

Mr. Speaker, I am amazed. I thought that pro-life and pro-abortion advocates would finally be able to find some common ground in this contentious debate. I thought that no one would be able to defend such an abhorrent procedure. Sadly, I was wrong. Luckily, there is still time to review the facts, and I urge my colleagues to do just that. Read over the procedure. Read over the AMA legislative counsel's unanimous decision. Read over the polls on America's view on late term abortions. Then do the only thing you can do and vote for the ban on partial-birth abortions.

Thank you.

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the following editorial which appeared in the September/October issue of the American Enterprise magazine. Maggie Gallagher does an excellent job of describing the brutal reality of an inhuman procedure known as partial birth abortion.

After you have examined the facts, I invite you to join with me in voting for H.R. 1833—the Partial Birth Abortion Act Ban of 1995.

[From the American Enterprise, September-October 1995]

A PERFECTLY LEGAL PROCEDURE

(By Maggie Gallagher)

She still has recurring nightmares—flashbacks, like a soldier back from Vietnam: "I see the baby, its hands and legs moving. Then the scissors jab, and the body goes limp. It haunts me."

Despite what you might think, Brenda Schafer, a 38-year-old registered nurse from Franklin, Ohio, is not a witness to a gruesome crime. She is an eyewitness to a perfectly legal procedure going on across America under the cover of abstract, pious words that all sensible people believe in—words like, "a doctor-patient relationship" and "a woman's right to choose."

The procedure is called a partial-birth abortion, and perhaps 500 to 4,000 of them are carried out every year. According to Brenda, it is impossible to exaggerate the procedure's horrors. Here is what she saw the day the temp agency assigned her to Dr. Martin Haskell's Dayton, Ohio abortion clinic: "The whole baby was delivered, except for its head. I could see the hands and legs moving. Have you ever seen a baby fling out its arms when it is startled? That's what it look like. I saw Dr. Haskell insert a pair of scissors, then the baby flinched. He inserted a high-power suction catheter [to remove the brain tissue], and the baby went limp. I almost threw up all over the floor." The baby was not defective and, at a gestational age of 26-and-a-half weeks, was well past the 23 to 24 weeks doctors considered the point of viability; most premature infants born at that age do pretty well.

There were six partial-birth abortions that day in that clinic alone. Brenda assisted in three of them. One mother sought an abortion because her baby had Down's syndrome; the other two carried babies with no defects. One mother was a 17-year-old unwed woman. The other, whose partial-birth abortion is described above, was a married 40-year-old with a grown son who apparently decided, rather late, that she didn't want a change-of-life baby.

While the larger issue of abortion is of course enormously controversial, we know that practices like partial-birth abortions, abortion for sex selection, and late-term abortion are strongly opposed by large majorities of Americans. Aiming to bring some peace to the abortion wars by at least eliminating these most offensive procedures, the House Committee on the Judiciary recently approved a bill to ban partial-birth abor-

tions. Abortion-rights advocates, however, have made it clear they will accept no limitations of abortion on demand, at any time or for any reason. NOW president Patricia Ireland has denounced the House bill, while Barbara Bradford of the National Abortion Federation sent out talking points for abortion defenders that urged: don't apologize, it's legal procedure.

Brenda says she once believed in the noble-sounding slogans of the pro-choice movement: "I have four teenage daughters. I told them if they got pregnant, I'd make them have an abortion." Like many Americans, she was fiercely committed to abortion rights in the abstract; it was the reality she literally couldn't stomach.

When it was over, the mother who underwent a partial-birth abortion that day insisted on seeing the results. So Brenda and the other nurses cleaned it up, wrapped it in a blanket, and put the corpse of a little baby in her arms. Face-to-face with what she had done, the woman began crying inconsolably, repeatedly pleading, "God forgive me."

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. SEASTRAND). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

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

ENDING WELFARE FOR LOBBYISTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MCINTOSH] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. MCINTOSH. Madam Speaker, I am here to speak tonight on an issue that is continuing to be debated in the House and in the Senate, and that is our efforts to end welfare for lobbyists. As many of you know, last summer this House of Representatives passed a landmark piece of legislation that was added to the Labor-HHS appropriations bill, that said from now on anybody who receives a Federal grant has to make a choice. They can either continue to receive the Government funds or they can give up the funds and then continue to be lobbyists. But they cannot do both as long as they are receiving a Federal subsidy.

That bill, I think, strikes an important blow on behalf of taxpayers everywhere who no longer wish to be seeing their taxes used to finance some of the biggest, most powerful and influential lobbying organizations right here in Washington, DC, organizations who have continually over the last 40 years lobbied this Congress for more and more and more spending so that we have runaway deficits and the largest national debt in history.

This legislation, legislation that we referred to as ending welfare for lobbyists, I think is very important and strikes a blow on behalf of taxpayers everywhere for responsible Government. Tonight I wanted to discuss with you and several of my colleagues the nature of this problem and what our solution is and how we plan to go for-

ward in implementing that reform on behalf of the taxpayers.

First, I have a chart here that gives you an idea of what is happening. We discovered that currently there are \$39 billion that the Federal Government says it gives out in grants each year. Now, some of that money goes to very worthwhile causes and to groups who are not lobbyists, but the large percentage of that money goes to groups who turn around and lobby the Government for more spending and for various social programs. That subsidy for the lobbying activities here in Washington is exactly the area that we are targeting with this legislation.

Again, I want to emphasize what we will be doing is saying to the groups, "If you want to be a charity and do good works, that you are entitled to do, and we will support you under the various Federal programs. But if you want to be a lobbyist, you need to do it on your own time and on your own dime, because the taxpayer is not going to subsidize lobbying any longer."

Madam Speaker, at this point I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH], who is here to join us in support of this bill.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend from Indiana for again introducing and really being the catalyst for this important legislation.

Madam Speaker, I think perhaps you were also in the Chamber the night this particular measure was first debated. I can recall, after all, this is known as the people's House, and as my good friend from Indiana joined me here on the floor, I guess it is safe to say that there was a particularly raucous response from one of our friends on the minority from California. Indeed, to read his comments the following day in the Wall Street Journal, I found it to be somewhat incredible; quoting him now, "It is a glorious day if you are a fascist; if you are a fascist, it is a glorious day."

My friend from California took great unbrage at the fact that through the efforts of my friend from Indiana this new majority was moving not to extinguish advocacy, but to say, as my colleague from Indiana did so quite eloquently, if you are engaged in lobbying, do it on your own time with your own dime. Would that it were just a dime being spent.

But as my friend from Indiana, in concert with my good friend from Maryland and our more senior colleague from Oklahoma have detailed, this is not penny ante here. This is \$39 billion in money from the taxpayers of America, Madam Speaker, from you and I and other taxpayers out there working hard to feed their families and to provide a future for their children, or as seniors on a fixed income, to make ends meet.

Their money is going into a process that I think is fair to describe, and I am not exaggerating here, it can only be described as somewhat incestuous, where people come to the Hill and lobby for funds and, indeed, many of their endeavors are worthwhile, and

yet even in receiving the taxpayers' largesse, they return, courtesy of those same funds, to again ask for more and more of the taxpayers' dollars.

Good people can disagree. I have often made that observation in the Chamber. And while I would never impugn the motives of my friend from California who on that particular raucous occasion perhaps it can be said chose to impugn our motives, could it be that as the Wall Street Journal editorialized, that in moving to correct this abuse we had tapped into a power source for those so willing to take the taxpayers' money in the advocacy of a certain social agenda?

Madam speaker, in the preceding special order I paraphrased the comments of Abraham Lincoln, and the message still applies here: The American people, once fully informed of the facts, will make the correct decision. There has been a widespread cry across this Nation for reform.

On the first day of this new Congress, this new majority passed the Shays Act, a simple but powerful notion that those who serve in this Chamber should live under the same laws as every other American. Now, indeed, if we are called to a higher standard, then a reexamination of where the hard-earned money of the American people goes is also in order, and I salute my friend from Indiana and, indeed, my good friend from Maryland who joins us here tonight in their efforts to fully inform the American people, because there is no place for the relentless assault on the pocketbooks of hard-working tax-paying Americans for continued subsidizing of big Government-orchestrated charities. We must make a change, and we, the new Members of this institution, stand united to make sure that change is realized.

With that, as I continue the dialog, I see our good friend from Maryland, and perhaps I should yield back to the gentleman who controls the time, my friend from Indiana, for the purposes of recognizing our friend from nearby Maryland.

Mr. MCINTOSH. I thank the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH]. Thank you for that very eloquent endorsement of what you have pointed out is, in fact, one of the leading reforms that our freshman class is really insisting that we include in this budget process as we send forward these spending bills to the President.

Let me now yield to one of the coauthors of this provision, who along with the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ISTOOK] and now Senator SIMPSON and Senator CRAIG in the Senate, is the lead sponsor of this bill, and I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. EHRLICH].

Mr. EHRLICH. I thank the gentleman.

I wish I could be as eloquent as our friend from Arizona, our freshman colleague. We appreciate your support very much on this very important initiative.

The only thing I can say to you, my friend, is I am sorry that you have been attacked at a personal level. That is a political culture I am not used to, and hopefully the American people will not get used to it either.

I bring some words tonight from across the hallway, from our friend, Senator SIMPSON.

We have not had an opportunity to talk about this, but as you know and the American people should know, he has been a wonderful friend during this entire process. His leadership in the other body has been unmatched, I am sure you would agree.

Mr. MCINTOSH. That is correct.

Mr. EHRLICH. I thought his words on the floor of the Senate last week were just profound, and I would like to recite them for a minute or two. I see we have been joined by our friend, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. TATE], as well.

Senator SIMPSON, in taking the floor to rebut some of the more ridiculous charges our piece of legislation has had to undergo, made these statements.

□ 2200

Hell hath no fury like an individual whose access to Federal bucks has been conditioned in any way. Because that is not what this issue is all about, access to the Federal Treasury. It is not about free speech or the First Amendment, or anything of the sort. Those are merely the terms which are being applied during the argument by those who wish to continue to ensure themselves of continued delivery of Federal money.

I have four statements, with the gentleman's indulgence, because they are so profound, they are so on point.

The second statement from Senator SIMPSON:

I know that is a strange and even bizarre thing in this day and age, to talk about "responsibility," instead purely of "rights" or purely of "victims." We are all experts in our own rights, but rarely do we acknowledge that these rights confer responsibilities. And that is what this issue is about, the responsibility of those who receive Federal money.

The third statement by our colleague from the Senate, and this is a point we have discussed on this floor many times.

Already in the law there are restrictions on the amount of lobbying that can be done by 501-C-3 organizations which take the 501-H election to identify themselves as charities.

These are the facts, the facts for the American people.

In return for the benefit of tax deductible contributions, these organizations agree to limit their lobbying expense. They may spend 20 percent of the first \$500,000 in lobbying, 15 percent of their next \$500,000, 10 percent of their next \$500,000, and 5 percent after that, up to a global cap of \$1 million on lobbying.

The same point we have made on this floor time after time, that the gentleman from Indiana, the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. MCINTOSH, has made time and time again during the course of his public hearings.

Finally, Mr. SIMPSON's last statement, he made all sorts of wonderful

statements in the course of his speech in the Senate.

I personally will have my old bald dome battered, because I have stated all along that I would seek to protect true charities from the scope of any legislation, the 501-C-3 organizations which we all care so much about and should. Well, the amendment which hopefully will shortly be presented as the Istook-Simpson compromise, will indeed protect them. We will protect them not by creating a blanket exception for all charitable groups, but by leaving in place and spending restrictions formulas that already apply to charitable organizations.

I would ask my friend and colleague from Indiana, has not our friend Senator SIMPSON hit the proverbial nail on the head?

Mr. MCINTOSH. I believe that is exactly correct. I see our colleague from Indiana, a good friend of mine is here is here, with some questions he had.

Let me take a moment to recite some of the provisions in the bill. In the debate, those are often lost, the facts people do not focus on. I think it is important to let the American people know what we are doing.

As the gentleman from Maryland pointed out, the core of this bill is to use the current IRS provision for 501-C-3 charitable groups and say that is going to be the limit of how much any group that receives a Federal grant can spend in lobbying activities. It is a small amount of their overall funding, starting out at I think 20 percent, going down to 5 percent totally with a cap. That is what they can do with their private funds.

With any government funds that the taxpayer is giving those groups, what we are saying is no taxpayer dime can be used for lobbying whatsoever. We are going to make that very clear. More importantly, we are going to put some real teeth into that provision and say first of all, it is a violation of the law to do so. Second, the taxpayer is empowered to be a watchdog, and if the taxpayer sees that a group is spending taxpayer dollars to lobby and engage in political campaigns, they have a right to bring a suit to stop that from happening.

Then, finally, we are going to force disclosure, because one of the things we discovered was that these groups will often hide behind various forms of organization, where the group that does the lobbying does not get the dollars directly, but there is an intermediate group that receives a taxpayer grant, and then they give another grant to the lobbyist organization.

So we are going to force everyone to disclose where the money comes from and where it is spent when they have Federal dollars at stake, and we are going to force disclosure of all lobbying activities by these groups to ensure that the taxpayer can have a full accountability for how the funds are spent.

Let me real quickly address two things we thought were very important. One was, as Senator SIMPSON mentioned, to exempt true charities

from coverage. They will be covered under the IRS rules, but it makes it clear they are not the targets of this legislation. It is the lobbying groups here in Washington who have lived off of the taxpayer dollars for so long who are going to be chiefly affected by this.

Mr. EHRLICH. That point is so important. The true charities, and we have made this point time and time again as well, the charities actually interested in fulfilling their mission, rather than becoming lobbyists, the people actually out there doing good in the world and not interested in continually coming here and asking for additional moneys.

Mr. MCINTOSH. That is so true. Later in the hour I would like to talk about some of those groups who come to us and say we are doing the right thing, because we are preserving the true nature of these charities.

One final point is it was pointed out to us that some of these groups might inadvertently be caught up in the legislation. What we did was made a very clear statement we would create a de minimis exception. If a group writes to their city council and says "We really think you ought to think of a new program to help clean up the inner-city," we do not intend that to be caught up in this legislation. That is not a problem of lobbyists coming and asking us to spend more and more money each year. That type of thing will be covered by our de minimis exception that makes it very clear that all groups can spend a small amount, \$25,000 each year, in stating their positions to the public. We thought that was fair as a way of preserving their first amendment rights, but not having them be corrupted and turned into lobbying organizations.

Those are the key elements of this bill. I think it is very fair, very well drafted, and goes directly to the problem, that the taxpayers are not being protected right now from their funds going to subsidize these lobbying efforts.

Let me now recognize my friend and colleague from Indiana [Mr. SOUDER].

Mr. SOUDER. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's leadership on this and the beating the gentleman has been taking on behalf of all those who agree with him. Whenever he takes the lead, he becomes a target for personal smear and innuendo from people who do not want to debate the issue, but the side issue to distract from the main issue, with the gentleman's addressing some of the things that have come up to me in my district and many others. Let me see if I can clarify this question.

Organizations that receive Federal funds, are they now restricted from any lobbying? For example, if it is a large organization and they spend some time advocating any kind of Federal policies, does that mean they can no longer do that if they get any money?

Mr. MCINTOSH. No, the bill is not as absolute as that. What it says is they

are now restricted to a limited amount of advocacy, using the IRS formula that charitable groups right now are supposed to follow but which is not codified into law. Some groups, such as the National Council of Senior Citizens, are not covered by that limit, so they can go out and set up a political action committee, which they have done. They can go out and take out television ads, which they have done. This would put them under the same limit that the charities have if they are receiving those Federal dollars.

Mr. SOUDER. One of the great honors I have had was to work with Focus on the Family over the years, and particularly as Dr. Dobson looked at developing and working with Gary Bowers to develop the Family Research Council, and I was working with them in some of the early years. One of the things that Dr. Dobson has to do in his radio addresses is balance how many times he talks about government issues and how many times he deals with political issues. Many 501-C-3's, all of them which deal with social issues, are already under these restrictions.

Why is it so shocking to the other groups that they have to behave the way most of these groups have to do already in this country? What makes them special? Why were they exempt in this process in the first place?

Mr. MCINTOSH. I think the gentleman asks a very good question, why is there this double standard. I think what happened is over the years, certain groups almost became an extension of the government. The National Council of Senior Citizens receives 96 percent of its funds from the Federal Government. Like the government, they became arrogant and thought that they could be above the standard, there would not be anybody there to police them, and they did not have to be accountable to the taxpayer. So now that we are starting to hold them accountable to what is very accepted with groups, like Dr. Dobson and other groups, they are starting to scream about it, because they thought they had a free ride and a special privilege. What we are saying is now the taxpayer does not want to put up with that any longer.

Mr. SOUDER. What is their defense for saying in the funds directly coming to them from the Federal Government for use for charitable work, whether it is seniors, or low income, or people who are handicapped, or people being abused, why do they feel that those dollars that are being given from the taxpayers for those purposes should be used directly for lobbying? Is there a reason that they say that they should be allowed to do that, other than self-fulfilling, they want more money for their group?

Mr. MCINTOSH. The only reason I have heard some of them say is, "Well, it is already not allowed." But then my question to them is why do you oppose this bill, if you say it is already not allowed? I think the answer must be that

they know that that is not being enforced. In fact, we have one example with where a government agency gave a grant to a group who held an entire conference teaching people how to go and lobby. When they were called on the carpet and the GAO investigated and said this is an abuse of this Federal grant, the agency sort of shrugged their shoulders and said, "Oh well, too bad."

Now what we are doing is putting teeth in it by letting the taxpayer be the enforcement mechanism for making sure that they have to live under the law as well.

Mr. EHRLICH. If the gentleman will yield, I know our colleague from Indiana will appreciate this as well, because I think being part of the process, attending the subcommittee hearings, reading the testimony, listening to the testimony, another part of the answer really is when you get used to something, it is very human, and you think you are going to have it forever. You believe it is going to increase forever. You get very angry, and you tend to call people names when someone takes it away from you.

We have had to endure the name calling. The gentleman from Indiana has provided wonderful leadership on this and has been attacked personally. We have all been attacked. I am tired of it. If they would just talk about the issues, we might get some progress made. But the fact is they are angry, and we have seen it played out time and time again. That is a very human element to this entire debate.

Mr. EHRLICH. Is it not true also, which I think is a very good point, that some people argue this is a chilling effect on public debate? Is it not true that, for example, if there is an organization that would, say, favor the National Endowment for the Arts or the Institute for Museum Services, that what we are saying is the organization itself that receives the funds will now have a cap on how much they can spend in lobbying. But it does not keep an individual member of a Chicago Art Institute or the Fort Wayne Art Museum or a supporter of the philharmonic from writing us as Members of Congress or speaking out in public. It is just the group cannot use its funds for those purposes if they get Federal funds. It that not correct?

Mr. MCINTOSH. That is correct. Each of us as individuals would have our first amendment rights to speak out. In fact, one of the provisions that our colleague from Maryland put into the bill was an absolute exemption for individuals, so that any person, as compared to an organization, who wants to exercise their first amendment rights would be totally protected under this statute.

Mr. EHRLICH. Most people I know who give money to a philharmonic or art museum expect that money to go to the philharmonic for music or for the art, not to lobbying Congress. I do

not think that was the intent that they thought they would give it.

Mr. MCINTOSH. I think that is right. If the gentleman would let me share with you an example that a reporter called up the other day and asked me about, and apparently there is a group in Washington State that is Big Brother-Big Sister. They raise a lot of their money by having nightly bingo games. People come and they pay to play bingo, and it is a fund-raising technique. It is a very successful one for them. But they also spend a certain amount of their money lobbying the State legislature to make sure that bingo continues to be an eligible fund-raising tool. They are entitled to that, and it makes sense they would want to do that. But they apparently spend more than 15 percent of their funds lobbying the State legislature, because they do not receive a grant themselves. But they were worried they would no longer be able to take money from someone who does get a Federal grant. The rule we put in there is if you lobby more than 15 percent, you cannot receive the money indirectly.

So my suggestion to the reporter was why do they not set up a separate organization as a lobbying group? One night a week they can have a bingo game and tell everybody, "We are raising money to lobby with this night's proceeds. The other 6 nights we are going to help people with the Big Brothers and Big Sisters." Then you have disclosure, and the people who give the money will know what they are giving the money for. They will know whether or not this is for lobbying, or to help people with a charitable good.

To me, I think that an ideal world. People know what their money is going for, and the groups have the freedom to enact their programs and proceed with those. If they want to lobby, they can set up another group that does not get taxpayer money, that they can set up for the lobbying purposes.

Mr. EHRLICH. I know there are others who desire to speak, our good friend from Washington, but I have one other question I wanted to ask you, and that is we have talked about this, but a representative of ARC, it used to be the Association of Retarded Citizens, came to me and was concerned they would not be able to advocate for people that they were working with as they go, say, to a housing authority to talk to them, and go along with that citizen for housing, or if they had a job training program, as we have in our legislation, for those who have special needs.

My understanding of this legislation is this is focused on lobbying to Congress, to legislatures, not for helping citizens who fall into their purview. Is that not correct?

□ 2215

Mr. MCINTOSH. Madam Speaker, the gentleman is exactly correct, and we have clarified the language to make certain that that is very clear. The

ARC came and testified in our committee, they did not like the bill as it was drafted, and I thought they had a very telling and important comment in that area about a possible problem that could be created where they help citizens who really do need help going to a government agency and applying for assistance they are entitled to.

So we went back and changed the legislation to reflect that concern and be able to make it very clear that they would still be able to engage in that activity.

Mr. EHRLICH. Madam Speaker, if the gentleman would yield. As my colleagues can tell, I am a little angry tonight because of the personal attacks against the gentleman personally.

Mr. MCINTOSH. Madam Speaker, let me thank the gentleman, but let me just comment. One thing I have taken solace in is, a friend of mine reminded me of the saying President Reagan had, which is "It is dangerous any time you get between the hog and the bucket". And I think our legislation may be doing exactly that.

Mr. EHRLICH. Madam Speaker, I think our friend from Indiana asked a very good question, but the gentleman's answer tells the American people a lot about the process we have brought to this entire debate. I know myself and my staff, Representative ISTOOK and his staff, the gentleman particularly and his entire staff have spent hundreds of hours meeting with groups actually trying to get input, to secure input relevant input to make the bill better. A very open process, which I am told around here was pretty rare before we got here. The gentleman deserves credit for that and yet the attacks continue.

Mr. MCINTOSH. I think I know what it is, Madam Speaker, I think they realize if the American people find out the truth of where their taxpayer dollars are being spent to subsidize lobbying they will not win. But if they make it a personal attack, they might distract enough people and actually end up winning in the ultimate vote. Fortunately, I think all of us freshmen here are committed to getting down to the truth and delivering on our promises to the American people and so we will not let them get us sidetracked with those.

Madam Speaker, I want to recognize now a colleague from Washington State who has been very active in our subcommittee in helping to craft this bill, Mr. TATE.

Mr. TATE. Madam Speaker, for the sake of not trying to sound like a broken record, I want to thank the Member from Indiana for taking all the arrows on our behalf on this issue. We all came here, all of us, to make real changes in Washington, DC. I do not think that is a surprise. I think we all knew going into this, from the git-go, that there would be attacks. The opposition would use every tool that they possibly had to stop the agenda.

The defenders of big government do not want to see things changed. That

means less power in Washington, DC, and more power in Washington State. That means less power in Washington, DC, and more in Indiana. And less power in Washington, DC, and more in Maryland. That is what it is all about. But I never knew they would be using my own tax dollars to lobby against these changes. It is one thing to do it privately, it is another thing to do it publicly. That is what they are so-so concerned about.

Recently in the Washington Times there was an editorial titled "Federally Funded GOP Bashing, talking about the case study of what has been going on out in my State, and this is what they said.

In the past knew months a variety of groups have spent monies that total in the hundreds of thousands of dollars. The problem is not that these activists are targeting Mr. Tate. That, after all, is politics. The problem is that many of these groups are engaged in very political, very partisan activities and receive big bucks from the Federal Government. The campaign they have mounted passes anyone's test of political activity.

That is the point. I want people to get involved in politics. I think all of us, we ran for office because we wanted to make changes. Everyone should get involved in politics, even if they disagree with us. But the difference is they should not use the public trough, lay sideways in the public trough, literally, and take that money and spend it trying to defeat some of the things we are working on. That is the thing I find outrageous, using the taxpayers' dollars.

Madam Speaker, the other attacks I have heard is this whole issue of free speech. I say this over and over. Free speech is not free if I have to pay for it. The taxpayer should not have to pay for this kind of lobbying. Imagine the outrage we would hear if the Christian Coalition was receiving money, or the National Rifle Association, or the National Right to Life. To me this is not an issue about left and right. I would be just as upset if it was the other side.

That is the point, it is wrong no matter what ideology it happens to be. We should not be funding these sort of activities.

Mr. EHRLICH. Madam Speaker, if the gentleman would yield for a point. The gentleman may have missed the colloquy we engaged in on this floor, I believe three weeks ago, with the Representative from Colorado and the Representative from Maryland. They even admitted on the floor that day that it is not a defunding of the left. We have been attacked as defunding the left. They actually admitted that day it is not defunding the left.

I wanted to gentleman to know that, because one of the principal charges against us, against this piece of legislation has been diffused by the main opponents.

Mr. TATE. Madam Speaker, that is exactly the point. This week it is the GOP. Maybe a couple of years from now it is the Democrat party. To me it

does not matter. It is wrong no matter what party it is. It is wrong to use the taxpayers' money to fund these kinds of acts, no matter who or what organization it is.

So, Madam Speaker, I guess what I would tell these organizations that are running attacks against the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MCINTOSH] and the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. EHRlich] and against other freshmen that are standing up against big government and their special interests and high paid lobbyists back here in Washington, DC, I would tell those organizations if they want to lobby, do it on their own dime, do it on their own time, not on the taxpayers' time.

So I appreciate the gentleman from Indiana once again taking a lot of heat, and he should be judged by his enemies. He should be judged by the work he is doing. I can tell my colleagues when I was home for town meetings this weekend, I had more people come up to me and say, "You know what, RANDY, don't give up. Keep on fighting. Because we know if these groups are attacking you, you must be doing something right; that you must really be making changes".

The louder they scream, the more effective we must be. So I just thank the gentleman for his work.

Mr. MCINTOSH. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for that. Let me tell my colleagues, however, it is more than me. It is the dedicated effort of all of us and our colleagues, and Senator SIMPSON and Senator CRAIG on the Senate side, who are working very hard to make sure we can win passage in that body and send it forward to the President.

I want to give my colleagues a brief update about what is happening with this bill so that the American people can follow it in the next couple of weeks and see what happens.

Our goal is to make sure that this provision, ending the welfare for lobbyists, is part of the spending bill that gets sent to the President that helps finance his White House staff, helps finance the IRS and the agents there, helps finance the Treasury Department and the law enforcement agents there. What we want to do is make sure that when the President signs a bill funding all of this operations over in the White House he has to also sign a bill on behalf of the taxpayer ending the welfare for lobbyists.

So what we are doing is negotiating with our colleagues in the Senate to make sure that that provision is part of that very important spending bill. There is a core group of approximately 60 Members here in the House who have all signed a letter to the Speaker urging that that bill not go forward unless this very important provision is included in it.

I do not want to take all the accolades. I think those 60 Members who have stood up and said, "We must do the right thing for taxpayers around the country before we take care of

business here as usual and send the President a funding bill for all his White House staff," they are the heroes that will make sure that this, in fact, remains intact.

Now, Madam Speaker, there is some discussion that all these spending bills may get wrapped up into something called a continuing resolution that would allow the Government to continue business as usual. If that happens, I think the leadership is very determined to make it a bare-bones bill that does not include a lot of the fat that might otherwise be put in there. But, also, I think it is important that if we have that continuing resolution we say one thing that is business as usual, taxpayers' subsidized lobbying is going to end. We mean to make sure that happens in this body so that we can deliver on that promise to the American voters.

Mr. EHRlich. Madam Speaker, if the gentleman would yield briefly, I know the gentleman from Arizona wants to pitch in.

Where would we be without the leadership? They have killed us about 10 times already, and we have come back every time stronger. The leadership in this House, the leadership in the Senate, Senator LOTT, I think we have to mention Senator LOTT as well, who has been a wonderful mainstay on our side with respect to this issue, our leadership, the Speaker, the majority leader, the majority whip have come and saved us time and time again because they know how important this provision is to the American people and their representatives here in Congress, particularly the freshman class so well represented here on the floor tonight.

Mr. MCINTOSH. Madam Speaker, that is absolutely correct. They have done a tremendous job of shepherding this bill.

I would yield to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH].

Mr. HAYWORTH. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Indiana, and I listened with great interest to my two colleagues from Indiana, my good friend from Maryland, and my friend from Washington State who preceded me here at this location.

Madam Speaker, I thought our friend from Washington State made a very valid point that needs to be amplified. Disagreement over political philosophies is not the issue here; but, again, dipping into the pockets of American taxpayers to fund that disagreement is absolutely the issue we are talking about tonight.

My friend from Washington State, lest he be accused of sour grapes, was far too modest to detail what has gone on against him in his home district. I just thought for the RECORD it would be good to analyze where some of the attacks on our friend from Washington State, from whence they have come, groups financed, oft times in large measure by tax dollars from the American public against our friend RANDY TATE in Washington State.

A radio advertisement in March dealing with lawsuit limits, this suit brought by Citizen Action and Trial Lawyers. \$15,000 goes into that anti-RANDY TATE ad campaign.

AFL-CIO radio ads in July dealing with OSHA regulation, \$20,000.

AFL-CIO TV ads in August dealing with OSHA regulation, \$80,000.

Save America's Families. Gee, I thought we were trying to do that, but I guess in this Orwellian newspeak one takes on a title that works.

Save America's Families TV and radio ads in September dealing with Medicare or, in honor of tomorrow's holiday, we could daresay their attack as Medicare, \$85,000.

A telephone campaign from the same aforementioned group, \$10,000.

A Medi-caravan, \$10,000.

\$230,000 from these advocacy groups personally attacking a Member of Congress.

Now, again, Madam Speaker, I will applaud anyone's right to come to the well of this House, anyone's right as one of our constituents, anyone's right through the first amendment to the courage of their convictions; but it is a far cry to talk about the courage of one's convictions and the convenience of taxpayer dollars.

To those again who would try to misdirect this debate, to those again who would cry that it is an effort to silence a particular political philosophy, I would just simply say once again the facts speak for themselves. Indeed, the efforts of my colleagues here in drafting this legislation, to take into account not only the legitimate concerns of charity but also another angle. If I daresay, on first amendment rights, to make sure that Congress does not absolutely prohibit or proscribe entreaties with elected officials on behalf of charities or on the parts of these organizations, the gentleman has included that in the legislation.

□ 2230

So, indeed this is to silence no one. But let the American people understand something that has been made painfully clear to those of us assembled here on the floor and, indeed to you, Madam Speaker, that in the midst of an historic shift to change this institution, sadly, arguments that come from those opposed to our changes have nothing to do with policy and have everything to do with power.

Who has the majority in this Chamber? Who has the opportunity to advocate certain policies? And, again, I say that political conviction is one thing, but political convenience is quite another. And in the case of our good friend from Washington State, and in indeed in the case of several others, again we draw this distinction. It is fine to have disagreements. It is fine to have at times what might be characterized as bare-knuckled comparisons and contracts in the political arena. But even rhetorically as you make your points, realistically do not pick the

pockets of Mr. and Mrs. America to do that. Have the courage of your convictions, rather than the convenience of taxpayer largesse.

Let me close with this comment. Those who would say we are silencing a certain philosophy, I think, perhaps so championed that philosophy that they are the same type of folks who believe that electricity emanates from the light switch, that milk is found in a container, and that this money originates with the Government here.

The money does not originate with the Government here, Madam Speaker. It is in the pockets of every American who is working hard. And if those Americans choose to voluntarily give to an organization to advocate a point of view, that is their right. But involuntary servitude to a political philosophy must be stopped. That is what we are trying to do with this piece of legislation.

Mr. MCINTOSH. Here, here. Let me commend the gentleman. As the gentleman was speaking, I realized that this is part of the large, titanic struggle that we are engaged in in this Congress. Because each of those issues that they were advertising against in our colleague's district in Washington State was a part of the Contract With America.

There was the effort to reform the legal system so that the lawyers do not continue to become richer and richer at the expense of the populace. There was the issue of regulatory reform to hold back the bureaucrats that are strangling our businesses and farmers in this country. And, finally, there is the issue that we considered last week of getting to a balanced budget and a tax cut in this country.

In each case, the opponents of our Contract With America were saying, "We want your taxpayer dollars to pay for our lobbyists, and we are going to insist that you give us funds to pay for our lobbyists out of the taxpayer's pockets in this country, and once again we are going to put that money to use to try to stop you from what you were sent here to do on behalf of the taxpayers; to once again give the Government back to the American people so that it is their government and not the government of the bureaucracies and the large lobbying groups who are resided here in Washington, DC."

So, the gentleman has inspired me in a way that I have not thought of being on this issue. That it is a part of this larger, overall struggle that this Congress is engaged in returning power to the people. I commend the gentleman for that.

I recognize my colleague from Indiana.

Mr. SOUDER. First off, I want to say that \$230,000 is really an impressive endorsement of my colleague from Washington. It shows how committed he is to change. The people back in his home State, when they hear that, they ought to say, "Boy, RANDY is really out here doing things. They really want him out."

The problem is that we do not like it that they are doing it with our money or our tax deductions. If people want the tax deductions, they should follow the 5-percent rule. If people want to do it with our money, then they should not be doing it to defeat RANDY TATE. They have all the opportunity in the world.

In fact, every \$10,000 that goes against RANDY TATE in his campaign should be considered a badge of honor that he is here reforming things. He should say, "Go get some more and come after me, because every dollar you are spending does it." But do not do it with the taxpayers' money and do not do it with our deductions.

Which really gets to a bigger question, which as somebody who boosts increasing the charitable deduction and who has made it a major part of what I came here to do, it has been frustrating to have some disagreements with the friends of mine in the charitable areas over this issue.

At the same time, the plain truth of the matter is that this is one of the things that we are fighting and what we are trying to deal with in this bill, and that is the corrupting influence that Government funds can have on the people who are caring for people who really need it. The people in Catholic social services and Lutheran social services and the tons of volunteer organizations dealing with people in prisons and child abuse, domestic violence, the terrible problems that we have in this society, feel the problem that we have in this country is a lot that many of us are ignoring those who are hurting and have not been taking an involvement.

They are struggling and they see these terrible problems and think, Boy, if we could just dip into the Federal dollars to solve this. But you start chasing your tail. First, you have to start compromising and start filling out paperwork and changing the nature of your organization. All the sudden there are religious restrictions and many of the most powerful groups have a very strong moral component that they cannot do with tax dollars.

They start chasing the Federal dollars and then they start to convert themselves and instead of spending their money on helping the people, the ones they could help, they are now trying to chase and get the Government involved. And the Government, who has been completely ineffective, tends to corrupt the influence of those groups in the first place.

So, there is a deeper question here, and that is not only are we trying to talk about the political ends and whether or not some of these groups have been using their funds to damage people in Congress who are trying to cause changes, but there is the core question of what this is doing to the organizations themselves and their mission and this society.

We need organizations in this country dedicated to values without the big hand of Government steering them and

trying to control what they can and cannot say. Part of this is to say, If you want the Federal funds, then stay out of the lobbying. And if you want to be completely independent and raise your money, then you can follow and get the 501(c)(3) restrictions on the 5 percent, but do not go over that, because your primary mission is to be independent and to help those who are hurting. Your primary mission is not to lobby Congress and to turn into mini-politicians.

We are in danger in this country of watching our charitable end turn into another quasi-government and become corrupted and as ineffective as what we have seen. As one pastor in Detroit who was told that he had to do it the Government's way, otherwise he could not get government funds. He could not talk about religion. He was an African-American pastor. He said, "From what I have seen what the Government has done, every housing project you have touched is crumbling; every juvenile delinquency program you have does not work; every drug abuse program does not have good return. Everything my church has done in the community has worked. Our housing, our juvenile delinquency, our drugs, our child care. Yet, you tell me unless I do it your way, I cannot have the money."

It is a sad day when our charitable organizations start to get into this web of Government. This is a great way, and really the undergirding of much of what you are doing, not the political. I thank the gentleman from Indiana for his leadership.

Mr. MCINTOSH. Thank you. Let me share testimony from one young man who came to our subcommittee, because it reinforces everything that the gentleman just said. Isaac Randolph is a former firefighter from Indianapolis, a black gentleman who is very dedicated to his community and that city.

He wants to help black youths who are in danger are being caught up in the gang violence and drugs and ruining their lives. He quit his job, a very good job with the city, and started a group called the St. Florian Society, named after the patron saint of firefighters.

He has been dedicating his life to trying to teach leadership skills and encourage young people from the inner-city to respect themselves, learn leadership, and make something of their lives. He receives a little bit of Federal grant money through the city, although most of it he collects really from the private sector.

He came and testified saying that he thought our bill was incredibly important, because he thought that the nature of the charitable activity that he was engaged in would be corrupted if it continued to be the goal of those groups to lobby and advocate for government programs, rather than getting in there and helping the inner-city youths in his neighborhood, helping the elderly, helping communities around the country.

It was very moving testimony from a gentleman who has dedicated his life to helping those around him. I think it is something we should take to heart very deeply as we move forward in this area.

So, the testimony in the subcommittee has been very supportive of exactly the point the gentleman is making about preserving and strengthening the true charitable activities that work in our country.

Mr. EHRlich. Just a quick follow-up, I know the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH] has some very important information to share, but we get so bogged down from time to time with the opposition to this initiative, with the organized way in which they have gone about attacking us across the country, particularly on the Internet. That is a subject for another day and hopefully we will have a colloquy on that as well.

But I think we get so bogged down with respect to the opposition that we lose sight of all the grassroots groups out there, the individuals, the organizations that have supported this legislation from day one. Just to name a few, because I have the letters right here and I know the chairman of the subcommittee has seen the letters: National Taxpayers Union; Citizens for a Sound Economy; the Association of Concerned Taxpayers; The 60-Plus Association, a seniors group; the U.S. Chamber of Commerce; the Seniors Coalition, another seniors group; the Association of Concerned Taxpayers; Americans for Tax Reform; the National Association of Manufacturers, and on and on and on and on.

Through the efforts of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. McINTOSH], we have been able to put together this coalition of people who know we need to change the law because it is broken.

I congratulate the gentleman from Indiana. I am proud to serve on his subcommittee.

Mr. McINTOSH. Thank you so much. It is a great subcommittee because of the members, more than everything. Yes, Mr. HAYWORTH?

Mr. HAYWORTH. I thank the gentleman from Indiana. We detailed a few figures concerning taxpayer-funded opposition or taxpayer-funded advocacy in the political arena involving our friend from Washington State. Others, Madam Speaker, may be joining us tonight saying, Well, you are not giving us the entire picture. We need some more evidence, if you will. What else can you show us? you talk about abuses of the taxpayers' money. What else can you show us?

I think it is instructive to go back to Federal funding as it existed from July 1993 through June 1994, and take a look at what has gone on. And I dare say, given the fact that this Congress was controlled by those with another philosophy, perhaps these appropriations even increased in the last fiscal year.

But that fact notwithstanding, the AFL-CIO, July 1993 to June 1994, over

\$2 million in taxpayers' money. And, of course, big labor is operating a program called Standup designed to defeat the new agenda in Congress. But, again, it is not the disagreement, but the fact that over \$2 million of taxpayers' money went into that endeavor.

AFSCME, the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, \$148,000 of taxpayers' money going into political advocacy.

Perhaps most egregiously, the National Council of Senior Citizens, a whopping \$68 million. I had to take a look at this to make sure I had this right. \$68 million. Over 90 percent, as the gentleman from Indiana pointed out, 96 percent of this charitable organization's funding comes from the pockets of hard-working taxpayers. Yet, the same organization, taking over \$68 million in taxpayers' money contributed \$405,000 to 134 candidates for Congress.

Again, if people want to contribute to political campaigns, that is their right. But 96 percent of that \$68 million and over \$400,000 going into those endeavors? Madam Speaker, it appears it was charitable only to the candidates involved. It was charitable only to those ceaseless proponents of a welfare state where big government is the answer to every question and where they would will a veil of secrecy descend. And when that veil is lifted, the most amazing and, yes, the most vile epithets are employed.

As we began in special orders tonight, I invoked the words of outrage from our friend from California who said as we passed this bill, quote, "It's a glorious day if you are a Fascist. If you are a Fascist, it's a glorious day."

Madam Speaker, nothing could be further from the truth. It is a glorious day for the American taxpayers when we are willing to stand up and say no more of this abuse. Let us lift this veil of secrecy and more importantly, let us terminate this egregious action.

□ 2245

Mr. EHRlich. Madam Speaker, was the gentleman in the subcommittee public hearing day, when we were referred to as McCarthyites?

Was the gentleman in the room?

Mr. HAYWORTH. Unfortunately, I was not there, but I have been treated as every Member of this institution. Every Member of this new majority has been treated to a ceaseless parade of epithets from those who see the gravy train about to come to an end. And it is a measure of their desperation, as has been noted here, that they will make any comparison, no matter how vile, no matter how reprehensible.

I have to say, with great confusion, I am surprised the fourth estate that so assiduously covers matters here does not respond on its editorial pages with outrage about these statements, but then again I guess we are new to this town and we have a lot to learn from those groups. But it is amazing to see those comments bandied about.

Mr. SOUDER. Madam Speaker, one of the things that we hear is, why are you guys picking on these groups? Why are you just doing this?

The plain truth of the matter is that, if there is any doubt about this freshman class and those of us who are here today, we are not picking on just this group. We are picking on everybody. We are going after this entire system, and we are not going to exempt any different groups.

We are looking at term limits. We finally got a commitment that we are going to do gift reform. We got a commitment finally that we are going to do lobby reform. We have a commitment that the freshmen are going to work on a week or at least a couple days or at least a number of initiatives this coming year on finance reform.

For 40 years, the other party was in control, and they did not do it. We have Members of this body, former Members of this body going to prison. We have others resigning in disgrace, getting long pensions and all sorts of things.

We came here to reform the whole system. We are not going to exempt one group because they look to be charitable corporations. If they are abusing taxpayer funds, they are going to get hit, too. If Members are abusing it, they are going to get hit. If PAC's are abusing it, they are going to get hit.

We were sent here to Washington to change this system. I commend the gentleman for his leadership on this issue. I commend the gentleman on other things and the other freshmen. It is not that we are just picking on this. We are, as I said, going to pick on everybody who is abusing the taxpayers' dollars and abusing this wonderful House and trying to return it back to the people. I am proud to be here with my fellow freshmen here tonight and those who came here really committed to reform.

Mr. McINTOSH. Madam Speaker, I find it ironic. I think the opponents of this measure are trying to make any argument to any group to try to stop us from going forward and protecting the taxpayer.

The most recent ones that I read in the mail today was that they were arguing that this bill that we have would be bad because it would limit businesses in their lobbying effort if they receive a Federal grant for research or other activities. So how ironic that people who have been attacking businesses all of their lives are now worried that we might be limiting the ability of businesses to lobby to a million dollars per business and that this could be a grave threat.

My answer is, it is not business, it is not charity. It is anybody who lives off of the Federal Government and the taxpayer funds who needs to realize we are serious. This is real lobbying reform. We are not going to subsidize your lobbyists anymore. We are going to put an end to it so that we end welfare for lobbyists.

Mr. EHRlich. Madam Speaker, the bottom line is, if they do not realize we are serious by now, they will never realize it. As the gentleman well knows, because he has been the target particularly, and the gentleman from Washington [Mr. TATE], they know we are serious. That is why they are so scared because they know we have the facts and we have the votes and we have the leadership, your leadership.

Mr. TATE. Madam Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, it has been referenced many times about the freshmen coming to this town. We brought fresh ideas. But it is amazing from the folks across the aisle, they want to do things the way they have always done it.

We can understand the mentality a little better when I think, well, why are you worried about this? This is \$40 billion, billion with a B. This is a lot of money. I am not sure how much was spent on political campaigns last year, but I think those pale in comparison to \$40 billion, to me if we can really reform the way things are done around here.

The other argument, as we are closing, is, how can we do this? How can we change this? How can they look into the taxpayers' eyes in my district, as they are working and struggling to get by to put food on the table, to buy shoes for the kids, to save money for education, to put a little money aside for health care, to maybe even save money to go on vacation and to find out that their own money is being sent to Washington, DC, to lobby for more of their hard earned money.

Basically, the taxpayer works hard, sends his money to Washington, DC, then some nameless bureaucrat writes a check to some group that turns around and lobbies for more of that hard earned taxpayers' money, which is what it really comes down to.

So I would challenge those across the aisle that oppose this to talk to the constituents in my district that work hard for their taxpayer dollars.

STANDING UP FOR THE AMERICAN TAXPAYER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. SEASTRAND). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SOUDER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SOUDER. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MCINTOSH].

Mr. MCINTOSH. Madam Speaker, let me come to a close here and say, no matter how much they attack us as individuals, I appreciate all of the efforts that each of you have put in in moving this bill forward and working with our leadership here, Speaker GINGRICH, Majority Leader ARMEY, Majority Whip DELAY, and the leadership in the Senate, from Senator DOLE to Senator LOTT to the Senators who have supported this, Senator SIMPSON and Sen-

ator CRAIG in making this bill a reality.

They can throw mud at us as individuals. They can run advertisements attacking us in our districts. They can impugn our motives and try to destroy our reputations in the press. But we were not sent here for any of those purposes. We were sent here to stand up for the American taxpayer and to do what is right.

We have now sent notice to this town that we will not rest until we have put an end to taxpayer subsidies for the bill lobbying groups here in Washington, DC. I think the American taxpayers will be relieved and heartened that we are willing to stand up and insist on this reform on their behalf.

I thank all of my colleagues for coming here tonight and working so hard to make this bill a possibility.

COMMUNICATION FROM HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR., MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Hon. ANDREW JACOBS, Jr., Member of Congress:

U.S. CONGRESS,
WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE,
October 26, 1995.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to formally notify you pursuant to Rule L (50) of the Rules of the House that I have been served with a subpoena issued by the United States District Court for the District of Columbia.

After consultation with the General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is not consistent with the privileges and precedents of the House.

Sincerely,

ANDY JACOBS, Jr.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today, on account of the birth of her first grandchildren, twin boys.

Mr. MCHUGH (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today, on account of a death in the family.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PALLONE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. MCKINNEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. OWENS, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HAYWORTH) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, for 5 minutes each day, on today and October 31.

Mr. KIM, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. RIGGS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DUNCAN, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. SOUDER, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PALLONE) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ACKERMAN.

Mr. COLEMAN.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida.

Mr. HAMILTON.

Miss COLLINS of Michigan.

Mr. POSHARD.

Mr. FRAZER.

Mr. RUSH.

Mr. ROEMER.

Mr. LIPINSKI.

Mr. BARCIA in two instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HAYWORTH) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM.

Mr. EHLERS.

Mr. GALLEGLY.

Mr. CRAPO.

Mr. SHUSTER.

Mr. KING.

Mrs. JOHNSTON of Connecticut.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MCINTOSH) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. RICHARDSON.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

An act to provide for the disclosure of lobbying activities to influence the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Government Reform and Oversight, Rules, and Ways and means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Oversight, reported that that committee did on the following date present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following title:

On October 26, 1995:

H.R. 716. An act to amend the Fishermen's Protective Act.

H.R. 1026. An act to designate the U.S. post office building located at 201 East Pikes Peak Avenue in Colorado Springs, CO, as the "Winfield Scott Stratton Post Office."