offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2294, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives just passed under suspension of the rules HR 2294, the Federal Courts Improvement Act of 1998. I was unavoidably detained from floor proceedings. However, had I been present I would have requested a recorded vote and voted against the bill.

I strongly opposed the measure based upon one section of the bill: Section 202. This section would grant magistrate judges contempt authority. I am adamantly opposed to granting such power to these judges on constitutional grounds. I am not alone in this. In fact, the Justice Department in its comments printed in the committee report argues that giving such power to non Article III judges raises constitutional concerns. Magistrates do not go through the normal nomination process. As the Supreme Court stated in a recent opinion, the power to hold persons in criminal contempt is not only awesome, but is also an inherent power of Article III judges. Magistrate judges are not Article III judges.

The Legislative Branch has much to lose if it continues to grant increased powers to those who are unelected. In my congressional district, a Federal magistrate has taken control of a local school district. To put it simply, he single handedly ordered the school board to raise taxes. Out of fear of contempt orders from the magistrate, school board members who were opposed to the tax increase switched their votes to support the tax increase. From the very fact that HR 2294 attempts to grant this power, it is clear that Federal magistrates do not currently have that power. However, it is also clear that there were no attempts made by the court to clear up the misunderstanding about that power and in fact promoted the false concept. Imagine what type of abuse of power we would see IF we actually grant such authority.

I am sure that there are other commendable provisions in HR 2294. However, it is my sincere hope that Section 202 as passed by voice vote today in the House of Representatives is stripped out of the final version of this legislation.

CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION ACT OF 1998

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3117) to reauthorize the United States Commission on Civil Rights, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3117

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Civil Rights Commission Act of 1998''.

SEC. 2. EXTENSION AND AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) EXTENSION.—Section 6 of the Civil Rights Commission Act of 1983 (42 U.S.C. 1975d) is amended by striking ''1996'' and inserting ''2001''.

(b) AUTHORIZATION.—The first sentence of section 5 of the Civil Rights Commission Act of 1983 (42 U.S.C. 1975c) is amended to read ''There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this Act for fiscal years through fiscal year 2001.''.

SEC. 3. STAFF DIRECTOR.

Section 4(a)(1) of the Civil Rights Commission Act of 1983 (42 U.S.C. 1975b(a)(1)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''There shall'' and inserting the following:

''(A) IN GENERAL.—There shall'';

(2) by striking ''(A)'' and inserting the following:

''(i)'';

(3) by striking ''(B)'' and inserting the following:

''(ii)''; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

''(B) TERM OF OFFICE.—The term of office of the Staff Director shall be 4 years.

''(C) REVIEW AND RETENTION.—The Commission shall annually review the performance of the staff director.''.

SEC. 4. APPLICATION OF FREEDOM OF INFORMATION, PRIVACY, SUNSHINE, AND ADVISORY COMMITTEE ACTS.

Section 4 of the Civil Rights Commission Act of 1983 (42 U.S.C. 1975b) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(f) APPLICATION OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF LAW.—The Commission shall be considered to be an agency, as defined in section 551(1) of title 5, United States Code, for the purposes of sections 552, 552a, and 552b of title 5, United States Code, and for the purposes of the Federal Advisory Committee Act.''.

SEC. 5. REQUIREMENT FOR INDEPENDENT AUDIT.

Section 4 of the Civil Rights Commission Act of 1983 (42 U.S.C. 1975b) is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''(g) INDEPENDENT AUDIT.—Beginning with the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and each year thereafter, the Commission shall prepare an annual financial statement in accordance with section 3515 of title 31, United States Code, and shall have the statement audited by an independent external auditor in accordance with section 3521 of such title.''.

SEC. 6. TERMS OF MEMBERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2(c) of the Civil Rights Commission Act of 1983 (42 U.S.C. 1975(c)) is amended by striking ''6 years'' and inserting ''5 years''.

(b) APPLICABILITY.—The amendment made by this section shall apply only with respect to terms of office commencing after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 7. REPORTS.

Section 3(c)(1) of the Civil Rights Commission Act of 1983 (42 U.S.C. 1975a(c)(1)) is amended by striking ''at least one report annually'' and inserting ''a report on or before September 30 of each year''.

SEC. 8. SPECIFIC DIRECTIONS TO THE COMMISSION.

(a) IMPLEMENTATION OF GAO RECOMMENDATIONS.—The Commission shall, not later than June 30, 1998, implement the United States General Accounting Office recommendations regarding revision of the Commission's Administrative Instructions and structural regulations to reflect the current agency structure, and establish a management information system to enhance the oversight and project efficiency of the Commission.

(b) ADA ENFORCEMENT REPORT.—Not later than September 30, 1998, the Commission shall complete and submit a report regarding the enforcement of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990.

(c) RELIGIOUS FREEDOM IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS.—

(1) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than September 30, 1998, the Commission shall prepare, and submit under section 3 of the Civil Rights Commission Act of 1983, a report evaluating the policies and practices of public schools to determine whether laws are being effectively enforced to prevent discrimination or the denial of equal protection of the law based on religion, and whether such laws need to be changed in order to protect more fully the constitutional and civil rights of students and of teachers and other school employees.

(2) REVIEW OF ENFORCEMENT ACTIVITIES.—Such report shall include a review of the enforcement activities of Federal agencies, including the Departments of Justice and Education, to determine if those agencies are properly protecting the religious freedom in schools.

(3) DESCRIPTION OF RIGHTS.—Such report shall also include a description of—

(A) the rights of students and others under the Federal Equal Access Act (20 U.S.C. 4071 et seq.), constitutional provisions regarding equal access, and other similar laws; and

(B) the rights of students and teachers and other school employees to be free from discrimination in matters of religious expression and the accommodation of the free exercise of religion; and

(C) issues relating to religious non-discrimination in curriculum construction.

(d) CRISIS OF YOUNG AFRICAN-AMERICAN MALES REPORT.—Not later than September 30, 1999, the Commission shall submit a report on the crisis of young African-American males.

(e) FAIR EMPLOYMENT LAW ENFORCEMENT REPORT.—Not later than September 30, 1999, the Commission shall submit a report on fair employment law enforcement.

(f) REGULATORY OBSTACLES CONFRONTING MINORITY ENTREPRENEURS.—Not later than September 30, 1999, the Commission shall develop and carry out a study on the civil rights implications of regulatory obstacles confronting minority entrepreneurs, and report the results of such study under section 3 of the Civil Rights Commission Act of 1983.

SEC. 9. ADVISORY COMMITTEES.

Section 3(d) of the Civil Rights Commission Act of 1983 (42 U.S.C. 1975a(d)) is amended by adding at the end the following: ''The purpose of each such advisory committee shall be to conduct fact finding activities and develop findings or recommendations for the Commission. Any report by such an advisory committee to the Commission shall be fairly balanced as to the viewpoints represented.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CANADY) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CANADY).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3117, the Civil Rights Commission Act of 1998, reauthorizes the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights through fiscal year 2001, and institutes reforms to help ensure that the commission will be more effective in pursuing its important mission.

The Committee on the Judiciary considered this legislation on March 3 of

this year, adopted 1 amendment by voice vote, and reported the bill favorably to the full House by voice vote.

The Civil Rights Commission is an independent, bipartisan commission originally established by the Civil Rights Act of 1957. The Commission's statutory authorization expired on September 30 of 1996. I am pleased that we have developed bipartisan legislation making the Civil Rights Commission more effective in carrying out its important mission. It is fitting that a reauthorization bill is bipartisan, since one of the strengths of the commission is its bipartisan nature.

The bill contains a number of provisions designed to strengthen and improve the performance of the commission. The current statute is silent as to the specific term of office for and accountability of the Commission's Staff Director. Since the Staff Director apparently wields considerable power within the Commission, it is important that the Staff Director be accountable to the appointed members of the Commission. Accordingly, section 3 of the bill provides for a 4-year term of office for the Staff Director, and requires that the Commission annually review the performance of the Staff Director.

Section 4 of our bill applies the Freedom of Information Act, the Privacy Act, the Sunshine Act, and the Federal Advisory Committee Act to the Commission's operations. These laws are designed to ensure that government conducts its operations in the spirit of openness, respect for the civil rights of individuals, and equal access. The Civil Rights Commission should comply with all of these important laws.

In a June, 1997, report the U.S. General Accounting Office found that the Commission's management controls over its operations are weak and do not ensure that the Commission is able to meet its statutory responsibilities, its spending data is not maintained by officer function, and furthermore, that its operations have not been audited by an outside accounting firm.

Every governmental entity should periodically review its fiscal operations, and the Commission is certainly no exception. Accordingly, section 5 of our bill requires that the Commission prepare an annual financial statement for audit by an independent external auditor.

Section 6 changes the term of membership for future commissioners from its current 6 years to 5 years. Under this section, existing commissioners' terms are unaffected, and there is no limit to the number of times a commissioner can be reappointed. Reduced term length could help to energize the Commission, bring in new perspectives, and make the Commission more effective and responsive.

Section 8 requires the Commission to implement the General Accounting Office recommendations calling for revision of the Commission's structural regulations to reflect the current agency structure, and for the establishment of a management information system to enhance the efficiency of the Commission. GAO identified these reforms as necessary for the continued viability of the Commission, which the GAO had termed an agency in disarray.

Current law provides that Congress may require the Commission to submit reports as Congress shall deem appropriate. Throughout the Commission's history, Congress has identified specific projects for the Commission to complete. In line with this practice, section 8 of our bill requires the Commission to complete its report regarding the enforcement of the Americans with Disabilities Act, its report regarding religious freedom in the schools, its report on the crisis of young African American males, its report on fair employment law enforcement, and its work on the civil rights implication of regulatory obstruction confronting minority entrepreneurs.

These are all projects the Commission itself has independently chosen to conduct, so this provision merely ensures timely completion of the work which the Commission has initiated on these projects.

Section 9 sets forth the purpose of the Commission's State advisory committees, which is to conduct fact-finding activities and develop findings or recommendations by the Commission, and provides that any report by such advisory committee to the Commission shall be fairly balanced as to the viewpoints represented.

Again, we believe that the bipartisan nature of the Commission is its strength, and it is important that this viewpoint balance be reflected at all levels of the Commission's work.

Finally, I want to thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on the Constitution, for his leadership and work in developing this legislation. I think it is important that we move forward with the reauthorization of the Civil Rights Commission with necessary reforms which are contained in the legislation. I think this will be good for the Commission and good for advancing the agenda of civil rights in this country.

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

□ 1100

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

I rise in favor of H.R. 3117, the Civil Rights Commission Act of 1998. The United States Commission on Civil Rights was established in 1959 to provide the country with advice and counsel on how to best address our still complex and persevering problems in civil rights.

Although the Commission was initially intended to last only 2 years, because of its importance and good work, it still serves as a valuable tool in our war against bigotry. In recent years the Commission has held hearings and released reports on issues such as church burnings, employment discrimination, police brutality and hate crimes. In addition, the Commission has made plans to study disability discrimination and the religious freedom in schools.

The Commission's work on Title VI of the Civil Rights Act is particularly timely. Title VI prohibits discrimination on the basis of race and national origin in federally-assisted programs. After extensive study of Justice Department's Title VI enforcement efforts, the Commission concluded that the Justice Department's enforcement efforts were inadequate.

As a result of this report, the Justice Department has improved its Title VI enforcement program, and other Federal and State agencies have made significant improvements as well. The Department of Agriculture has relied heavily on this report in its response to the problem of discrimination against black farmers. No other agency provides this crucial information. Without civil rights, without the Civil Rights Commission, one would wonder how thoroughly such concerns and underenforcement and noncompliance would be addressed.

Mr. Speaker, last year, as the chairman of the subcommittee has indicated, the General Accounting Office released a report on the Civil Rights Commission. The report pointed out a number of management and organizational problems and made recommendations on how the Commission could best address these concerns.

The Commission has actively moved to initiate all of the GAO's recommendations. Its management information system will soon be operational. This will allow greater accountability in program management. In addition, the Commission is in the process of implementing other GAO recommendations which provide, which will provide greater public access to the information and processes of the Commission and will better ensure staff compliance with Commission rules and regulations.

The Commission has graciously responded to the GAO's recommendations, and therefore we will enjoy an even stronger Commission.

Mr. Speaker, the Commission has some tough work ahead of it. I look forward to the Commission continuing its unyielding fight against discrimination that still divides this country. In addition, I look forward to the Congress's full and continued support of the Civil Rights Commission.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Florida, for his efforts and work in a bipartisan nature to make sure that the Commission was not politicized. We have worked together in this reauthorization effort. I would like to thank him again for working in a bipartisan effort.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, to both the chairman and ranking member, I, too, want to add my appreciation for the cooperative bipartisan effort of reauthorizing the Civil Rights Commission Act and as well continuing the funding until 2001. Dr. Berry and the Commissioners who presently serve and have served in the past have had awesome responsibility. I appreciate their leadership on the question of civil rights.

Many times in an acrimonious debate the question arises, why do we need an United States Civil Rights Commission? I am delighted that this Committee on the Judiciary through the Subcommittee on the Constitution has seen fit to continue the work of this body that, for those who may not be aware, covers issues involving charges of citizens being deprived of voting rights because of color, religion, sex, age, disability or national origin.

This Commission also collects and studies information concerning legal developments on voting rights, monitors the enforcement of Federal laws and policies from a civil rights perspective, and serves as a national clearinghouse for information. I believe that it is extremely important as our country becomes increasingly diverse that there is a commission that overseas and protects these very important rights.

I also think, as the GAO agency report, that there are and is room for improvement. I do not believe that the report focused on the lack of intent or the commitment of the Civil Rights Commission, but certainly I believe that the process of including and establishing a computerized management information system and updating internal management communication procedures is a good procedure.

I also think that it is very helpful, and I thank the committee for directing the Commission to prepare by September 30 reports on religious freedom, antidiscrimination policies and practices in public schools, the crisis among young African American males, regulatory obstacles facing minority entrepreneurs and enforcement of the Americans with Disabilities Act.

In particular with the religious freedom question and as it relates to those in public schools, as I am not in support of the religious freedom amendment that is being proposed, one of the reasons is because I say we do have religious freedom. We have the first amendment. Many times the interpretations in our local communities and public schools are excessive in terms of not allowing people to worship and to freely express their commitment to religion. I hope that this study by the U.S. Civil Rights Commission will give us the ammunition that the first amendment does right, and that those problems that are isolated throughout our Nation can be corrected by local influence.

Then I would simply say that it is extremely important as I work with young African American males in this country and in this community that we focus on the crises of discrimination with respect to African American males. In particular as they travel about the highways and byways are they targeted by law enforcement because of no uncertain reasons. As they move in and out of neighborhoods, are they targeted; are they targeted as they go into the shopping malls of America? It is extremely important that we focus on their improvement and their growth.

Then, Mr. Speaker, I would simply like to say I hope that the Civil Rights Commission will help us in explaining to the American people the crucial and viable importance of renewing the Voter Rights Act of 1965. As late as the mayoral election in 1997, when Lee P. Brown ran in Houston, Texas, we found a circumstance of voter rights violation, of adding people to the rolls, of adding votes to the compilation that people who had not even voted, of accusations and charges circling around the question of race. We are delighted that he was elected, but we realize that there are problems. The latest congressional races in Texas we also saw discrimination and voter intimidation.

Barbara Jordan, when she was in this body, had the pleasure of amending the Voter Rights Act of 1965 to include language minorities. We saw the tragedy of the Loretta Sanchez intimidation process. I truly believe that we are not ready to eliminate the Voter Rights Act that was passed in 1965. The Civil Rights Commission in its duties will have the responsibility and the obligation to document voter rights violations and will require us, I think, to have the basis, to have the documentation necessary to hopefully have a vigorous and serious debate on the importance of renewing the Voter Rights Act.

I would simply close, Mr. Speaker, by saying one thing in conclusion related to this whole process of court appointments which I spoke about earlier. Tragically we find that the criticism of Judge Massiah-Jackson dealt with possible vulgarities which I have no knowledge of and soft on crime. I will say that she was noted as giving some of the highest sentences of any judge.

I think the important point is we wonder about what has been said by judges of years past still on the bench in the deep South when vulgarities were talked about by various judges as it related to those civil rights workers and African Americans who were pressing forward for their rights. With that I would say that it is important that the Civil Rights Commission continues to monitor these violations and hopefully that it will give us the momentum to renew the Voter Rights Act that needs to be renewed.

The Commission that we seek to reauthorize here today was created in 1957, at a time in our nation's history when the notion of universal civil rights was still in doubt. Even though just over two scores later, we have made great strides in the area of civil rights, the distance we still have to travel is nonetheless significant. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3117 and the reauthorization of the Civil Rights Commission.

While I certainly support the reauthorization of this Commission, I have some serious questions about both the language of this bill and the delays that this reauthorization action has faced thus far in the legislative process. In particular, some of the restrictions on the purview of the Commission in language of this bill concern me greatly. The reduction in length of Commissioners' terms and the short duration of this reauthorization bill seem to reflect a diminishing regard for civil rights in this Congress.

As is often the case in a serious discussion about civil rights, I return to the famous legal phrase of ''Where there's a right, there's a remedy.'' There is absolutely a right for Americans to be free from infringement upon their civil rights. When these rights are violated, victims are entitled to a remedy. The Commission on Civil Rights provides one such remedy. The Commission investigates charges of civil rights violations, collects information on voting rights, monitors law enforcement activities, and educates the public on civil rights issues. It is also imperative that we renew the Voting Rights Act when it is up for renewal next year. Last night in a special order we celebrated the 33rd anniversary of the Selma March which was held so that every American citizen can exercise his right to vote. We must renew the Voting Rights Act of 1965. Why are we not supporting these efforts with every possible resource?

We should not allow ideological differences over issues such as affirmative action to cloud the debate over this particular bill. Of course, I believe that the very fact that the existence of discrimination exists to the extent that this Commission is still so necessary evidences the need for continued affirmative action. However, whatever your perspective, the positive activities of this Commission cannot be overlooked.

The Commission has had some organizational and managerial issues that it is currently remedying. We cannot allow administrative problems to overshadow the substantive good work accomplished by the Commission on Civil Rights. Attempts to distract our focus from the investigatory and educational accomplishments of the Commission are rooted in either an opposition to, or an apathy about, equal civil rights for all Americans.

This bill contains provisions directing the Commission on Civil Rights to complete certain reports. I will be particularly interested in the results of the studies on the crisis confronting young African American males, fair employment law enforcement, and regulatory obstacles facing minority entrepreneurs. In light of all of these things, with my points of hesitancy duty noted, I still support this reauthorization initiative, so that our tomorrows might be brighter than our yesterdays.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support the United States Commission on Civil Rights, and support this bill to reauthorize the Commission. However, I am concerned that, while the legislation places deadlines for reporting, the Commission remains underfunded and without the resources necessary to complete its many essential functions.

Congress has consistently appropriated funds to the Commission below the President's authorization request, leaving the Commission year after year with inadequate resources to carry out its directive of investigating charges of citizens deprived of their civil rights, monitoring the enforcement of Federal civil rights laws, and serving as a national clearinghouse for information related to discrimination. With no specified funding level, the proposed legislation increases the possibility that Congress will continue its pattern of underfunding an important and critical component of this Nation's goal of eliminating discrimination in all its ugly forms.

Moreover, there is no indication that the Majority is prepared to support increased funding for the Commission as requested in the FY 1999 Budget. In fact, in its Estimates and Views on the 1999 Budget, the Majority remains noncommittal on the appropriateness of the President's request of $11 million funding request. However, each year, the Congress continues to underfund the Commission. Last year, the Commission requested $11 million, but was only appropriated $8.75 million.

While increased congressional oversight over the Commission may be warranted, it is irresponsible for the Committee to place additional burdens on the Commission and yet continue to overlook the need for full funding of the Commission. It is an unnecessary and intrusive requirement to have the Commission constantly under the obligation of responding to the many requests made by the Majority, but without any provision for the funds necessary to perform its duties effectively.

The Majority has consistently focused on the problems associated with enforcement of our civil rights laws and insists that discrimination is no longer the problem it was 30 years ago. However, there is no question that the need for the Commission is greater than ever before. Discrimination continues to be a persistent problem in American society, and the role of the Civil Rights Commission plays a crucial part in fighting it. Instead of continually scrutinizing perceived defects in remedies to discrimination, we need to examine the persistent, invidious, intractable and often disguised nature of race and gender discrimination that is an undeniable fact in America today. This is what the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights was established to do, and Congress has an obligation to provide it with the necessary resources to do so.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCINNIS). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CANADY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3117, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LOBBYING DISCLOSURE TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS ACT OF 1997

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 758) to make certain technical corrections to the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 758

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE AND REFERENCE.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Lobbying Disclosure Technical Amendments Act of 1997''.

(b) REFERENCE.—Whenever in this Act an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995.

SEC. 2. DEFINITION OF COVERED EXECUTIVE BRANCH OFFICIAL.

Section 3(3)(F) (2 U.S.C. 1602(3)(F)) is amended by striking ''7511(b)(2)'' and inserting ''7511(b)(2)(B)''.

SEC. 3. CLARIFICATION OF EXCEPTION TO LOBBYING CONTACT.

(a) CERTAIN COMMUNICATIONS.—Section 3(8)(B)(ix) (2 U.S.C. 1602(8)(B)(ix)) is amended by inserting before the semicolon the following: '', including any communication compelled by a Federal contract grant, loan, permit, or license''.

(b) DEFINITION OF ''PUBLIC OFFICIAL''.—Section 3(15)(F) (2 U.S.C. 1602(15)(F)) is amended by inserting '', or a group of governments acting together as an international organization'' before the period.

SEC. 4. ESTIMATES BASED ON TAX REPORTING SYSTEM.

(a) SECTION 15(a).—Section 15(a) (2 U.S.C. 1610(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''A registrant'' and inserting ''A person, other than a lobbying firm,''; and

(2) by amending paragraph (2) to read as follows:

''(2) for all other purposes consider as lobbying contacts and lobbying activities only—

''(A) lobbying contacts with covered legislative branch officials (as defined in section 3(4)) and lobbying activities in support of such contacts; and

''(B) lobbying of Federal executive branch officials to the extent that such activities are influencing legislation as defined in section 4911(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.''.

(b) SECTION 15(b).—Section 15(b) (2 U.S.C. 1610(b)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''A registrant that is subject to'' and inserting ''A person, other than a lobbying firm, who is required to account and does account for lobbying expenditures pursuant to''; and

(2) by amending paragraph (2) to read as follows:

''(2) for all other purposes consider as lobbying contacts and lobbying activities only—

''(A) lobbying contacts with covered legislative branch officials (as defined in section 3(4)) and lobbying activities in support of such contacts; and

''(B) lobbying of Federal executive branch officials to the extent that amounts paid or costs incurred in connection with such activities are not deductible pursuant to section 162(e) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.''.

(c) SECTION 5(c).—Section 5(c) (2 U.S.C. 1604(c)) is amended by striking paragraph (3).

SEC. 5. EXEMPTION BASED ON REGISTRATION UNDER LOBBYING ACT.

Section 3(h) of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938 (22 U.S.C. 613(h)) is amended by striking ''is required to register and does register'' and inserting ''has engaged in lobbying activities and has registered''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CANADY) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CANADY).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on S. 758.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield to myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, S. 758 the Lobbying Disclosure Technical Amendments Act of 1997 addresses several technical issues which have been raised during the initial months of implementation of the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995.

Once the Lobbying Disclosure Act was implemented by the Clerk of the House and the Secretary of the Senate, several minor problems with the language of the statute became apparent. The offices of the Clerk and the Secretary have sought to interpret the Lobbying Disclosure Act with respect to these problems in accordance with the original intent of the law, but this technical corrections bill is necessary to clarify the language of the Act to ensure compliance with the Act's original intention.

In 1996, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) and I sponsored similar legislation, H.R. 3435, which passed the House under suspension of the rules by voice vote. A dispute over one of the provisions contained in the bill precluded that bill from passing in the Senate in the last Congress. Except for the removal of this section and one other, the language contained in S. 758 is identical to H.R. 3435. The amendments made by S. 758 will strengthen what is already widely viewed as a significant and successful law.

The Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 was the first substantive reform in the laws governing lobbying disclosure since the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act of 1946. This reform was necessary due to the Supreme Court's narrow construction of the 1946 law. That construction came in the case of United States v. Harriss, which effectively eviscerated the 1946 act.

In the fall of 1995, the House passed this landmark legislation in identical form to the Senate-passed language. This enabled passage of the bill by the Congress and sent it directly to the President. We were thus responsible for the first meaningful lobbying disclosures legislation in over 40 years.

The bill before us today simply clarifies various technical issues arising from that landmark legislation. Section 2 of the bill clarifies the definition