis of the personal friendship exception in subparagraph (c)(4) unless the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct issues a written determination that such exception applies. No determination under this subparagraph is required for gifts given on the basis of the family relationship exception.

"(f) When it is not practicable to return a tangible item because it is perishable, the item may, at the discretion of the recipient, be given to an appropriate charity or destroyed.

"2. (a)(1) A reimbursement (including payment in kind) to a Member, officer, or employee from an individual other than a registered lobbyist or agent of a foreign principal for necessary transportation, lodging and related expenses for travel to a meeting, speaking engagement, factfinding trip or similar event in connection with the duties of the Member, officer, or employee as an officeholder shall be deemed to be a reimbursement to the House of Representatives and not a gift prohibited by this rule, if the Member, officer, or employee—

"(A) in the case of an employee, receives advance authorization, from the Member or officer under whose direct supervision the employee works, to accept reimbursement, and

“(B) discloses the expenses reimbursed or to be reimbursed and the authorization to the Clerk of the House of Representatives within 30 days after the travel is completed.

“(2) For purposes of clause (1), events, the activities of which are substantially recreational in nature, shall not be considered to be in connection with the duties of a Member, officer, or employee as an officeholder.

“(b) Each advance authorization to accept reimbursement shall be signed by the Member or officer under whose direct supervision the employee works and shall include—

- “(1) the name of the employee;
- “(2) the name of the person who will make the reimbursement;
- “(3) the time, place, and purpose of the travel; and

“(4) a determination that the travel is in connection with the duties of the employee as an officeholder and would not create the appearance that the employee is using public office for private gain.

“(c) Each disclosure made under subparagraph (a)(1) of expenses reimbursed or to be reimbursed shall be signed by the Member or officer (in the case of travel by that Member or officer) or by the Member or officer under whose direct supervision the employee works (in the case of travel by an employee) and shall include—

- “(1) a good faith estimate of total transportation expenses reimbursed or to be reimbursed;
- “(2) a good faith estimate of total lodging expenses reimbursed or to be reimbursed;
- “(3) a good faith estimate of total meal expenses reimbursed or to be reimbursed;
- “(4) a good faith estimate of the total of other expenses reimbursed or to be reimbursed;
- “(5) a determination that all such expenses are necessary transportation, lodging, and related expenses as defined in this paragraph; and

“(6) in the case of a reimbursement to a Member or officer, a determination that the travel was in connection with the duties of the Member or officer as an officeholder and would not create the appearance that the Member or officer is using public office for private gain.

“(d) For the purposes of this paragraph, the term ‘necessary transportation, lodging, and related expenses’—

“(1) includes reasonable expenses that are necessary for travel for a period not exceeding 3 days exclusive of travel time within the United States or 7 days exclusive of travel time outside of the United States unless ap-

proved in advance by the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct;

“(2) is limited to reasonable expenditures for transportation, lodging, conference fees and materials, and food and refreshments, including reimbursement for necessary transportation, whether or not such transportation occurs within the periods described in clause (1);

“(3) does not include expenditures for recreational activities, nor does it include entertainment other than that provided to all attendees as an integral part of the event, except for activities or entertainment otherwise permissible under this rule; and

“(4) may include travel expenses incurred on behalf of either the spouse or a child of the Member, officer, or employee, subject to a determination signed by the Member or officer (or in the case of an employee, the Member or officer under whose direct supervision the employee works) that the attendance of the spouse or child is appropriate to assist in the representation of the House of Representatives.

“(e) The Clerk of the House of Representatives shall make available to the public all advance authorizations and disclosures of reimbursement filed pursuant to subparagraph (a) as soon as possible after they are received.

“3. A gift prohibited by paragraph 1(a) includes the following:

“(a) Anything provided by a registered lobbyist or an agent of a foreign principal to an entity that is maintained or controlled by a Member, officer, or employee.

“(b) A charitable contribution (as defined in section 170(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986) made by a registered lobbyist or an agent of a foreign principal on the basis of a designation, recommendation, or other specification of a Member, officer, or employee (not including a mass mailing or other solicitation directed to a broad category of persons or entities), other than a charitable contribution permitted by paragraph 4.

“(c) A contribution or other payment by a registered lobbyist or an agent of a foreign principal to a legal expense fund established for the benefit of a Member, officer, or employee.

“(d) A financial contribution or expenditure made by a registered lobbyist or an agent of a foreign principal relating to a conference, retreat, or similar event, sponsored by or affiliated with an official congressional organization, for or on behalf of Members, officers, or employees.

“4. (a) A charitable contribution (as defined in section 170(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986) made by a registered lobbyist or an agent of a foreign principal in lieu of an honorarium to a Member, officer, or employee shall not be considered a gift under this rule if it is reported as provided in subparagraph (b).

“(b) A Member, officer, or employee who designates or recommends a contribution to a charitable organization in lieu of honoraria described in subparagraph (a) shall report within 30 days after such designation or recommendation to the Clerk of the House of Representatives—

- “(1) the name and address of the registered lobbyist who is making the contribution in lieu of honoraria;
- “(2) the date and amount of the contribution; and
- “(3) the name and address of the charitable organization designated or recommended by the Member.

The Clerk of the House of Representatives shall make public information received pursuant to this subparagraph as soon as possible after it is received.

“5. For purposes of this rule—
“(a) the term ‘registered lobbyist’ means a lobbyist registered under the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act or any successor statute; and

“(b) the term ‘agent of a foreign principal’ means an agent of a foreign principal registered under the Foreign Agents Registration Act.

“6. All the provisions of this rule shall be interpreted and enforced solely by the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct. The Committee on Standards of Official Conduct is authorized to issue guidance on any matter contained in this rule.”

SEC. 502. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendments made by this title shall take effect, and shall be effective with respect to calendar years beginning on, January 1, 1996.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank both the chairman and ranking member of the Legislative Branch Subcommittee for their very hard work on this bill. I know their task has been very difficult; I only hope that the cuts made to the operations of the Congress will not, in the long-run, inhibit our ability to do the people's business.

I include the following additional material for the RECORD.

FLOOR PROCEDURE IN THE 104TH CONGRESS; COMPILED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE DEMOCRATS

Bill No.	Title	Resolution No.	Process used for floor consideration	Amendments in order
H.R. 1*	Compliance	H. Res. 6	Closed	None
H. Res. 6	Opening Day Rules Package	H. Res. 5	Closed: contained a closed rule on H.R. 1 within the closed rule	None
H.R. 5*	Unfunded Mandates	H. Res. 38	Restrictive: Motion adopted over Democratic objection in the Committee of the Whole to limit debate on section 4: Pre-printing gets preference.	N/A
H.J. Res. 2*	Balanced Budget	H. Res. 44	Restrictive: only certain substitutes	2R; 4D
H. Res. 43	Committee Hearings Scheduling	H. Res. 43 (OJ)	Restrictive: considered in House no amendments	N/A
H.R. 2*	Line Item Veto	H. Res. 55	Open: Pre-printing gets preference	N/A
H.R. 665*	Victim Restitution Act of 1995	H. Res. 61	Open: Pre-printing gets preference	N/A
H.R. 666*	Exclusionary Rule Reform Act of 1995	H. Res. 60	Open: Pre-printing gets preference	N/A
H.R. 667*	Violent Criminal Incarceration Act of 1995	H. Res. 63	Restrictive: 10 hr. Time Cap on amendments	N/A
H.R. 668*	The Criminal Alien Deportation Improvement Act	H. Res. 69	Open: Pre-printing gets preference: Contains self-executing provision	N/A
H.R. 728*	Local Government Law Enforcement Block Grants	H. Res. 79	Restrictive: 10 hr. Time Cap on amendments: Pre-printing gets preference	N/A
H.R. 7*	National Security Revitalization Act	H. Res. 83	Restrictive: 10 hr. Time Cap on amendments: Pre-printing gets preference	N/A
H.R. 729*	Death Penalty/Habeas	N/A	Restrictive: brought up under UC with a 6 hr. time cap on amendments	N/A
S. 2	Senate Compliance	N/A	Closed: Put on Suspension Calendar over Democratic objection	None
H.R. 831	To Permanently Extend the Health Insurance Deduction for the Self-Employed	H. Res. 88	Restrictive: makes in order only the Gibbons amendment; Waives all points of order; Contains self-executing provision.	1D
H.R. 830*	The Paperwork Reduction Act	H. Res. 91	Open	N/A
H.R. 889	Emergency Supplemental/Rescinding Certain Budget Authority	H. Res. 92	Restrictive: makes in order only the Obey substitute	1D
H.R. 450*	Regulatory Moratorium	H. Res. 93	Restrictive: 10 hr. Time Cap on amendments: Pre-printing gets preference	N/A
H.R. 1022*	Risk Assessment	H. Res. 96	Restrictive: 10 hr. Time Cap on amendments	N/A
H.R. 926*	Regulatory Flexibility	H. Res. 100	Open	N/A
H.R. 925*	Private Property Protection Act	H. Res. 101	Restrictive: 12 hr. time cap on amendments; Requires Members to pre-print their amendments in the Record prior to the bill's consideration for amendment, waives germaneness and budget act points of order as well as points of order concerning appropriating on a legislative bill against the committee substitute used as base text.	1D
H.R. 1058*	Securities Litigation Reform Act	H. Res. 105	Restrictive: 8 hr. time cap on amendments: Pre-printing gets preference; Makes in order the Wyden amendment and waives germaneness against it.	1D
H.R. 988*	The Attorney Accountability Act of 1995	H. Res. 104	Restrictive: 7 hr. time cap on amendments: Pre-printing gets preference	N/A

FLOOR PROCEDURE IN THE 104TH CONGRESS; COMPILED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE DEMOCRATS—Continued

Bill No.	Title	Resolution No.	Process used for floor consideration	Amendments in order
H.R. 956*	Product Liability and Legal Reform Act	H. Res. 109	Restrictive: makes in order only 15 germane amendments and denies 64 germane amendments from being considered.	8D; 7R.
H.R. 1158	Making Emergency Supplemental Appropriations and Rescissions	H. Res. 115	Restrictive: Combines emergency H.R. 1158 & nonemergency 1159 and strikes the abortion provision; makes in order only pre-printed amendments that include offsets within the same chapter (deeper cuts in programs already cut); waives points of order against three amendments; waives cl 2 of rule XXI against the bill, cl 2, XXI and cl 7 of rule XVI against the substitute; waives cl 2(e) of rule XXI against the amendments in the Record; 10 hr time cap on amendments. 30 minutes debate on each amendment.	N/A.
H.J. Res. 73*	Term Limits	H. Res. 116	Restrictive: Makes in order only 4 amendments considered under a "Queen of the Hill" procedure and denies 21 germane amendments from being considered.	1D; 3R
H.R. 4*	Welfare Reform	H. Res. 119	Restrictive: Makes in order only 31 perfecting amendments and two substitutes; Denies 130 germane amendments from being considered; The substitutes are to be considered under a "Queen of the Hill" procedure; All points of order are waived against the amendments.	5D; 26R.
H.R. 1271*	Family Privacy Act	H. Res. 125	Open	N/A
H.R. 660*	Housing for Older Persons Act	H. Res. 126	Open	N/A
H.R. 1215*	The Contract With America Tax Relief Act of 1995	H. Res. 129	Restrictive: Self Executes language that makes tax cuts contingent on the adoption of a balanced budget plan and strikes section 3006. Makes in order only one substitute. Waives all points of order against the bill, substitute made in order as original text and Gephardt substitute.	1D.
H.R. 483	Medicare Select Extension	H. Res. 130	Restrictive: waives cl 2(1)(6) of rule XI against the bill; makes H.R. 1391 in order as original text; makes in order only the Dingell substitute; allows Commerce Committee to file a report on the bill at any time.	1D.
H.R. 655	Hydrogen Future Act	H. Res. 136	Open	N/A
H.R. 1361	Coast Guard Authorization	H. Res. 139	Open; waives sections 302(f) and 308(a) of the Congressional Budget Act against the bill's consideration and the committee substitute; waives cl 5(a) of rule XXI against the committee substitute.	N/A.
H.R. 961	Clean Water Act	H. Res. 140	Open; pre-printing gets preference; waives sections 302(f) and 602(b) of the Budget Act against the bill's consideration; waives cl 7 of rule XVI, cl 5(a) of rule XXI and section 302(f) of the Budget Act against the committee substitute. Makes in order Shuster substitute as first order of business.	N/A.
H.R. 535	Corning National Fish Hatchery Conveyance Act	H. Res. 144	Open	N/A
H.R. 584	Conveyance of the Fairport National Fish Hatchery to the State of Iowa	H. Res. 145	Open	N/A.
H.R. 614	Conveyance of the New London National Fish Hatchery Production Facility	H. Res. 146	Open	N/A.
H. Con. Res. 67	Budget Resolution	H. Res. 149	Restrictive: Makes in order 4 substitutes under regular order; Gephardt, Neumann/Solomon, Payne/Owens, President's Budget if printed in Record on 5/17/95; waives all points of order against substitutes and concurrent resolution; suspends application of Rule XLIX with respect to the resolution; self-executes Agriculture language.	3D; 1R.
H.R. 1561	American Overseas Interests Act of 1995	H. Res. 155	Restrictive: Requires amendments to be printed in the Record prior to their consideration; 10 hr. time cap; waives cl 2(1)(6) of rule XI against the bill's consideration; Also waives sections 302(f), 303(a), 308(a) and 402(a) against the bill's consideration and the committee amendment in order as original text; waives cl 5(a) of rule XXI against the amendment; amendment consideration is closed at 2:30 p.m. on May 25, 1995. Self-executes provision which removes section 2210 from the bill. This was done at the request of the Budget Committee.	N/A.
H.R. 1530	National Defense Authorization Act FY 1996	H. Res. 164	Restrictive: Makes in order only the amendments printed in the report; waives all points of order against the bill, substitute and amendments printed in the report. Gives the Chairman en bloc authority. Self-executes a provision which strikes section 807 of the bill; provides for an additional 30 min. of debate on Nunn-Lugar section; Allows Mr. Clinger to offer a modification of his amendment with the concurrence of Ms. Collins.	36R; 18D; 2 Bipartisan.
H.R. 1817	Military Construction Appropriations; FY 1996	H. Res. 167	Open; waives cl. 2 and cl. 6 of rule XXI against the bill; 1 hr. general debate; Uses House passed budget numbers as threshold for spending amounts pending passage of Budget.	N/A.
H.R. 1854	Legislative Branch Appropriations	H. Res. 169	Restrictive: Makes in order only 11 amendments; waives sections 302(f) and 308(a) of the Budget Act against the bill and cl. 2 and cl. 6 of rule XXI against the bill. All points of order are waived against the amendments.	5R; 4D; 2 Bipartisan.
H.R. 1868	Foreign Operations Appropriations	H. Res. 170	Open; waives cl. 2, cl. 5(b), and cl. 6 of rule XXI against the bill; makes in order the Gilman amendments as first order of business; waives all points of order against the amendments; if adopted they will be considered as original text; waives cl. 2 of rule XXI against the amendments printed in the report. Pre-printing gets priority (Hall) (Menendez) (Goss) (Smith, NJ).	N/A.
H.R. 1905	Energy & Water Appropriations	H. Res. 171	Open; waives cl. 2 and cl. 6 of rule XXI against the bill; makes in order the Shuster amendment as the first order of business; waives all points of order against the amendment; if adopted it will be considered as original text. Pre-printing gets priority.	N/A.
H.J. Res. 79	Constitutional Amendment to Permit Congress and States to Prohibit the Physical Desecration of the American Flag	H. Res. 173	Closed; provides one hour of general debate and one motion to recommit with or without instructions; if there are instructions, the MO is debatable for 1 hr.	N/A.
H.R. 1944	Rescissions Bill	H. Res. 175	Restrictive: Provides for consideration of the bill in the House; Permits the Chairman of the Appropriations Committee to offer one amendment which is unamendable; waives all points of order against the amendment.	N/A.
H.R. 1868 (2nd rule)	Foreign Operations Appropriations	H. Res. 177	Restrictive: Provides for further consideration of the bill; makes in order only the four amendments printed in the rules report (20 min each). Waives all points of order against the amendments; Prohibits intervening motions in the Committee of the Whole; Provides for an automatic rise and report following the disposition of the amendments.	N/A.
H.R. 70	Exports of Alaskan North Slope Oil	H. Res. 197	Open; Makes in order the Resources Committee amendment in the nature of a substitute as original text; Pre-printing gets priority; Provides a Senate hook-up with S. 395.	N/A.
H.R. 2076	Commerce, Justice Appropriations	H. Res. 198	Open; waives cl. 2 and cl. 6 of rule XXI against provisions in the bill; Pre-printing gets priority; provides the bill be read by title.	N/A.
H.R. 2099	VAV/HUD Appropriations	H. Res. 201	Open; waives cl. 2 and cl. 6 of rule XXI against provisions in the bill; Provides that the amendment in part 1 of the report is the first business, if adopted it will be considered as base text (30 min); waives all points of order against the Klug and Davis amendments; Pre-printing gets priority; Provides that the bill be read by title.	N/A.
S. 21	Termination of U.S. Arms Embargo on Bosnia	H. Res. 204	Restrictive: 3 hours of general debate; Makes in order an amendment to be offered by the Minority Leader or a designee (1 hr); If motion to recommit has instructions it can only be offered by the Minority Leader or a designee.	ID.
H.R. 2126	Defense Appropriations	H. Res. 205	Open; waives cl. 2(1)(6) of rule XI and section 306 of the Congressional Budget Act against consideration of the bill; waives cl. 2 and cl. 6 of rule XXI against provisions in the bill; self-executes a strike of sections 8021 and 8024 of the bill as requested by the Budget Committee; Pre-printing gets priority; Provides the bill be read by title.	N/A.
H.R. 1555	Communications Act of 1995	H. Res. 207	Restrictive: waives sec. 302(f) of the Budget Act against consideration of the bill; Makes in order the Commerce Committee amendment as original text and waives sec. 302(f) of the Budget Act and cl. 5(a) of rule XXI against the amendment; Makes in order the Bliely amendment (30 min) as the first order of business, if adopted it will be original text; makes in order only the amendments printed in the report and waives all points of order against the amendments; provides a Senate hook-up with S. 652.	2R/3D/3 Bipartisan.
H.R. 1977 *Rule Defeated*	Interior Appropriations	H. Res. 185	Open; waives sections 302(f) and 308(a) of the Budget Act and cl 2 and cl 6 of rule XXI; provides that the bill be read by title; waives all points of order against the Tauzin amendment; self-executes Budget Committee amendment; waives cl 2(e) of rule XXI against amendments to the bill; Pre-printing gets priority.	N/A.
H.R. 1977	Interior Appropriations	H.Res. 187	Open; waives sections 302(f), 306 and 308(a) of the Budget Act; waives clauses 2 and 6 of rule XXI against provisions in the bill; waives all points of order against the Tauzin amendment; provides that the bill be read by title; self-executes Budget Committee amendment and makes NEA funding subject to House passed authorization; waives cl 2(e) of rule XXI against the amendments to the bill; Pre-printing gets priority.	N/A.
H.R. 1976	Agriculture Appropriations	H. Res. 188	Open; waives clauses 2 and 6 of rule XXI against provisions in the bill; provides that the bill be read by title; Makes Skeen amendment first order of business, if adopted the amendment will be considered as base text (10 min); Pre-printing gets priority.	N/A.
H.R. 1977 (3rd rule)	Interior Appropriations	H. Res. 189	Restrictive: provides for the further consideration of the bill; allows only amendments pre-printed before July 14th to be considered; limits motions to rise.	N/A.
H.R. 2020	Treasury Postal Appropriations	H. Res. 190	Open; waives cl. 2 and cl. 6 of rule XXI against provisions in the bill; provides the bill be read by title; Pre-printing gets priority.	N/A.

Bill No.	Title	Resolution No.	Process used for floor consideration	Amendments in order
H.J. Res. 96	Disapproving MFN for China	H. Res. 193	Restrictive; provides for consideration in the House of H.R. 2058 (90 min.) And H.J. Res. 96 (1 hr). Waives certain provisions of the Trade Act.	N/A.
H.R. 2002	Transportation Appropriations	H. Res. 194	Open; waives cl. 3 of rule XIII and section 401 (a) of the CBA against consideration of the bill; waives cl. 6 and cl. 2 of rule XXI against provisions in the bill; Makes in order the Clinger/Solomon amendment waives all points of order against the amendment (Line Item Veto); provides the bill be read by title: Pre-printing gets priority..	N/A.
H.R. 2127	Labor/HHS Appropriations Act	H. Res. 208	Open; Provides that the first order of business will be the managers amendments (10 min), if adopted they will be considered as base text; waives cl. 2 and cl. 6 of rule XXI against provisions in the bill; waives all points of order against certain amendments printed in the report; Pre-printing gets priority; Provides the bill be read by title.	

* Contract Bills, 67% restrictive; 33% open. ** All legislation, 58% restrictive; 42% open. *** Restrictive rules are those which limit the number of amendments which can be offered, and include so called modified open and modified closed rules as well as completely closed rules and rules providing for consideration in the House as opposed to the Committee of the Whole. This definition of restrictive rule is taken from the Republican chart of resolutions reported from the Rules Committee in the 103rd Congress. **** Not included in this chart are three bills which should have been placed on the Suspension Calendar. H.R. 101, H.R. 400, H.R. 440.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], chairman of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Miami, FL for yielding me this time. Ordinarily I would not take the time of this House to speak on a rather routine rule that simply allows us to consider a conference report.

However, I feel compelled to do so because the minority is trying to convert this rule debate into something that it is not, should not be, and cannot be under the rules of this House.

What the minority is proposing is that we defeat the previous question so that we can consider a nongermane substitute rule.

It is just that simple, it is just that ridiculous, it is just that outrageous, and it is just that futile.

The rule before us simply waives points of order against the conference report on the legislative branch appropriations bill.

The rule the minority Democrats would like to offer if they defeat the previous question would do much more than that. It would deem the conference report to be rejected and would then make it in order to take the House-passed bill from the Speaker's table with Senate amendments thereto, and substitute the conference language with further amendments—one of which is completely nongermane to that conference language.

But even if the additional language were germane to the conference report, the substitute rule itself is nongermane to the reported rule because it goes beyond waiving points of order on the conference report—it attempts to provide for the consideration of another matter by another procedure.

In other words, even if the minority were to succeed in defeating the previous question, there substitute rule would be ruled out of order on a germaneness point of order.

It is not germane to a rule waiving points of order to provide for the consideration of another matter using another procedure.

And here I cite Cannon's Precedents, volume 8, section 2956; Hinds' Precedents, volume 5, sections 5834-36; and Deschler-Brown's Precedents, volume

10, chapter 28, section 17.3, 17.4, and 17.5.

The precedents are clear on this. The minority knows this is the case. They tried this same ploy back on March 30th of this year on H.R. 831, the bill providing a health insurance tax deduction for the self-employed.

We got an advisory reading from the Parliamentarians at that time, just as we have on this occasion. That reading is that this is a nongermane substitute rule—plain and simple.

And yet the minority Democrats still insist on going through these meaningless procedural hoops that will get them absolutely nowhere. This is not just an exercise in futility. It is a political sham, a partisan charade, and a hollow gesture—all signifying nothing.

Moreover, by pursuing a procedural strategy that is clearly in violation of House rules and therefore cannot succeed under any circumstances, the minority Democrats are engaging in a cynical ploy by pretending to do something they know they cannot do.

Mr. Speaker, it is high time that we blew that whistle on such tactics as knowingly and willfully attempting to mislead the American people.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, the proposed substitute rule the minority would like to offer is nongermane on two counts. First, it attempts to make in order a nongermane procedure; and second, it attempts to make in order a nongermane amendment under that nongermane procedure.

Being knowingly guilty on one count is shameful; being knowingly guilty on two counts is downright sham-ful and deserves to be punished by the overwhelming adoption of the previous question on this rule.

I just want to commend the chairman and the subcommittee chairman of the Committee on Appropriations for bringing this bill to the floor because it does set the example for this Congress with all the other agencies, bureaus, departments of the Federal Government that are going to have to tighten their belt. We are doing it. With our help we expect the rest of the agencies to live up to the same thing so we can deal with the most important problem facing this Nation, and that is the terrible deficit that is literally turning this Nation into a bankrupt debtor nation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of the previous question and the rule.

□ 1615

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, some people viewing this proceeding, Members listening in the Chamber, certainly are aware that the United We Stand organization had a meeting during the break in my hometown of Dallas, TX. I went to that meeting and I had to regretfully tell the members of that organization that the majority leadership in the House of Representatives was stonewalling on the lobby reform issue, would not let us bring it up for a vote. I regretted that I had to communicate that to them.

We tried to offer this on the first day of the session, and we were prevented from offering this in January. I tried to offer this in the Committee on Rules, waiving points of order, so that it clearly would have been in order, and I was voted down on a strict partisan vote in the Committee on Rules.

Mr. Speaker, my only point is that the majority leadership in the House does not want this issue to come up, will not permit the lobbying gift ban to come up, and it is very unfortunate and I regretted that I had to inform the United We Stand organization of that.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD], the distinguished subcommittee chairman.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I will take time during the debate on the conference report itself to explain the bill, so I do not intend to do that at this time. I simply want to respond to the effort that is being made to put the gift ban issue onto this conference report.

Mr. Speaker, the gift ban issue is a very serious issue. It certainly demands and deserves a great deal of debate. To put anything of this consequence, which consists of 51 pages of legislation into the confines of a very limited debate during this conference report would be an absolute mistake. It ought to stand on its own; it ought to be debated on its own. It certainly should not be put on as a rider to a conference report that has 1 hour of debate on the rule and 1 hour of debate on the report itself. It is an issue of such great consequence that it ought to

have much more than that. So I would strongly urge the Members to not vote to allow this to go onto this conference report without the opportunity to have extensive debate and extensive review.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO], the ranking member of this subcommittee.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend from Texas for yielding me this time and indicate my congratulations to the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD], who brings this conference report to the floor, for the fine job that he has done in general during his first year as chairman of this subcommittee. But I regret that I have to stand in opposition to the previous question, in hopes that this body will take the opportunity when it deals with the budget of the legislative branch to deal with something that we have far too long neglected, certainly in this Congress, and frankly, in prior Congresses, to deal with, and that is the need to adopt strong lobby reform and gift ban legislation.

The House twice approved strong lobby reform and gift reform in the 103d Congress by 3-to-1 bipartisan majorities. The Republicans sadly filibustered it in the Senate at the end of the last session of Congress in order to deprive the President and the Democratic majority of having a political victory on something that had been worked out in great detail.

Regrettably, as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST] has already indicated, despite the effort to speak to the Perot movement in this country, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY] and the Speaker have stonewalled lobbying and gift reform for the 7 months we have been here. There was no willingness to deal with it during the reforms that were engaged in, far less significant reforms, on the first day of this session. And now, despite our efforts to speak to this group of people in our society, we continue to avoid dealing with the responsibility of having to reform the way we go about dealing with lobbyists, the way we go about dealing in our interrelationships with those who would lobby us or give us gifts.

Mr. Speaker, the Senate has passed lobby reform and a gift ban unanimously, something I never thought could possibly occur. The House should now join the executive branch and the Senate and do the same.

Mr. Speaker, the issues are well known. This conference report provides an excellent opportunity to deal legislatively with both of these issues in an expeditious fashion.

Lobby provisions that are included in this motion are identical to what the Senate has done, and that is appropriate. We need a commonly understood statute that would affect the enormous loopholes that have existed in the 1946 Lobbying Act that have permitted a situation in which fewer than

4,000 of the estimated 13,500 known Washington lobbyists are registered with this Congress. We need to close that loophole. We need to make sure, on the other hand, that the unpaid grassroots activities are completely exempt from this new requirement, and so those who opposed this bill last year because of opposition from the so-called Christian coalition should be comfortable to understand that advocacy by churches and religious groups are exempted in this bill that the Senate has adopted.

The gift restrictions are identical to the Senate-passed provisions and mirror restrictions that now apply to Members of the executive branch. Any gift over \$10 counts toward a \$100 annual limit per Member, or per staff, per lobbyists. We ought to have the same provisions apply to us that now apply to the Senate. It is appropriate we deal with it now so it can be effective in the next year.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the kind words that the chairman of the Legislative Appropriations Subcommittee, RON PACKARD, spoke at Rules Committee—that the reductions in this conference report build on the progress started under my chairmanship.

The conference report improves the House bill in several ways.

But the thoughtful treatment of many issues in this conference report, and the successful defense of the House position at conference on several important items, unfortunately emphasizes the two major issues where the conference has fallen far short:

General Accounting Office—the conference chose the lower Senate number, \$374 million, nearly \$20 million less than the House—more than a 15-percent cut below last year.

Office of Technology Assessment—despite two strong votes in the House and a near-majority in the Senate, the conference gave in to the Senate in mandating a close-down of OTA.

Accordingly, I reluctantly oppose the conference report.

The shut-down of OTA is particularly thoughtless. Restoring OTA did not need to come at the expense of GAO or the Library of Congress, who are struggling with flat budgets or budget cuts.

There are different ways to accomplish it:

An across-the-board cut—the Congressional Budget Office says less than a .03 percent—three one-hundredths of a percent—would be required to provide another \$6.5 million for OTA.

Use existing budget authority. The bill is \$114 million below the House 602b allocation and \$20 million below in outlays—there is plenty of room to provide these funds.

In fact, there was plenty of room to provide funds and stay close to the \$200 million in cuts that seem to be the goal of the Republicans.

But it is clear that the Republican fight to close OTA has been a symbolic fight.

It is clear this has nothing to do with budget cuts. The public is unlikely to be more impressed that we cut \$205 million instead of \$200 million.

At conference, Chairman PACKARD and Chairman LIVINGSTON opposed \$6.5 million to keep OTA alive—yet pleaded vigorously for \$7 million to renovate the Botanic Garden.

So this is a symbolic victory for the Republicans—but it is a victory that will be very expensive in the long run.

Policy issues across the spectrum are increasingly complex and technical.

OTA helps us sort out the facts from the fiction.

The need won't go away in the future—but we will be ill-equipped to deal with it.

The issues in the last few days before we adjourned for the August recess—environmental risk assessment and telecommunications—are just two examples of complicated policy issues that confront Congress each year.

I have examples of OTA reports issued in just the past few days:

Information Security and Privacy in Network Environments—this was produced as a followon report for the Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs on the heels of a 1994 report, and it was used to prepare for hearings and legislation in this Congress.

This report points out the necessity of a standing agency. Some opponents have said we can contract for such reports, but where do we get the followup assistance if we paid a private contractor to do the first report?

Electronic Surveillance in a Digital Age—this is a background paper requested by our colleague, MIKE OXLEY, last September when he was still a member of the minority.

But the Technology Board thought Mr. OXLEY had a great idea—to consider the technical aspects of implementing the Communications Assistance for Law Enforcement Act—so the background paper was authorized.

This report is perhaps the best indicator of the bipartisan nature of OTA and the fair-handed manner that the Technology Board operates.

International Partnerships in Large Science Projects—the budget implications of international collaboration in research and science projects are huge.

When does international collaboration make sense? When is it not in our national interest?

Research into such sweeping questions is what OTA does best—neither CRS or GAO is prepared to pick up analyses of such scope.

In short, I find it particularly ironic that the Speaker has termed this the cyber-Congress—yet has instructed his whips to destroy OTA.

AMO HOUGHTON has made a convincing case. He speaks with the best outside-the-beltway experience of any Member.

The House agreed with AMO, and spoke strongly in two votes, but the conferees did not insist on House position.

There were 46 votes in the Senate to sustain OTA including eight Republicans.

We believe there were other OTA supporters who were concerned about offsets from Library and GAO.

Since this ill-considered action by the conference, the outpouring of editorial comment has been astounding:

The Washington Post—"Congress should think this one over again. Thrift in Government operations holds a high priority in today's politics. But the information and insights provided by OTA's studies are important ingredients of wise legislating, and worth far more than the few millions needed to keep OTA alive."

The Economist—"What do you do with an institution that offers you impartial technical advice? If you are America's Congress, you close it down."

The Christian Science Monitor—"It would be a costly mistake."

The Pittsburgh Post-Gazette—"Through a comedy of errors, oversight and political machismo, Congress has chosen ignorance, and ended the 23-year history of its best and smallest agency."

The Minneapolis Star-Tribune—"The majority acts as though it wants to be a 20th century Know Nothing Party."

The International Association for Technology Assessment and Forecasting Institutions—"It would be a serious loss to the world community if OTA should be terminated. We see OTA as a flagship for all countries interested in adapting wisely to the ever increasing rate of technological change."

To summarize: OTA is a bipartisan organization—overseen by bipartisan House-Senate Technology Board.

OTA goes outside-the-beltway—5000 specialists from business, industry, and academia have contributed to its reports and policy recommendations.

OTA is a lean organization—since 1993, OTA voluntarily has reduced its middle and senior management by almost 40 percent. The funds we are seeking would represent a 40 percent cut below last year.

But the bottom line—OTA saves taxpayer dollars.

In looking at the Defense appropriations bill we'll take up soon, I'm struck by what CURT WELDON and JOHN SPRATT said in a "Dear Colleague" about OTA—"The type of work they perform is just not available from other congressional agencies."

It is imperative that Congress retain an independent analytical function, but that function is missing from this conference report.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS], my distinguished colleague on the Committee on Rules.

(Mr. GOSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend from Florida for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, this is the first of the appropriations bills to make it through the conference process, and I wish to commend the bill's managers, the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD], as well as the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], the chairman of the full committee who is here, for making sure that the legislative branch leads the way in the belt tightening that we know is going to be done.

This conference report, which obviously funds the conference, comes in at \$200 million below the actual amount spent for the current fiscal year. That is a real cut. That is real savings and one we can all be proud of, I think, in these tight budgetary times.

Mr. Speaker, the issue has been raised today that somehow the conferees of this spending bill failed because they did not include provisions reforming the gift rule for Members of this House. Well, the first point here is that reform of the gift rule, although it is a matter of great importance and very significant interest to many people, is not within the scope of the legis-

lative branch funding bill. It is an apples and oranges problem. No matter how big an apple gift reform is, it just cannot become an orange because somebody wants to declare it so. It would be a little bit like Cal Ripken showing up at Fenway Park tonight. Wrong place. So from a procedural point of view, raising this issue as part of today's debate I think is way off the mark.

Mr. Speaker, after the substance of reforming the gift rules, I do share the interests of many of our colleagues on both sides of the aisle of reviewing our gift rules and for the action recently taken in the other body reforming our House rules. I would point out I believe tomorrow there are going to be hearings in the Committee on the Judiciary; our colleague, the gentleman from Florida, CHARLES CANADY, I believe is chairing a subcommittee hearing on the bill of the gentleman from Connecticut, Mr. SHAYS, which actually was the forerunner of all of these, which is what got it started, and I believe that we are proceeding apace. I understand the Speaker has made a public statement today committing that we will take this up in due course. In my office we have a strict policy.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, in due course?

Mr. GOSS. I think due course is coming a lot sooner than you think.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Something like deliberate speed?

Mr. GOSS. Deliberate speed means different things of course on different sides of the aisle, but I think at this point we have a promise to go by early next year on this, and we are going to start the hearings tomorrow.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Would this be effective in the next calendar year?

Mr. GOSS. I do not know what the effective date is. I think it remains to be seen, but I think it is very clear that we can start the hearings tomorrow.

Along those lines, I have to point out that others have offered all kinds of bills. I have a lobbyist-paid travel bill that is in. It has a handful of Members' bipartisan support. Unfortunately, some of the colleagues I hear discussing this issue today are not on that bill. I hope they will take a good long look at it. I think efforts are underway to tighten the disclosure requirements to bring sunshine and accountability into our process.

Certainly as Members know, these principles sound easy, but they are not as easy when you start applying them, because you have to define what a gift is. If somebody gives you a memento, it is hard to make that distinction occasionally. I think most Members agree that we have to be wise and judicious in what we do, and I think it is very clear that both the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct and the Committee on Rules, both of which I am on, are interested in this along with the Committee on the Judiciary.

It has a terrific amount of interest, it is underway, it is going forward. To

somehow say that we are off on the wrong track here because the appropriations process, which we all know is on a very tight timetable which needs to go forward, to suddenly now throw a monkey wrench on that process because it does not have what is clearly a nongermane, inappropriate, out of scope issue in it, does not do us a service here at all. We need to get on with this rule, we need to get on with the conference, let things happen, and we need to take up the gift reform and the lobby reform and campaign reform as we have promised we would do in the right season when their time comes, and that season apparently starts tomorrow.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, last night in Fort Worth, TX, the local United We Stand organization had another meeting, and once again I informed them that I was going to attempt to bring this up today and once again the Republican leadership would steamroll this issue and not permit it to be brought up.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BRYANT].

(Mr. BRYANT of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BRYANT of Texas. Mr. Speaker, nothing could be simpler in the legislative business of this House than what we are doing today. It is a simple question for Members. Do you think that we should be able to continue to play golf for free, play tennis for free, go skiing for free, fly around the country on these recreational outings that are thinly disguised vacations, or do you think we ought to impose the same limits on this House that the U.S. Senate imposed on itself 4 weeks ago?

It is that simple. We ask you to vote against the previous question so that the amended rule of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST] may come forward so that we can simply offer the same provisions which the Senate has applied to itself as applicable to the House. That is all there is to it. All of this gobbledygook about procedures and all the tough talk about Deschler's Rules and so forth, all of it is meaningless. It is a very simple question.

There are those who believe Members of the House of Representatives ought to be able to play golf for free, who do not want to pay for their own golf or their own ski trips or their own tennis. They think the lobbyists ought to pay for it, and there are those who think it ought not to be allowed, that it ought to stop, that it is an embarrassment to the institution. There are those of us who have worked for 2½ years to pass legislation to stop this outrage, and there are those who spent 2½ years trying to prevent that legislation from passing. We have heard from some of those this afternoon just a few moments ago. They jump up and holler regular order. They are ready to fight for their right to have free golf and free tennis.

Mr. Speaker, I would just say that I wish we could get the same interest for some other issues as we seem to get for protecting free golf for Members of the House of Representatives. All of this would have the same rules that the Senate passed which, by the way, are quite moderate; they do not go as far as I would like to go. We want those rules applied to the House of Representatives. We do not have to wait for January, or more hearings; we can do it in the next 1½ hours. That is all we are asking for. We ask you to vote down the previous question so that we can offer this amendment to the legislative appropriation bill.

What are we doing? We are simply saying that there is a limit of \$50 on all gifts, meals and entertainment to Members of the House of Representatives. Fifty bucks is probably too much. I do not think most folks watching this debate think we even ought to get 50 bucks. But that limit is on there, and for those Members who want to keep on accepting it, they can keep on accepting it. But for goodness sakes, the same rules ought to apply to the House of Representatives.

We are saying that there is a \$100 limit from a single source. Pay for your own meals and golf and ski trips, but let the rest of us impose this rule upon the House so that we can regain the confidence of the American people and this institution.

I would point out to you that the bitterest attacks on this institution have come from some of the same people who stand up here every time we have this debate and defend the status quo. And where does the status quo get us? It just gets us greater and greater in debt to the American people with regard to credibility.

Why do we not go ahead and do this? Two-and-a-half years ago we embarked on an effort to do it. This House passed it two times by overwhelming margins. It would be law today except for a filibuster in the Senate that killed it. Why not get it done right now, impose reasonable restraints on the behavior of Members of the House with regard to gifts from lobbyists and be done with it. Why not?

Nobody wants to rise and answer that question. The defense over here today will be all over the board. Now we hear there is going to be more hearings. We had hearings on this 3 months ago. We were told there would be a markup in due course, very soon, do not worry about it. Here we are, September, 3 months before the end of the year, no markup. All we have had is an announcement that as a result of what we are trying to do here today, my goodness, there will be another hearing tomorrow.

□ 1630

Well, let us stop beating around the bush and putting the American people off and stop playing games. Lobbyists should not be able to buy meals and so forth for Members of the House of Rep-

resentatives. It is as simple as that. There is not a single person in this House who has served here or who has served in State and local government who has not behaved in the same fashion we are trying to prohibit today.

Mr. Speaker, I do not hold myself out as a paragon of virtue either, but it is clear some years ago it was necessary to make this change. We began trying to make the change, and I would encourage the Members of the House to vote down the previous question and given us an opportunity to amend this law to pass the same rules to apply to the House as apply to the Senate and be done with this issue once and for all, and say if you are going to play golf, gentlemen, pay for it yourself. If you are going to go on a ski trip, pay for it yourself. If you are going to go out and have a big fancy meal, pay for it yourself. That is all we are saying today. Vote down the question.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, as a Member of Congress who has never played golf nor has any intention to, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I find it interesting that my colleagues appear to be so sanctimonious and self-righteous about somebody going out and having a hamburger or dinner with somebody saying that is buying influence when the same Members that are making these statements and trying to make the American people feel like we are doing something wrong by playing golf with somebody or tennis with somebody or having dinner with somebody are accepting thousands of dollars in campaign contributions.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BRYANT], according to the information on his FEC report, got 52, count them, 52 \$5,000 contributions from PAC's. I would not accuse him of wrongdoing, but if there is any influence peddling, if the appearance of influence peddling is something we are talking about, I would think 52 \$5,000 contributions would have more of an impact on the gentleman from Texas, [Mr. BRYANT], than somebody buying me a sandwich, or somebody playing tennis with someone, or someone playing golf with someone; 52 \$5,000 contributions.

In 1994, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BRYANT] got \$273,689.51, and over half of those were from special interest PAC's, but he does not want to talk about that.

The gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] got \$196,400, and 69 percent, over two-thirds, came from PAC's. He got contributions from the American Federation of State, county and municipal people. He got the cable industry, human rights campaign, Democrat, Republican, Independent Voters Educational Political Action Fund, and a lot of labor unions. But those do not have influence, folks, those \$5,000 contributions to him does not have any influence. I believe that. But if I have a hamburger with somebody I am break-

ing the law? That is buying influence? I think my colleagues have their priorities kind of skewed.

Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that many of these functions that we are talking about raises money for charitable contributions, like leukemia research and cancer research. I say to my colleagues, I think that is very important. I would rather have these private individuals do this and private groups do this than the taxpayers.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BRYANT] if he would like to respond to the gentleman who just spoke.

Mr. BRYANT of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for the time. I would like to ask the gentleman from Indiana if he would engage in a colloquy with me.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRYANT of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I would be happy to.

Mr. BRYANT of Texas. Mr. Speaker, since we are talking about political action committee contributions, did the gentleman vote for the campaign finance bill that passed the House last year?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I do not know which the gentleman is talking about. We had several.

Mr. BRYANT of Texas. Did the gentleman vote for any of them?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I would have to check.

Mr. BRYANT of Texas. I do not have to check.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman a question? I will limit the campaign contributions to \$1,000. Will he vote for that?

Mr. BRYANT of Texas. Regular order, Mr. Speaker. I have the time.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, then let me respond.

Mr. BRYANT of Texas. The gentleman had political action committee contributions when most of us voted to limit those and the gentleman did not.

Let me ask a second question. Has the gentleman played golf at any time in the last year at the expense of a lobbyist?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I have played golf at the expense of people raising money for leukemia research and for cancer research so the taxpayers do not have to.

Mr. BRYANT of Texas. Did those people happen to be lobbyists?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. No.

Mr. BRYANT of Texas. Is the gentleman going to tell Members of the House that you have not played golf this year at the expense of a lobbyist?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. No.

Mr. BRYANT of Texas. How about last year?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. No. The people who put on fundraisers for cancer research are organizations, not lobbyists.

Mr. BRYANT of Texas. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I am not even talking about these sham vacations that come in the guise of—

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, will you let me answer? Do not ask me a question if—

Mr. BRYANT of Texas. The gentleman's answer was no, I think. And what I am saying is, I am not even talking about these sham vacations that come in the guise of some fundraising scheme for some charity. I am talking about just taking you out on the golf course and letting you play golf for free? The gentleman is going to say you have not done that?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. No. I said no. Did the gentleman hear me?

Mr. BRYANT of Texas. Very well. I am just so surprised, Mr. BURTON.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Will the gentleman vote for an amendment to your bill to limit campaign contributions from PACs to \$1,000? Because I am going to introduce it, and I want to see if the gentleman will vote for it because you are getting all these \$5,000 contributions.

Mr. BRYANT of Texas. I would ask the gentleman if he will vote for a bill that says Members do not get to play golf for free and they have to pay for their own green fees? That is what we have before the House today.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Of course.

Mr. BRYANT of Texas. The gentleman will vote for a bill that says a lobbyist cannot pay for a Member's golf green fees?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Of course.

Mr. BRYANT of Texas. It is before us. Vote with us.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. The fact of the matter is, will the gentleman vote to limit your campaign contributions to \$1,000?

Mr. BRYANT of Texas. I have already voted for political action committee reform.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. The gentleman is going to get that chance, because we are going to propose that amendment to your bill.

Mr. BRYANT of Texas. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time. I will say one more time. Mr. BURTON protests against circumstances against which he had a chance to change and he refused to vote to change it.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Did you get 52 \$5,000 contributions?

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY], the majority whip.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to support this rule. This is a fair rule which provides for the consideration of the legislative branch appropriations bill. This appropriations bill is the first shot across the bow for those last defenders of the status quo. It cuts spending first, it cuts spending fast, and it cuts spending fairly.

In fact, this bill spends \$205 million less than we spent last year on the leg-

islative branch. These are real cuts, not the mythical decreases in the rate of spending made popular by the former majority.

Mr. Speaker, we have kept our promises with this legislation and we will continue to keep these promises all during the fall. Let us not be confused by the rhetoric from the other side of the aisle. They keep trying to confuse the issue. The issue here is spending. They do not have a plan to cut spending so they go into gift bans and all this other stuff.

A vote to defeat the previous question will kill this conference report. It will not reform campaign finance, it will not reform our lobby laws. Any claims to the contrary are simply not accurate. The minority seeks to defeat the previous question so they can stop this first spending reduction bill in its tracks. That is not why the American people sent us here. They sent us here to change the way the government operates.

I want to commend the gentleman from California, RON PACKARD, my good friend, for his excellent work on this conference report. It is truly the first step to a balanced budget. So I urge my colleagues to think before you vote to vote for real reform and to vote to cut spending first by voting for the previous question for the rule and for this conference report.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I asked earlier of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] if he could indicate when we would deal with gift reform and lobby reform if it were not possible to do it on this bill at this time, which, by the way, does nothing to disturb any of the other work that Mr. PACKARD and his committee have done, as I have indicated. But when will that be brought to the floor if we do not bring it up tonight and try to resolve it before we go to Baltimore?

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, the best I can tell the gentleman is before we adjourn sine die.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, does that mean it will be effective in the next Congress?

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER].

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding time to me.

This is an incredible debate to have on our first day back. It is absolutely no wonder the American people are very tired of listening to the wrangling in this body. It is like we have not been away.

Now, let me talk about some of the things that I think do not pass the straight-face test. Yes, this is the first of the 13 bills we have to pass to keep the Government going before September 30. September 30 has been the dead-

line forever and ever. It is not a secret date. We know it. And we have never been so late in getting these bills done. So there is a possibility that many people are going to be furloughed, all sorts of awful things are going to happen, the Government may close down, or whatever, but we are going to step up to the plate today, if this passes, and we are going to pass ours first. That means if we get to the 30th and you have not passed the others, we will not be hurt.

It is interesting because we are putting it in the name of "we are belt tightening," which is true, we are belt tightening, so we are setting an example and we just hope that we will be able to get the other people's bills through. If they are not, they will be furloughed, have a nice day, or their programs will be cut or whatever, but we will not be hurt. We will not be tied to the track as this train wreck is coming. That is No. 1.

Listen to this and say wait a minute.

Wait a minute. This bill ought to be last, not first. If the Congress has not gotten its business done, they certainly should not make sure that they are held harmless by the fact they have not done their business. That is what the President is talking about when he says he will not sign this. I salute him. He is right.

Now, No. 2, we have been trying to get a gift bill cleaned up since President Truman was here. President Truman was the first President to come down and say that there were lobbying loopholes, and we have worked away at trying to tinker and figure it out. Last year this body passed it, the other body filibustered it. This year the other body passed it and we are trying to say let us put exactly the same thing on and be done with it.

Mr. Speaker, I love the golf conversation. Now, the way I understand these things, and maybe the gentleman from Texas can explain it to me, people come to play golf to raise money for these wonderful causes, and they are wonderful causes, but they come because they think they are going to get to play with a Congressman and they may have some words with them as they ride around in the cart.

Now, first of all, if we cared so much about the cause, I would think we would be willing to donate our time, would we not, and pay for our own green fees and have a little more money for whatever we are doing? And, second, to pretend like these are just citizens who walked in and were willing to donate so some Congressman could play free, that does not make sense. We know what this is all about and it is not passing the straight-face test.

We should pass this gift ban. It would make people feel much better about what is going on here. We also should not be rushing out here to pass our bill first so ourselves and our staff and the Senate, boy, no matter how bad we mess up, we will not be hurt. We will

get our paycheck through all of this and we just hope some of those GS-7's or some people relying on Government checks or whatever, that they do not get hurt too bad, and we hope we get their bills through before the 30th or whatever.

Now, that just looks like the same old same old. In fact, worse than that, because I think that the people on this side of the aisle, who have been on the appropriations and in a leadership position can tell you we had these bills in this body passed every single time in July, at the latest. Never have we come back and had more than one or two bills hanging out there with some kind of disagreement. But now to have all 13, and run forth and say we will take care of ourselves first, as this great example that we belt tightened, yeah, we belt tightened, and we should have, but we are not hurt, and we are not going to do the gift bill because we are hiding behind the legalism of nonegermane, baloney. People are tired of it. Vote it down.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

(Mr. LIVINGSTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the Committee on Rules for recommending a good rule. This is an excellent conference agreement, and I urge the adoption of this conference agreement and the ordering as well of the previous question.

Frankly, I am astounded at hearing all of this revisionist history, about how in 40 years of Democratic control of the House of Representatives you could not pass a gift ban bill, so now all of a sudden it is imperative we defeat the previous question on a rule so we can add a gift ban bill to a conference report that has nothing whatsoever to do with a gift ban bill.

Now, you had 40 years to do it and yet you want to do it today? How about next year? That is when we are going to take it up. The Speaker has indicated we are going to take it up next year. Let us take it up then.

□ 1645

This is a good conference agreement. The gentlewoman says, "We are helping ourselves first." First of all, this conference agreement cuts \$206 million below 1995, when the Democrats were in control of the House. It cuts \$114.7 million below the budget authority allocation for this bill. It cuts \$20.4 million below the outlay allocation, and it cuts, this is what they do not like to hear, 2,614 full-time Federal employees, a 9.5 percent reduction. They do not like to hear that, so they want to tack on all this extraneous stuff to overlook the fact that we are actually accomplishing a great deal.

The gentlewoman says, "We have never approached this bill first." Let

me suggest to the gentlewoman she is entirely wrong. In fact, for fiscal year 1995, in which the Democrats were the majority party, this was the first bill to be signed by the President of the United States on July 22, 1994. For fiscal 1994 it was the first bill to be signed on August 11, 1993. For fiscal 1992 it was the first bill to be signed, on August 14, 1991, and for the point that the gentlewoman made about it never being so late, never been passed late, this bill was signed with all 13 bills on November 5, 1990. It was signed with all 13 bills on December 22, 1987, and it was signed with all 13 bills in an omnibus C.R. on October 18, 1986.

The point is that these arguments are fallacious. They are red herrings. They are trying to get around the fact that this is a good conference agreement. We cut our budget, we bring it to the President and say, "It cuts money out of the legislative budget, the budget that governs the conduct of this House and the other body." It is a decent conference report, and it is foolish, foolish to say, after they could not pass a gift ban in 40 years, therefore we ought to disrupt this good bill and pass a gift ban with it today. I say to the Members, reject what they are trying to do, order the previous question, pass the rule, pass the bill, and let us get on with the business, because we are running out of time.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, my friend, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], who is a very fine Member, before he leaves the Chamber I am afraid had a little case of selective amnesia a moment ago. He said that we had never passed this. I know he did not intend that. We did pass this bill last year. It was passed when the Democrats controlled the Congress last year, it passed the House of Representatives, went over to the Senate, was filibustered by Republicans in the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I take the time to simply inform Members what I plan to do on the motion to recommit, and also to urge opposition to the previous question on the rule. As the gentlewoman from Colorado has indicated, I think it is extremely unseemly, when it appears that we are headed into a train wreck with the Government shutting down because of the nonpassage of various appropriations bills, I think it is unseemly that the one bill which would be released from the track so it will not participate in that train wreck is the bill that funds the legislative branch of Government. I do not think the public will understand that, I do not think we would want to have to go home and explain that.

If other groups in this society are going to be held hostage, so should we. That is why I will offer a motion to recommit, which would require that the bill be recommitted to the committee on conference with instructions that

the conferees not meet until they are subsequently instructed to do so by the House, so we can in fact pass our other business before we take care of our own.

Second, with respect to the previous question, I simply want to say that I find it amazing that the majority party cannot object at all when 17 separate legislative riders were attached to the EPA appropriation bill, virtually all of which were special interest deals. Yet, they somehow are morally offended when we try to attach an amendment to the legislative appropriations bill which cleans up the relationship between Members of Congress and lobbyists.

I for one am tired of seeing network news programs run stories about Members of Congress schmoozing with lobbyists on beaches or on golf courses. We all understand the special advantage that gives them. We think it is a special advantage that ought to be taken away. That is why the Bryant amendment ought to pass.

With respect to the equation of PAC contributions, let me simply say this. I myself make no apologies whatsoever for any PAC contributions I have ever received. They are fully aboveboard, they are reported, and I have no objection to having a bunch of workers in the back of the shop being able to unite to contribute collectively as much as four chief executives in the front office can contribute to the other side in any corporation.

I would also say that I frankly find it a joke to have Members of the majority party concerned about a \$5,000 PAC contribution and the damage that may do to the legislative process, but they have no objection whatsoever to one family in Wisconsin contributing \$1 million to the empire of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH], GOPAC, and the other pieces. If we want to get worried about buying special privileges, I would say that is what we ought to start looking at.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. SMITH], a distinguished and effective freshman Member of this Congress.

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I just returned from a conference in Dallas that I heard referred to earlier. It was United We Stand America. I have spoken in 2 weeks to over 20,000 people at conventions. There is now a national group called the Clean Congress Foundation that is now bigger than all of the individual groups.

I will tell the Members, America is disgusted as much by the partisan bickering, posturing, with no intent to go anywhere, as they are with anything. Dallas was about a lot of people tired of partisan politics, disgusted by people that have held power for 42 years that could have cleaned up the system, who are now standing pure as the driven snow, disgusted; disgusted by the Republicans that used to do the

same thing, all of us, them and us, on both sides of the aisle.

I want to tell the Members that what is most disturbing today to Middle America is what they are seeing on the floor today. I checked out to see if this amendment could actually do anything. No. Members know it cannot do anything. The Parliamentarian stands and says it is not germane. It is not even debatable. They knew when they took up this time on the floor that there was not a chance of a cold day in hell of getting it through, and they were playing with the American people again, and they are mad. They are mad.

I tell the Members today, we have a bill, the Clean Congress Act, 2072, and it stops playing around like this bill that still allows trips, trips that fly you all over the world as gifts, still allows things that people do not want. They do not want a \$50 gift, they do not want a \$100 gift, they do not want any gift. They want no money flowing here in Washington, DC. 2072 is the bill that we want to pass, and we ask Members to stop quibbling and support it. Please approve the previous question.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out to the gentlewoman, who is a new Member, that I offered a motion in the Committee on Rules to waive germaneness so this could be brought up on the floor today, and that motion was voted down on a straight party line vote. The Republican members of the Committee on Rules refused to waive germaneness in the Committee on Rules so we could address this issue today. The Democratic members asked that it be waived in the Committee on Rules.

If the Republican Members had been willing to do that in the Committee on Rules, there would be no argument on the floor today about whether it is germane or not germane. This is all a game. This is all a sham on the other side of the aisle. This could be brought up. This could have been on the floor today if the Republican Members of the Committee on Rules would have permitted it to be on the floor today.

It is 9 months now. We passed this last year. I want to make that point again, because the gentlewoman made the same point that the gentleman from Louisiana made: Why did the Democrats not pass this? The Democratically controlled House of Representatives did pass this last year, and it was blocked by the Republican Members of the U.S. Senate in a filibuster.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO].

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to the previous question, and I urge my colleague to vote against the previous question so that the gift and lobbying reform language can be added to this legislation. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle are very fond these days of talking about how responsive they are

to the American public. I will tell the Members, go to any town hall, go to any group of Americans these days, working middle-class families. The American public strongly favors banning gifts from lobbyists to Members of Congress, and they are right, because it is the perks and the privileges that demean this institution, and every single person who serves here.

That is not what we were elected to do, or why we were elected to this body. We are here to do the people's business, and we are well compensated for that. We do not need free vacations, free frequent flier miles, free gifts, or free meals to sweeten the deal.

Let me say that working middle-class families are getting nothing for free. They are paying every single day for everything, and they are working darned hard for it. Let us understand what their lives are about. They are getting a glimpse of what some Members of this body's lives are about in accepting free gifts from lobbyists and their influence every single day.

We do need to enforce disclosure by the lobbyists. The American people have a right to know how much these groups are spending in order to influence legislation in this body. It is high time that we tackled these issues and join our colleagues in the other body in implementing serious gift and lobby reform.

The Republican leadership has repeatedly told us that the schedule for this session is full, so that the vote today, Mr. Speaker, is probably our last chance to pass lobby and gift reform this year. Let us seize the opportunity to limit the influence of special interests. Let us defeat the previous question. Let us once and for all tell the American people that we are serious about reform. Let this body reflect the interests of the people and not the special interests.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS].

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, these are the kinds of debates where you wonder whether you should weigh in, because a lot of people are angry and there is a lot of partisan debate. Then you say, "Is this something you want to be a part of, this debate?" I do not know if I want to be a part of this debate, but I do want to say that I believe with all my heart and soul that I have waited 40 years for the opportunity to have a leading role as a majority Member. I have only been in office 8 months in the majority. I would like to give my Republicans an opportunity to do in 2 years this issue, which my colleagues on that side had an opportunity to do for 40 years.

When I listen to the gentlewoman from Colorado, PAT SCHROEDER, saying that "I am voting for the legislative appropriation because I want to increase or make sure that I am paid," in this code, by statute, Members of Con-

gress and the President of the United States are under permanent appropriation. The Democrats voted in 1980, and Republicans as well, to make sure that we were paid under permanent appropriation, so I just do not think it carries any weight to say a Member of Congress wants to vote for the legislative appropriation to be paid. We are, for whatever reason, in this book, permanent.

In terms of the issue of gift ban or lobby disclosure, I will say something I would never say if I did not mean it. I would not run again if gift ban and lobby disclosure are not passed. I would say to my colleagues, this issue is going to be taken up by Republicans. If it is not taken up, I will not run again. That is how strongly I believe in my leadership and in my fellow Republicans taking up gift ban and lobby disclosure.

I happen to agree with what the Senate has done. I do not think it is monumental, but I think it gets us a long way. I do not criticize that side for bringing this issue up. If it puts it on the antenna of some of our leadership, then so be it. However, there are very important Members of this Congress who have gotten elected on this issue.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I regret that I have to say this. I think there are some Members on the other side who feel if they repeat something often enough that is not true, people will believe it, so I feel an obligation to repeat what is true. The previous speaker just said the Democrats did not pass this legislation. We passed this legislation last year. The gift ban was passed by the Democratically controlled House of Representatives. It is not true to say that the Democratic Party would not and could not pass this piece of legislation.

□ 1700

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT].

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, the Senate of the United States has acted on this issue and they achieved a good result because they had some bipartisan support. It is unfortunate today that there appears to be no bipartisanship on this question of how we can cut the ties that have bound legislators and lobbyists, because it definitely needs to be attended to.

I think that all that this will accomplish is to take an imperfect compromise from the Senate and put it in place here in the House. If anyone needs a reason as to why this ought to occur, let me reflect on my own experience in this regard, because when this measure was up before, I spoke on it here on the floor of the House. I addressed the issue on the floor of the House in the motion to recommit, and

I did so without making any reference to either Democrats or Republicans, but suggested there was a need to end these freebies.

What I got from that in response was a member of the Republican Committee on Appropriations, one of the great cardinals who is here on the floor today, to tell me that he had told his staff to go out and look for a project to cut in my district. They found one to the tune of \$90 million, a project in my district to whittle out because I had the audacity as a new Member to stand up and say we need to do something about a gift ban.

Well, I am here today to say I am not going to be intimidated on that issue because I think it goes to the core of what this Congress is about and the demand of people to see this place cleaned up. My objection to the Republicans is not that they have done too much to change the way this Congress operates, but they have done too little, and they know it.

In Texas when you shake hands on something like Speaker GINGRICH did up in New Hampshire, it means something. It is an agreement. You lend your word. But all we got was a promise and a lot of talk and whistling in the background. Someday over the rainbow we will get around to dealing with this.

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

Mr. DOGGETT. I will yield on your time as long as you want to talk about this act of intimidation right here on the floor of the Congress.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD].

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I simply want to take time to clarify two issues that have been mentioned several times.

Last year we did pass a gift ban bill. It was not this gift ban that is being proposed. Totally different. This one is 51 pages long. I have not read a single page of that 51 pages. I do not think any Member of Congress except those that have proposed it have read the 51 pages. This is not the time to pass a 51-page amendment to this conference report. That is the point I wanted to make.

The second point: We have worked very carefully for several years and certainly this year to make this a bipartisan bill. I want to commend the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] who is the ranking member of the subcommittee. We have worked in a bipartisan way.

Unfortunately, this is turning into a very partisan vote on the rule. Frankly, that is probably the way it is going to go, along a straight partisan vote. That is unfortunate when we have worked together on a nonpartisan bill that has done a lot of good work for restructuring Congress.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. Then I will be yielding to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BRYANT].

Mr. Speaker, last night at the United We Stand meeting in Fort Worth, I informed the United We Stand members that the Republicans would unanimously vote against the gift ban today. That appears to be the case, based on what I have just heard. I think that is unfortunate. We have a chance to lay this issue to rest once and for all, but the Republicans will not permit us to bring it up.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BRYANT], the author of the gift ban.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 2 minutes.

(Mr. BRYANT of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BRYANT of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I really appreciate my colleague the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST] yielding me the time.

Let me simply say that we have heard a number of statements on the floor today that once again, as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST] said, need to be corrected very clearly. First, the repeated refrain from the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] and a few others, why did the Democrats not pass this legislation in the past when they had control of the House?

The answer, of course, is we did pass it. We did not just pass it once, we passed it twice. It was filibustered to death by the then Republican minority in the Senate.

Second, we heard the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. SMITH] say a moment ago that somehow or another what we are trying to do will have no effect, it cannot happen, it is against the rules.

The fact of the matter is that notwithstanding what the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. SMITH] was told, I am sure by some Members on her side, we can pass this gift ban in the next hour and a half simply by voting down the previous question. That is all we are asking that this House do.

This is about the third time we have asked that this be done this year. We did it last year. We are simply asking that we go ahead and make the same rules that apply to the Senate as of 5 weeks ago also apply to the House. It is not complicated. It is a simple question of whether or not you want to do it. It is just that simple.

Does it make sense, particularly in light of all of the legislatures around the country who have already applied these kind of rules or more strict rules to themselves, does it make any sense that the House of Representatives would be the last bastion of free golf and free tennis and free ski trips for legislators? I think it does not make any sense. We have moved into a new era. Nobody is perfect.

We began this process, by the way, in a very bipartisan fashion 2½ years ago.

We actually got it out of the subcommittee which I was the chairman of at the time with a unanimous vote of both parties. But at some point along the way, one side of the House decided it was not in their interest to see it passed and it was filibustered to death in the Senate.

Look, let us just take it up and pass it today and not hear of it any more. If you want to go further than the Senate has gone, and I would sure like to because I do not think they went far enough, but if you want to go further than the Senate has gone, you can do so. This does not raise any obstacles to that. Certainly you can do so. But today let us pass the Senate rule that says Members of the Senate cannot get free gifts from lobbyists, and make it apply to the House of Representatives, and be done with this issue and do the American people a favor.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to that distinguished member of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my very good friend from Miami, the vice chairman of the Subcommittee on Rules and Organization of the House, for yielding me this time.

I would like to bring us back to the issue that we are debating here. It happens to be the legislative branch appropriations bill.

If we are going to simply comply with the standing rules of the House which is what we try desperately to do on a regular basis, we will not waive germaneness. With the exception of the conference report itself, there are not waivers on this bill, and so it seems to me that the responsible thing for us to do is to recognize that a measure which is going to cut \$205 million, a real cut of \$205 million, should have the chance to be voted on here on the House floor.

We have been debating during this legislative branch appropriations debate the issue of lobbying reform. The fact of the matter is that is going to come up. As my friend, the gentleman from Connecticut, has pointed out, an opportunity has existed for four long, uninterrupted decades on the other side of the aisle to deal with this issue. The 104th Congress has met for 8 months. We have had 8 months to deal with a wide range of things.

I would hasten to say to my friends from Texas, Mr. DOGGETT especially whom I asked to yield earlier, when he said that we have not brought about reforms, I have to take that as a personal insult, because on January 4, we passed the largest, most sweeping reforms that the U.S. Congress has seen in over half a century. Not since the 1946 Legislative Reorganization Act have we done very important things that gained bipartisan support, like eliminating proxy voting; dramatically reducing the number of committees and subcommittees, by 25 percent; reducing by

a third committee staff; and something that my friend from Connecticut also worked long and hard on, having Congress comply with the laws imposed on other Americans.

The fact of the matter is we brought about major sweeping reforms and it has not come to an end. But this bill is not where we should be debating this. We are simply trying to cut the level of appropriations for this institution, and I hope very much that we will be able to pass the previous question, and pass this rule.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question in order to add the gift and lobbying reform provisions passed by the other body to the conference report now before the House. Unless we act now, the House will have no opportunity this year to vote on lobbying and gift reform.

Throughout the 104th Congress, the House Republican leadership has refused to schedule consideration of lobbying and gift reform legislation. In fact, they have made it clear that such measures will not be considered by the House this year. From the first day of the 104th Congress, the Republican leadership has allowed corporate lobbyists unprecedented access to the legislative drafting process. This access has resulted in weakened environmental and health protections, crippled worker safety standards, and special tax benefits for the wealthiest Americans. Nowhere in the much-heralded Contract With America did the Republican leadership address gift and lobbying reform. Nowhere in the Rules of the House reform package did these provisions appear. My colleagues, the silence of the House Republican leadership on this issue has been deafening.

Mr. Speaker, twice during the 103d Congress, the House approved similar lobbying reform and gift legislation by solid bipartisan majorities only to see these measures stalled by filibusters in the other body. Now that they have finally passed these reforms, we in the House must also act.

The lobbying reform provisions would correct the enormous loopholes in current law that allow more than 70 percent of Washington's lobbyists to lobby congressional offices without registering. Under these provisions, unpaid grass-roots lobbying activities would be completely exempt from the new requirements, as would advocacy by churches and religious groups.

My colleagues, the issue of lobbying and gift reform has been thoroughly debated by Congress. The time to act is now. I urge defeat of the previous question so that we may add these important provisions to H.R. 1854, the conference report on legislative branch appropriations for fiscal year 1996.

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the previous question on the rule for the legislative branch appropriations conference report.

First, let me commend my colleagues, VIC FAZIO, MARTY MEEHAN, and JOHN BRYANT for bringing this important issue to the floor.

My friends, let's not pass the bill which funds our daily business until we reform the political business-as-usual in this city.

It has been 87 days since our Speaker shoot hands with the President in New Hampshire, pledging to act on campaign finance and political reform.

I praised the Speaker for that handshake. In fact, I asked the Speaker to consider a bill I introduced with MARTY MEEHAN, TIM JOHNSON and others that would establish the kind of independent commission that the Speaker shook hands on.

But since then, the Speaker argued against a rush to judgment.

Eighty-seven days later, it's safe to say the Republican leadership of the House is in no rush to clean up our political system.

And that's a shame. We're the only House in this city that is dragging its feet on reform.

At the White House, the President has twice laid out his detailed plan to the Speaker. He's even named possible commissioners.

The other body—not known for its zest for reform—held 2 days of debate and passed solid lobbying and gift ban reform bills.

During the first 100 days of this Congress, we passed numerous items of the Contract With America which will do great harm to our cities, our families, and our environment.

During the second 100 days, we passed appropriations bills that slash so many of the programs which benefit ordinary Americans, while at the same time leaving policies that help rich and powerful corporations untouched.

So before another 100 days go by since the historic handshake in New Hampshire, let's at least take one small step to try to convince the American people that this institutions is not for sale to the highest bidder.

Defeat the previous question. Adopt these critical gift and lobbying reforms.

Don't wait another day. Pass reform now.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5 of rule XV, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device, if ordered, will be taken on the question of agreeing to the resolution.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 228, nays 179, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 636]
YEAS—228

Allard
Archer
Armedy
Bachus
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)

Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Bilbray
Billirakis
Bliley
Blute

Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brewster
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunn
Bunning

Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Castle
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clinger
Coble
Coburn
Collins (GA)
Combest
Cooley
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Creameans
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Flanagan
Forbes
Fowler
Fox
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Funderburk
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutknecht
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert

Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kasich
Kelly
Kim
King
Kingston
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Linder
Livingston
Longley
Lucas
Manzullo
Martini
McCollum
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Metcalf
Meyers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Molinari
Moorhead
Murtha
Myers
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Oxley

Packard
Parker
Paxon
Petri
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roukema
Royce
Salmon
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stockman
Stump
Talent
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Trafigant
Upton
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NAYS—179

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews
Baesler
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Berman
Bevill
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (OH)
Bryant (TX)
Cardin
Chabot
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Condit

Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Danner
de la Garza
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Durbin
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost

Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gonzalez
Gordon
Gutiérrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Holden
Hoyer
Jackson-Lee
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E.B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Klecicka
LaFalce

Lantos	Orton	Spratt
Levin	Owens	Stark
Lewis (GA)	Pallone	Stenholm
Lipinski	Pastor	Stokes
LoBiondo	Payne (NJ)	Studds
Lofgren	Payne (VA)	Stupak
Lowe	Pelosi	Tanner
Luther	Peterson (FL)	Taylor (MS)
Manton	Peterson (MN)	Tejeda
Markey	Pickett	Thompson
Martinez	Pomeroy	Thornton
Mascara	Poshard	Thurman
Matsui	Rahall	Torres
McCarthy	Rangel	Torricelli
McDermott	Reed	Towns
McHale	Richardson	Velázquez
McNulty	Rivers	Vento
Meehan	Roemer	Visclosky
Meek	Rose	Volkmer
Menendez	Roybal-Allard	Ward
Miller (CA)	Rush	Waters
Mineta	Sabo	Watt (NC)
Minge	Sanders	Waxman
Mink	Sawyer	Williams
Montgomery	Schroeder	Wise
Moran	Schumer	Woolsey
Nadler	Scott	Wyden
Neal	Skaggs	Wyn
Obey	Skelton	Yates
Olver	Slaughter	

NOT VOTING—27

Bishop	Maloney	Reynolds
Brown (FL)	McDade	Riggs
Deal	McKinney	Sanford
Fattah	Mfume	Serrano
Foley	Moakley	Sisisky
Geren	Mollohan	Smith (NJ)
Green	Morella	Tucker
Harman	Oberstar	Waldholtz
Lincoln	Ortiz	Wilson

□ 1731

Ms. SLAUGHTER and Mr. MANTON changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I, reluctantly voted for the previous question in spite of my desire to support the Senate gift ban. I personally have implemented the Senate gift ban in my office. While the golf and tennis trips worth thousands of dollars to Members usually benefit charity as well as the Members, there is no question in my mind that these primarily recreational trips should be eliminated as a Member's perk. The American people are demanding that we reform this system of expensive dinners, gifts, and trips. The question is not whether or not people believe the other party. They don't trust them either. Citizens are fed up with both parties because they believe we work too closely with those who give us financial benefits—personal and political. Our large freshman Republican class was elected largely on Government reform. We are not likely to remain if we don't progress on real reform—of Congress itself, or PACS, of gifts, of term limits. I will continue to sponsor legislation on these issues, as well as voluntarily implement them in my office. While ultimately this is a question of integrity and character, I sincerely hope that our leadership will begin voting on these issues soon because previous Congresses have spent the public's full measure of trust.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

LIMITING DEBATE ON CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 1854, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that debate on the conference report to accompany H.R. 1854 be limited to 10 minutes each, equally divided between myself and the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO].

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

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the consideration of the conference report to H.R. 1854, making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, and that I may include extraneous and tabular material.

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

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 1854, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 206, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 1854) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of July 28, 1995, at page H7964.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD] and the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] each will be recognized for 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD].

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, it is pleasure to present the conference report on the 1996 legislative branch appropriations bill. This is the first 1996 appropriations bill to come out of conference, but there are a number close behind us.

The conference report presents a bill that will greatly reduce the size of our own branch of Government.

To summarize, the conference agreement provides budget authority of \$2.18 billion. This is \$433 million below the President's budget request, a 16.5 percent reduction. It is \$205.7 million

below fiscal year 1995; that's an 8.6 percent reduction in funding below the current year. This agreement reduces legislative branch jobs [FTE's] by 2,614 under fiscal year 1995, Senate staffing excluded; that's a 9.5 percent reduction in jobs. Finally, the conference agreement is \$114.7 million below our 602(b) budget resolution target.

The House and Senate concluded a successful conference.

There were 55 amendments to the House bill, all were resolved by the conferees.

I will include a table showing details and a list of the highlights of the conference agreement.

We have compared the conference agreement to the House bill.

The bill we sent to the Senate did not have funds for Senate operations.

Excluding the Senate items, the conference agreement is \$9,518,000 below the House-passed bill. The reductions to the House bill consist of: \$18,458,000 further reduction to GAO; \$4,511,000 further reduction in congressional printing; \$903,000 reduced from the Joint Committee on Taxation; \$1,060,000 further reduction in the power plant; \$14,999,000 reduced from Congressional Research Service in order to restore Library of Congress funding; \$7,000,000 from the Botanic Garden Conservatory renovation which eliminates the funds to begin that project.

There were several additions to the House bill, including: \$2,500,000 for a joint Office of Compliance; \$3,615,000 for an orderly shutdown of the Office of Technology Assessment; \$50,000 for Capitol buildings maintenance; \$17,753,000 was restored to the funding of the Library of Congress; and \$13,995,000 was added back for the depository library program under the Superintendent of Documents.

There were several provisions included, primarily to facilitate the operations of the House and Senate. The conference report (House Report 104-212) has been available for several weeks and explains these provisions.

One of these provisions is contained in amendment No. 10 which provides \$6,115,000 for the orderly shutdown of the Office of Technology Assessment and includes provisions for severance pay and disposal of property.

Amendment No. 55 includes some House housekeeping provisions added by the managers and a provision that establishes an awards and settlement fund required by the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995.

In addition to the overall reductions I have already enumerated, a few of the highlights include:

House of Representatives—has been cut \$57.2 million—\$57,174,000—below 1995. Included in this reduction, committee staff have been cut 33 percent; committee budgets have been reduced by \$39.8 million—\$39,762,000—House administrative offices have been cut by \$11.9 million below 1995—\$11,934,000—