

Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Canady
Castle
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clinger
Clyburn
Coburn
Coleman
Collins (GA)
Combest
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Creameans
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis
de la Garza
Deal
DeLauro
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dixon
Dooley
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Dunn
Edwards
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fawell
Fazio
Fields (TX)
Flanagan
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Fox
Franks (CT)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Frost
Funderburk
Gallegly
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling

Goss
Graham
Green
Greenwood
Gunderson
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Hefner
Herger
Hilleary
Hobson
Holden
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kim
King
Kingston
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Linder
Livingston
Longley
Lucas
Manton
Manzullo
Martinez
McCollum
McCreery
McDade
McHale
McIntosh
McKeon
McNulty
Meek
Metcalf
Meyers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Mink
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Moran
Murtha
Myers
Myrick
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney

NAYS—158

Ackerman
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Blute
Bonior
Borski
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)

Brown (OH)
Bryant (TX)
Camp
Cardin
Chabot
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Coble
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Condit

Norwood
Nussle
Ortiz
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Pastor
Paxon
Peterson (FL)
Pickett
Pombo
Porter
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Reed
Regula
Richardson
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Salmon
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Scott
Seastrand
Shadegg
Shaw
Shuster
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stearns
Stenholm
Stockman
Stump
Talent
Tanner
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas
Thompson
Thornberry
Thornton
Thurman
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Torres
Traficant
Visclosky
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Ward
Waters
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

Ehlers
Engel
Ensign
Eshoo
Evans
Fattah
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Ford
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Furse
Ganske
Gilman
Gordon
Gutiérrez
Gutknecht
Heinemann
Hilliard
Hinchee
Hoekstra
Hoke
Jackson-Lee
Jacobs
Johnson (SD)
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kildee
Klecza
Klug
LaFalce
LaHood
Lantos
Largent
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lincoln

Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loftgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney
Markey
Martini
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McDermott
McInnis
McKinney
Meehan
Menendez
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Minge
Moakley
Morella
Nadler
Neumann
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Orton
Owens
Pallone
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pomeroy
Portman
Poshard
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel

Fields (LA)
Hayes

Riggs
Rivers
Roemer
Roth
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sanford
Sawyer
Schroeder
Schumer
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shays
Skaggs
Steagler
Stark
Stokes
Studds
Stupak
Torricelli
Towns
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Volkmer
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Williams
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—4

□ 1423

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 264

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be withdrawn as a cosponsor of House Resolution 264.

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

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF INTENTION TO OFFER RESOLUTION RAISING QUESTION OF PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

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

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 2(a)(1) of rule IX, I hereby give notice of my intention to offer a resolution—on behalf of myself and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. JOHNSTON]—which raises a question of the privileges of the House. The form of the resolution is as follows:

Whereas the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct is currently considering several ethics complaints against Speaker Newt Gingrich;

Whereas the Committee has traditionally handled such cases by appointing an independent, non-partisan, outside counsel—a procedure which has been adopted in every major ethics case since the Committee was established;

Whereas—although complaints against Speaker Gingrich has been under consideration for more than 14 months—the Committee has failed to appoint an outside counsel;

Whereas the Committee has also deviated from other long-standing precedents and rules of procedure; including its failure to adopt a Resolution of Preliminary Inquiry before calling third-party witnesses and receiving sworn testimony;

Whereas these procedural irregularities—and the unusual delay in the appointment of an independent, outside counsel—have led to widespread concern that the Committee is making special exceptions for the Speaker of the House;

Whereas the integrity of the House depends on the confidence of the American people in the fairness and impartiality of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct.

Therefore be it resolved that;

The Chairman and Ranking Member of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct should report to the House, no later than November 28, 1995, concerning:

(1) the status of the Committee's investigation of the complaints against Speaker Gingrich;

(2) the Committee's disposition with regard to the appointment of a non-partisan outside counsel and the scope of the counsel's investigation;

(3) a timetable for Committee action on the complaints.

Mr. Speaker, this is motherhood. This is not to take a prejudicial view of their findings, it is asking for a clear, specific report to this House, of which we stand ready to receive at any time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under rule IX, a resolution offered from the floor by a Member other than the majority leader or the minority leader as a question of the privileges of the House has immediate precedence only at a time or place designed by the Speaker in the legislative schedule within 2 legislative days of its being properly noticed. The Chair will announce the Chair's designation at a later time.

The Chair's determination as to whether the resolution constitutes a question of privilege will be made at the time designed by the Chair for consideration of the resolution.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
GIFT REFORM ACT

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 268 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 268

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the resolution (H. Res. 250) to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to provide for gift reform. The amendments recommended by the Committee on Rules now printed in the resolution are hereby adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution, as

amended, and any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except:

(1) Thirty minutes of debate on the resolution, which shall be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules;

(2) The amendment printed in part 1 of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, if offered by Representative Burton of Indiana or his designee, which shall be considered as read and shall be separately debatable for thirty minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent; and

(3) If the amendment printed in part 1 of the report is rejected or not offered, the amendment printed in part 2 of the report, if offered by Representative Gingrich of Georgia or his designee, which shall be considered as read and shall be separately debatable for thirty minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent. All points of order against the amendments printed in the report are waived. During consideration of the resolution, no question shall be subject to a demand for division of the question.

□ 1430

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina). The gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] is recognized for 1 hour.

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

(Mr. SOLOMON asked unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.)

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 268 provides for the consideration of House Resolution 250, the House Gift Reform Rule. The rule provides for 30 minutes of debate equally divided and controlled between myself and the ranking minority member of the Rules Committee. The rule provides that the technical amendments adopted by the Rules Committee are considered as adopted.

Following debate on House Resolution 250, the rule makes in order the consideration of an amendment in the nature of a substitute to be offered by Representative BURTON of Indiana or his designee.

The rule then provides that it is in order, if the Burton substitute is rejected or not offered, to consider an amendment by GINGRICH of Georgia or his designee.

Following the disposition of that amendment, if offered, the House would then vote on final adoption of the resolution as amended.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 250 was introduced on October 30 by our Rules Committee colleague, Mrs. WALDHOLTZ of Utah, with a bipartisan group of cosponsors. It is identical to the Senate gift rule adopted on July 28 by a vote of 98 to 0. There are no substantive changes.

An earlier version of the resolution, House Resolution 214, was introduced

on September 6 by Mrs. WALDHOLTZ. It amended the existing House gift rule, which is under the exclusive jurisdiction of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct. Given that committee's heavy workload, the leadership requested that the Rules Committee assume responsibilities for reporting the gift rule.

Mrs. WALDHOLTZ accordingly re-drafted her resolution as a new House rule and introduced that version as House Resolution 250 which was referred to our committee.

On October 27, the majority leader held a press conference at which he promised that both the gift rule and the lobbying disclosure bill would be considered by the House not later than today, November 16.

I am pleased that both the majority leader and the Rules Committee have been able to keep to that timetable. I especially want to commend my colleagues for enduring the forced march we put them through over the last 3 weeks to come up to speed on this issue.

We conducted two hearings at which we heard from numerous House Members as well as public witnesses. Then, on Tuesday of this week, we marked-up and reported by unanimous voice vote House Resolution 250 with only minor, technical changes recommended by the chairman and ranking minority member of the ethics committee.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 250 would apply a new and tighter gift rule to House Members, officers and employees. Whereas at present, gifts under \$50 are not counted towards the annual aggregate of \$250 from any source, the new gift rule would lower that exempt threshold to gifts under \$10. No formal record-keeping or disclosure is required for gifts of \$10 or more—only good faith compliance.

And the proposed new rule also lowers the annual limit for total gifts from the same source in a year from \$250 to \$100.

And, whereas, at present meals are not counted towards the gift limit, under the proposed new rule, meals of \$10 or more would be counted.

The new rule differs from the existing rule in that it does exempt gifts from close personal friends. However, it requires an ethics committee waiver for any gifts from friends that are over \$250 in value. And as with the present rule, gifts from relatives are exempt from the limits.

Mr. Speaker, another tough new provision of this proposed gift rule is the more frequent and detailed disclosure of reimbursement from private sources for travel related to a Member's official representation duties. These include making speeches to groups, fact-finding, and substantial participation events.

Whereas the current rule requires annual disclosure and does not require a detailed accounting of reimbursable expenses, the new rule requires that disclosures be filed with the Clerk within

30 days of such travel, and that a good faith estimate be included of total costs for travel, lodging, meals, and other expenses.

Mr. Speaker, I won't go into greater detail at this time on the proposed new rule, since other members of the Rules Committee will be doing so, and there will be further time during debate on the resolution itself.

I would point out to Members that we could have brought House Resolution 250 directly to the floor as privileged motion without a special rule. But, in that case, there would be no opportunity for amendments.

But because it was the strong feeling of many Members on both sides of the aisle that there should be an opportunity to allow for the consideration of alternatives, we have put out this rule that will permit the possible consideration of two such alternatives.

One is by Mr. BURTON of Indiana. It would retain the current \$250 annual aggregate on gifts, but would lower the exempt category from gifts under \$100 to gifts under \$50. Moreover, the Burton substitute would include meals towards the limit if they are \$50 or more.

Another major difference between the Burton substitute and the base text is that the Burton substitute would permit Members to be reimbursed for travel for charity events.

Finally, the rule permits the offering of an amendment by the Speaker or his designee that would ban all gifts from persons other than close personal friends or relatives, and gifts of personal hospitality.

In other words—there could be no gifts or meals from people who are not friends or relatives.

The Speaker's amendment would also make clear that Members could take a spouse or dependent child to privately reimbursed, events connected with their official duties—as they now may under existing rules—without having to make a determination that the presence of the wife or child "is appropriate to assist in the representation of the House."

Mr. Speaker, this is a good rule, a fair rule, and one which does allow for both stricter and less strict alternatives than House Resolution 250. I urge adoption of the rule and of the new gift ban reform resolution before us.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I am extremely gratified that we are here today to begin the debate on reform of the gift rules. I rise, however, in reluctant support for the rule which has been reported by the Republican majority of the Committee on Rules. Mr. Speaker, for 11 months my Democratic colleagues and I have attempted to bring this issue before the House. Now, when at last the Republican leadership has scheduled this reform for the consideration of the full House, they have stacked the deck.

Mr. Speaker, instead of providing the House with an opportunity to take a clean vote on the Senate-passed gift reform proposal, this rule compels the House to vote down two gift reform amendments before the House ever gets to House Resolution 250, which contains virtually the same language as the Senate measure passed last July. The resolution is sponsored by the gentlelady from Utah [Mrs. WALDHOLTZ], as well as a number of Democrats and Republicans. House Resolution 250, closely resembles the proposal of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BRYANT], which Democrats have tried to bring to the House on six separate occasions this year. The resolution was reported by the Rules Committee with only minor modifications.

While most observers recognize that the Rules Committee proposition is not perfect, it is clearly far superior to the substitute proposed by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON], but also provides far more flexibility for Members than the proposal which may be offered by the Speaker. This rule stacks the deck in such a way that the House will be forced to choose between more of the same—which is the Burton substitute—or a modified zero gift rule—which is what the Speaker's amendment offers. If either one of those propositions prevail, then the Waldholtz bipartisan proposal will never even come to a vote.

Never mind the fact that the Rules Committee held one briefing, two hearings, and one markup on the Waldholtz proposal. Never mind that the Rules Committee proposal was carefully examined by the Standards Committee and contains amendments that were recommended on a bipartisan basis by the Chair and ranking member of that committee. Never mind, Mr. Speaker, that the bipartisan group of Members supporting gift reform asked that House Resolution 250 be quickly sent to the floor and considered without amendment.

So what has the Rules Committee done, Mr. Speaker? In effect, the committee has ignored the product of its own labors and has given us a rule which may very well assure that the Waldholtz proposal may never be voted on directly.

Mr. Speaker, the Democratic Members of the Rules Committee support reform, but we question how we can move toward reform when this rule which puts golf outings ahead of real reform. We will support this rule, but it is a shame that the House is being placed in this position. Yesterday an amendment was offered to this rule which would have allowed for a direct vote on the Waldholtz proposal and every member of the majority—that's right, every Republican Member including Mrs. WALDHOLTZ, the sponsor of the proposal—voted no. I have to ask, What's the problem, Mr. Speaker? Why can't we just take a vote on a proposal which enjoys such wide bipartisan support?

Mr. Speaker, this issue, and the closely linked issue of lobby reform, have enjoyed support from Members both Democratic and Republican, liberal and conservative, senior and junior. Congressional reform is not a partisan issue—it is an issue that matters to all Americans who cherish this House as the House of the people. We cannot let the appearance of impropriety continue to add fuel to the fire of public animosity toward the Congress. If we do not pass the Senate-passed version of gift reform, I fear we will, to a man and a woman, be held in scorn and ridicule.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge my colleagues—those of us who are truly committed to restoring the public's confidence in this institution—to vote support this rule, but in doing so, I must urge a "no" vote on the Boston proposition. Mr. Speaker, this institution is not held in particularly high regard by the American people, especially at this moment when we are grappling with this budget impasse. I fear that in spite of our good intentions, and those intentions are bipartisan—this rule will force us into a box and our resulting actions will be seen as just more serious business as usual here in Washington.

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS], a distinguished member of the Committee on Rules as well as a member of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, who has probably more expertise on these matters than any Member I know.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] be permitted to manage the remainder of the bill with me.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules, for his confidence. Fortunately, we have staff here who really do know what the Rules of the House are that can help us out, in case I go off track.

I think more important, since we are talking about the rule at this point in the debate, I think it is critical to note that today we are fulfilling a commitment that was made to the House and to the American people that we would debate and vote on the new gift rules for our membership by November 16.

□ 1445

For those like this Member who may have lost track of the days and nights in the midst of all the budget discussions and so forth in the past few days, it just so happens that today is November 16. Promises made, promises kept. I

congratulate our leadership for doing that.

I commend the many Members who have worked to bring us to this point, most notably my colleague on the Committee on Rules, the gentlewoman from Utah [Mrs. WALDHOLTZ]. She has persevered under extraordinarily difficult circumstances, and we owe her our thanks. Likewise, I must commend and thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], my chairman, for his hard work and eminent fairness in handling this issue. It has not been easy.

Mr. Speaker, Thomas Jefferson once said, "When a man assumes the public trust, he should consider himself as public property."

Many Americans subscribe to that philosophy, I among them, and it is for that reason that I support efforts to strengthen and expand our current gift rules. I quickly say that I realize that how you deal with the problem of gifts is a very personal decision for all Members, and I totally respect the rights of how they go about doing it.

Therefore, I think we have come up with a pretty good rule because we have tried to provide for a number of options, hopefully finding a comfortable home for each of the Members' personal preferences that still passes muster with the idea that we are being asked to explore gift reform by the American people.

I believe that most of the Members and staff who work long hours in this Capitol are very honorable and very deserving of the public's confidence. However, I also know from the polls, just general street talk, that the public does not always have great confidence in us, in part because they believe perhaps that we enjoy too many perks and privileges, many of them provided by people who seek special access.

For this reason, since my early days in Congress, my policy for myself and my own office staff has been not to accept any gifts, meals, or travel. Although this policy is personal to me, and it is certainly more stringent than any of the reform versions we are taking under consideration today, I find it has proven to be relatively easy to implement and precluded a lot of difficult decisions that frankly would have been in gray areas that might have raised people's concerns. I know other Members who have practiced the same policy generally agree with those conclusions. Regardless of what we do today, I personally will continue my policy.

Now, gift reform for the entire House, however, is important even if most of the Members adopt their own stringent policies voluntarily. Why? The answer is simple. Because a large number of American people have asked us to take this extra step. Many feel our low approval ratings can be raised only if we do take that kind of a commitment to begin to build back trust. I think building back trust is an important mission for this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that this rule affords Members with differing

perspectives on the need and the proper direction of gift reform an opportunity to be heard and issue their debate and their arguments and their persuasion on the approach that they think is best.

I know some Members believe strongly that the approach embodied in House Resolution 250, which is the one that the other body adopted in July, they feel strongly that is the wrong way to go, that will not work. Others believe that that approach does not go far enough, that it will not restrict Members' and staffers' acceptance of gifts and it will not achieve the mission of building credibility.

So we have the chance to debate these points of view and vote first on a bipartisan substitute offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON], a measure that is designed to emphasize disclosure more than bans. If that should fail, then we will vote on a proposal offered by our Speaker geared toward a more stringent gift ban than the other body has adopted. If neither alternative should pass, then we will have a vote on House Resolution 250, provisions that are almost identical to the other body's, we have cleaned up some of the minor problems in it, but it is very similar to that, known as the Waldholtz version.

This seems to me to be a very fair and proper way to go. I do not know how we could have done it better and accommodated more views and still brought the matter to the floor. I urge our colleagues' support for this rule so we can get on and examine the versions that we have offered for us.

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

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO].

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend on the Committee on Rules for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of lobby reform and the rule and the gift reform legislation, the Barrett-Shays-Waldholtz bill before us now, which merely reflects the gift reform bill of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BRYANT] which we have tried to take up since the beginning of this year.

We cannot begin today without a quick recounting of events that have occurred over this calendar year. Our consideration of lobby and gift reform today characterizes the Republican approach to legislating: take bills which enjoy broad bipartisan support, that were passed by the Senate unanimously, act only when forced to, and then proceed in a partisan manner.

Democrats have offered four previous occasions to consider lobby and gift reforms on the House floor this year, most recently just 3 weeks ago during the consideration of the second legislative branch appropriations bill. On October 25, that bill was pulled from the floor. Why? Because Democrats and reform-minded Republicans had the votes to pass the lobby and gift bills we will

consider today. Then and only then did Majority Leader ARMEY make a public commitment to consider these bills today. Did he then take a bipartisan approach? I would argue no.

The Senate-passed lobby bill was not even referred to the committee for 3 months. The lobby reform bill languished at the desk. The Subcommittee on the Constitution did not mark up a lobby bill until hearings were completed, until given the go-ahead by the GOP leadership. The gift reform bill was referred to the partisan Committee on Rules instead of the usual referral to the bipartisan Committee on Standards of Official Conduct. The restrictive rule offered for the gift bill today stems from extensive discussions and votes within the Republican conference, but no consultation with the Democratic leadership ever took place.

So, at the end of the day, is the product improved? Has more bipartisanship on the issue been achieved? Has more bipartisanship on the issue been achieved? Has the House earned its traditional reputation as the more reform-minded of the two bodies? The events speak for themselves.

At the very least, the GOP leadership tactics have cast a shadow over what should have been a straightforward, consensus approach, working hand-in-hand as we did in the last Congress to pass this kind of legislation.

Now the situation has been created where our gift reform product may fall short of the Senate, or our lobby reform bill may be amended, permitting it to bog down in a House-Senate conference committee over amendments that have already shown to be unpopular in the other body. If either of those things happens today, the blame clearly will lie at the feet of the Republican leadership.

I urge my colleagues to adopt the Senate-passed provisions. We should have done so a long time ago.

For my colleagues who want to complicate this issue by saying the limits are too low or charity events will be restricted or record-keeping will be required, I say the American public does not like what it sees in Washington, and we need to set a higher standard and work toward restoring their trust.

I say that not because I am holier than thou. I am no different than any other Member in this institution. I have engaged in all the practices that will be mentioned here today. I am not impugning the motives of any of my colleagues. I think this is the cleanest legislative body anywhere, and I think it has been cleaner every year I have served here.

There is no question in my mind, however, that we need to bring responsibility and accountability to our dealings with lobbyists and our relationships with them. That is the point of these bills that have been brought to this floor finally today. That point should not be obscured by any 11th hour reformers who seek to maintain their own notions of business as usual.

Our mission today is to restore the confidence of the American people in this great institution. Whether we like it or not, the perception exists that this place is too influenced by too close a relationship with those who are paid to influence our decisions.

I urge my colleagues to accept this very unfair rule, yes, accept it anyway, and to defeat the various amendments, and pass the Senate-passed gift and lobby reform provisions.

I know this will be a divisive issue, within both the conference of the Republicans and the caucus of the Democrats. But I think it is in the best tradition of past efforts to reform the institution, and to try to build additional public understanding of the relationships we invariably must have with interest groups and lobbyists, and at the same time reassure each other that our own common standards will be such that we can go to the public and ask for them to reinvest their trust in us.

Many of us have different standards. I do not impugn, as I say, the motives of any. We all have different perspectives as we evaluate where we must be on these issues. But there are other standards that must apply to all of us because we are judged often by the actions of a few.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the rule.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from the Commonwealth of Virginia [Mr. BATEMAN].

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

Mr. BATEMAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, it would have been much easier for me not to have asked for the time to speak on this issue, on this subject matter. But I think that would have been an act of cowardice for me not to do so.

I know full well that it is politically more comfortable to vote for the most extreme measure pending before us on that subject. But I think that does to this body an enormous disservice. Harken to the words of the gentleman from California who just spoke, who says this is the cleanest institution, legislative body that he knows of and it is getting better all the time. Then why are we flagellating ourselves the way we are doing it?

I could stand before you and tout the virtues of the House Resolution 250 based text that we have before us, but I have looked at it, I have studied it, and it is terribly, terribly flawed.

You should know that what comes to you as the instrument passed by the other body was written on the floor of the other body in an ad hoc, spontaneous kind of way. If we look at that legislation, it shows all the earmarks of the atmosphere in which it was drafted. It is shot full of opportunities for entrapment of Members. It calls for Members exercising, quote, good faith discretion, which is an invitation for

those who are most conscientious to deny themselves while inviting those who are least conscientious to go to the limits of the system. It creates the necessity of a recordkeeping that would burden you to the point where it would seriously jeopardize your ability to get the work done for which you were elected.

Mr. Speaker, in 1967 when I first decided to run for public office, I promised myself and my family that it would be more important why I got elected than whether I got elected. I think we should apply that standard as we make our judgments in passing the better gift reform bill.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BARRETT].

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, gift reform is not a Republican issue. It is not a Democratic issue. It is an issue that strikes at the very core of the integrity of this institution.

The greatest honor in my life is serving in this institution. I have met some of the greatest people I have ever met in my life, and I think virtually every one of those people is dedicated to doing what is right for the American people. I think Congress gets a bad rap when people think we are not here to help. But I also think it is incumbent upon us to do everything we can to make sure the people of this country have confidence in this institution. We must have the people in this country have confidence in the democratic process. In order to do so, that means we are going to have to make some personal sacrifices and I am willing to take those sacrifices. That means we are going to have to say, "I am willing to give up golf trips." That means we are going to have to say, "I am willing to give up unlimited meals worth \$50." That means I am going to have to say, yes, it is more important for the integrity of this institution than it is for me to have frills that every one of us wants.

I am human just like everybody else. I would love to have these things. But it is far more important for this institution to have the integrity restored in it.

□ 1500

That is why I think it is important that we are working together today on a bipartisan basis. It is important we move forward.

This is not a perfect bill. You are never going to have a perfect bill in this area, but it is, I think, a bill that moves in the right direction. It is a bill that deserves the support of every person of this institution.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California talked about fairness. I know we are talking about gift reform, but there was some partisanship put in it.

In 30 years the Republicans did not win but one motion to recommit because the deck was stacked. The king-of-the-hill rule in my first years here, we did not win any, because the deck was stacked.

We are trying to offer three different options. Personally I feel that during the time when the Government is shut down, we have got appropriations bills to do, we have got 25,000 troops that are looking, by the President, to be sent to Bosnia, it is absolutely ludicrous for us to be doing this at this particular time.

Let us take a look. I am going to support the Burton amendment. I will also support a zero, no trips, no gift, nothing, de nada, rather than partial.

Let me tell you why. Democrats have got a convention coming up in Chicago. Can you imagine when a high school student volunteers time as a gift? Can you imagine someone that drives a car or a flower or anything? There is no way that the people that put on your convention or the people that are involved in it are going to stay out of prison. I guarantee you someone is going to question somebody working somewhere sometime, and that person is going to end up going to jail. I mean, it is absolutely ludicrous.

I have never been on a trip myself, never once, never taken my family. I do not plan on doing it. I would love to go to Mexico where we have a lot of problems in common with California. But I have not done that.

I think probably the most thing I have ever received is a T-shirt or a golf hat. But individually it does not matter.

But I think for us to take and do this partially and the recordkeeping, you say it is insignificant, but I think, I really believe you are going to end up with Members on both sides of this thing in jail just because something is not reported. Somebody drops a book off, which I have received books, I have no idea what they cost. I will log it in. If it comes up over the \$10 or \$50, like that, somebody could bring it up, and we could end up in a lot of trouble.

I would ask you to support Burton or support zero.

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

I ask the gentleman from California, who just spoke, if he would remain at the microphone, if he would.

I know that the legislation is complicated and it is hard to keep track of all the details when things move around. But the gentleman may not have been aware that there is a specific exemption in the bill for political activities. Nothing surrounding the political convention either of the Democratic Party or of the Republican Party is covered under this legislation.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. If the gentleman will yield, then would a charity gift at a political event be covered?

Mr. FROST. All I can tell the gentleman is the restrictions in this paragraph shall not apply to the following,

and then it says a contribution is defined in section 301(a) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 that is lawfully made under the act, the contribution for election to a State or local government office prescribed by section 301(8) (b) of the act or attendance at a fundraising sponsored by a political organization.

A political convention is obviously sponsored by a political organization. The intent is not to cause problems for either the Republican Party or the Democrat Party at their national conventions.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I have been essentially involved in virtually every reform issue this House has faced since I first came, whether that issue is limiting outside income or requiring financial disclosure or campaign reform or lobbying gift reform. I have not been involved in that because I thought that most Members did not have integrity, I have been involved in it because I know that they do.

Yet what we have often seen is that many Members in this place have their reputations unjustly besmirched because of the careless or thoughtless actions and sometimes the venal actions of a very small percentage of the Members of this body. I do not believe that we can afford, as an institution or as stewards of the political process, I do not believe that we can afford to have a situation continue in which taxpayers can turn on their television set and see their local Congressman cavorting on a beach with his expenses paid for by lobbyists or golfing with his expenses paid for by lobbyists. The system cannot afford it. That kind of scene turns this country cynical. It robs them of any remaining faith they have left in their political institutions.

We have got to cut off that kind of behavior and that kind of activity. That is why I would urge the House, when they take action today, to support the committee bill, to oppose the Burton amendment.

I respect the gentleman's motives. But I do not respect the judgment that leads one to conclude that we can afford to continue those kinds of relationships. I think that for the good of the country, those kinds of relationships must end, and that is the most important lesson which I think we have to take out of the debate today.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Washington [Mrs. SMITH], who has been one of the principals in bringing this legislation forward.

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend the Members of the Committee on Rules and the House leadership for allowing gift reform to come to the floor for a vote.

I will be supporting the rule, and I will also be supporting the substitute

amendment offered by the Speaker and the base bill underlying this bill.

Just know that if you vote for the Burton amendment, you do not ever get to real reform. The rule is structured in a way that, if Burton passes, you never get the two reform versions, not the total ban and not the bipartisan solution that mirrors the Senate solution. You must vote "no" on Burton first.

Now, why am I supporting both of the underlying bills? A group of freshmen, in a variety of ways, sometimes the same bill, sometimes with others, came together in December and made a decision that we would run against the perceived perception of this place that it was affected by special interests. We ran against incumbents, some of us, saying we would be different, we would not go and be affected by those special interests and that we had to keep our word, see, because we had run on a promise, a contract, and the American people thought that contract included going and cleaning up Congress and changing the perception.

People turn on the TV night after night and see us in warm places with friends on golf trips and have the perception everyone is like that, and since I have been here, I realize that is an exception. It is not the rule.

The hearts are good here. They are well-intentioned. But the people still have little confidence in us.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the rule, vote "no" on Burton. Burton is introduced by a lot of people with good hearts who believe very strongly that these trips are not harmful. But they are harmful to our image. Vote "no" on Burton and "yes" on the rule.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. DELAURO].

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, it is time that we restore the integrity of the House of Representatives by banning gifts to Members of Congress. These gifts threaten the bonds of trust that we need in order to govern in this body.

We are here to do the people's business, and we are compensated very well for that. We do not need paid vacations, frequent-flier miles or free meals to sweeten the deal.

Most of all, Members of Congress do not need lobbyists' paid golf weekends. If Members want to play at Pebble Beach or Augusta, they should do it on their own time and on their own tab.

I am pleased a bipartisan effort is being made to finally ban gifts. I commend my colleagues on the other side of the aisle for their work on this issue. I must register my disappointment that Congress has not acted sooner. In fact, Democrats have tried to bring gift ban measures to the floor of the House 4 times since the first day of this Congress but have been blocked each time.

The House passed a strong gift ban bill last year with a 3-to-1 bipartisan majority, only to see that bill blocked

in the Senate. This year, the Senate passed a gift ban 98 to 0. It is time to make sure that the House follows the same strict rules as the Senate.

I urge my colleagues to support the resolution, oppose the Burton amendment or any other changes that would weaken the gift ban, create loopholes for lobbyists or would impede the momentum that has pushed this House toward finally banning unnecessary and harmful gifts.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN], my friend and colleague.

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

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, in this House, there are two things you have to look at. One is perception, and one is reality.

I spent 12 years on the Ethics Committee. In fact, I was the ranking member for the last 2 years of the Ethics Committee. I remember the Jim Wright case well. I remember the case where I was in charge of the Republican side on check cashing—109 Members say they lost their positions because of that.

I also took the time to go back and look at every case that has ever happened since the beginning of Congress on what we have tried in front of the Ethics Committee; somebody hit somebody with a cane, they went outside here and dueled, they spit on each other, they did all kinds of interesting things. But, you know, to this day, whatever the perception is, the reality is there has never been a case before the Ethics Committee because of an honoraria or a gift, never been there.

When I was first here in the early 1980's, we had an interesting time. We said we have got to change this around, and we did not get around to it, however, but in 1989 we did. People, like the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MEYERS] sitting there, the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES], and others, all of us spent hundreds of hours trying to come up with some rules. We got them done. We did away with honoraria. We did away with a lot of things.

Then what happened? We had people come to the floor and say, "We finally did it. We have got it done. We will pacify the American public. They will be happy with this." That was not done behind closed doors. That was done in the open, for everybody to see. All the papers said, "Gee, they finally did it."

Let me just ask the question: How many in here know what we did in 1989? I do not think very many people do. One. Thank you. I appreciate the gentleman from Texas.

Most of the people, though, it is just like saying what is wilderness. Nobody can define that. So we get down to the idea of what have we got; really, why do you not take it and read it before you vote on it? Why do you not find out what we have got before we talk about something else?

There are a lot of ways to skin this cat.

I personally feel we should leave it as it is and say to the American public, "Why do you not go read what we did in 1989? I think you will feel we did a good thing and a good thing for America."

I urge the Members to just let this one go. I am proud of the work that we did in 1989. I see no reason to change it.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I rise in strong support of this bipartisan effort to reform the rules of the House with respect to gifts.

I, too, will be supporting Speaker GINGRICH's substitute for no gifts. I wish he had treated lobbyists differently than the Girl Scouts, but so be it. I think we are better off with no gifts at all than all of the other problems raised by the exemptions.

I would seriously hope my colleagues would turn down the Burton amendment. This effort at disclosure is not real disclosure. But what it does is take off all the limits between lobbyists and people with unlimited expense accounts and the special access they have to Members of Congress at events, whether they are billed for charity or for any other. You may disclose under the Burton amendment that you went to charity. What you will not disclose is you played with three oil executives or three people from the homebuilders or three people from the banking industry or from the savings-and-loans. That was not chance. That was set up. It was determined ahead of time because that is how they attracted those people to give money to the charity was to promise them that they could play with the Member of Congress and they could spend time with them over a 3-hour, 4-hour, 5-hour period of time.

□ 1515

That will never be disclosed under the Burton resolution. We ought to turn that down. Because disclosure, disclosure will not solve the problem that we have. The problem that we have is that a group of paid people in this town who do very good work on behalf of their clients, whether it is on behalf of teachers or utility companies or home builders or what have you, they do marvelous work, but because of their access to money, because of their access to privilege, they have access to Members far beyond what our constituents have to us.

That is not fair, in an area where we are competing for ideas and competing for votes and competing to persuade our colleagues to vote one way or another, and that access that is bought by money must be ended. The bipartisan bill does that.

The Speaker's amendment takes it a step further, which I think is worthy of all of our support. Our constituents do not want us to disclose it, they want us

to stop it, and they want us to stop it now.

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

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, as a newcomer in this Congress, my concern with many of my Republican colleagues is not that they have tried to change the operation of this House too much, but that they have changed it too little. And with all due respect to my good friend from Florida, I have to say that the Republican leadership really has broken its promise to the American people in this regard.

From day one, when the issue was the relationship between the lobby and the Members of this body, they refused to reform. We tried on January 4, we tried in May, we tried in June, we tried in September, we tried in October, again and again and again. We met a stone wall of resistance to doing anything to change those ties that bind Members of Congress to the lobby.

This year, finally, under pressure from the U.S. Senate, where 98 Members of that Senate voted to reform gift ban, finally it became obvious that some reform was going to have to happen. And I salute those Members, largely new members of the Republican caucus, who have spoken out on this issue, because it is essential that it have bipartisan support.

Yet as recently as this past Sunday on "Meet the Press," Speaker GINGRICH again spoke out against the version of this bill that passed the U.S. Senate. We have a rule today that has been structured to make it as tough as possible to pass a real meaningful rule.

So today we have an opportunity to enact real reform, yet there is yet an amendment up here that would provide little more than the current system. It is essential that we not contract out the operation of this Congress to the lobby, that we rely on the Members of the Congress to do it, and not the gifts from the lobby.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mrs. MALONEY].

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and for underlying bipartisan bill. Mr. Speaker, we were sent here to give Americans a better life, not to live the good life at the expense of lobbyists. But Congress has played games with gift bans for years, grandstanding against perks, but quietly preserving them.

Today we can stop playing games and pass real gift ban reform, either the Shays-Barrett gift ban bill, or the Gingrich total ban on gifts, or we can keep playing games, especially golf, and pass the Burton substitute. We need to vote against the Burton substitute.

House Resolution 250 is a good, tough gift ban. It limits single gifts to \$50 and annual gifts to \$100. The Burton sub-

stitute is not a gift ban; it is a gift bonanza. It will continue free round trip tickets to charity events; it says a gift under \$50 is not really a gift. How many Americans would agree with that?

The only true gift ban bill before us today is the bipartisan Shays-Barrett bill, or Speaker GINGRICH's total ban, but in order to get to them, we need to vote for the rule and against the Burton substitute.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mrs. ROUKEMA].

(Mrs. ROUKEMA asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the rule and of this resolution. It has taken us too long to get to this day.

What we are doing here today is a straightforward change in the House rules to enact a strict ban on gifts to Members from lobbyists and other people with a direct interest in legislation. And, you know what? It is about time. Ross Perot is absolutely right on this one. The system is badly broken and must be fixed today. No more excuses, no more delays.

These two measures, the gift ban and the lobbying disclosure bill, are designed to correct basic faults in the system, a system that has shaken the confidence of the American people and our ability to do what is best for the country, and not what is best for our junketeering buddies.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know of any of my colleagues who can be bought off on an important issue by a trip or a dinner. But the American people perceive Washington to be nothing more than a swamp of back scratching and self-enrichment. Today we can take a step to correct that view. We must act here and now to eliminate the potential for corruption and eliminate even the appearance of junketeering buddies.

Mr. Speaker, some in this Chamber have decided to spread myths and use scare tactics on this bill. But my colleagues, I do not want you to be fooled by the loose talk on this resolution.

I really am looking forward to the day when this House cannot only do what we have to do today, but look forward to the real good government reform that the American people want and deserve, which is campaign financing reform. That will have to wait until next year. But without delay, today, we should defeat the Burton substitute. It kills reform, and support the Shays-Waldholtz-Barrett gift ban.

Mr. Speaker, I submit to you the "Dear Colleague" of the gentleman from Connecticut, Mr. CHRIS SHAYS, the gentleman from Utah, Mrs. ENID WALDHOLTZ, and the gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. TOM BARRETT, which dispels those myths and tells the reality of this bill.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC, November 16, 1995.

GIFT BAN: MYTH VERSUS REALITY, PART 2

DEAR COLLEAGUE: Many questions have arisen recently during the discussion of gift ban legislation. We want to take this opportunity to dispel some of the "myths" you may have heard regarding the resolution.

Myth. This legislation will result in countless innocent members and staff going to jail for accidentally violating the ban.

Reality. H. Res. 250 is a rules change, not a law, and therefore could not result in any criminal violations. Just like the system that exists today, violation of the gift rules would be subject to disciplinary action by the Standards Committee.

Myth. I understand the personal friendship exemption doesn't apply if a gift was paid for with company expenses, or by someone other than my friend. Therefore, I could be in violation even if I don't know that a gift my friend gave me was paid by his company.

Reality. The rule states a member shouldn't apply the personal friendship exemption if "to the actual knowledge of the Member, officer, or employee" someone other than the friend paid for the gift. If you didn't know the gift was not paid for by your friend, you would not be in violation.

Myth. Sometimes my attorney waives a fee for me, just as she does for other clients. Under the H. Res. 250, I wouldn't be allowed to accept this.

Reality. The resolution exempts gifts which are "offered to members of a group or class in which membership is unrelated to congressional employment." As long as your lawyer waives other clients' fees, and is not waiving your fee because you are a Member of Congress, you would not be in violation. This is similar to current rules.

Myth. I understand that personal hospitality is allowed under H. Res. 250, but that the exemption doesn't apply to free lodging at a company-owned resort. If someone invites me to stay at his condo, and I don't know that it's owned by his company, I will be in violation.

Reality. The limitations on gifts of personal hospitality are the same under H. Res. 250 as they are under current rules. You would not be in violation if you did not know the condo was company-owned.

Myth. If my friend invites me to go on his boat or use his jet ski, and I don't know that they're owned by his company, I would be in violation of the rule.

Reality. Again, if you don't know that a gift was paid by a company, you would not be in violation of the rule.

Myth. If someone gave me four tickets worth \$20 each for my family to attend a baseball game, I would not be able to accept them, because the cumulative value of \$80 exceeds the \$50 limit.

Reality. The Standards Committee currently applies a "simultaneous gift rule" which would continue under H. Res. 250. Under this rule, the tickets would each be considered separate gifts and could be accepted as long as each ticket's value did not exceed \$50. The total value of all tickets could not exceed \$100.

Myth. Sometimes there's a charity event in my district, such as a 10K run or a tennis tournament, and the fee is waived for me. Under H. Res. 250, I couldn't participate in such events and have the fee waived.

Reality. This is not true. The resolution allows members to accept free attendance at a charity event, offered by the event's sponsor. You would not be able to accept free airfare to or lodging at a charity event.

Myth. Under the resolution, a gift to a staff member would count toward the member's limit.

Reality. A gift to a staff member does not count towards his/her member's limit, it would count toward the staff member's limit.

Myth. Sometimes I take courses or lessons and the fee is waived. Under H.Res. 250, I won't be able to do this.

Reality. Training is exempt under H.Res. 250 if such training is in the "interest of the House". The Standards Committee could determine if a class is in the interest of the House.

Myth. Unpaid interns would be banned under the legislation.

Reality. This is not true. Regulations regarding the service of interns already exist in House rules. H.Res. 250 does not affect these rules.

Myth. Use of government tennis courts and weight rooms would be banned.

Reality. This is not true, for two main reasons. Under the resolution "Anything which is paid for by the Federal Government, by a State or local government, or secured by the Government under a Government contract" is exempt. In addition, opportunities which are "offered to members of an organization . . . in which membership is related to congressional employment and similar opportunities are available to large segments of the public through organizations of similar size" are allowed.

Myth. I will not be able to take tickets to any game, even if it is a university in my district.

Reality. If the tickets are worth less than \$50 each, they can be accepted. The cost of the tickets would count toward the aggregate \$100 annual gift limit.

Myth. If an unsolicited gift basket comes into my office I will be in violation of the gift ban.

Reality. Provided the gift basket is worth less than \$50, it can be accepted. The cost of the gift basket would count toward the aggregate \$100 annual limit. If it is worth more than \$50, the resolution states "if it is not practical to return a gift because it is perishable, the item may, at the discretion of the recipient, be given to an appropriate charity or destroyed."

Myth. If the Chamber of Commerce has a lunch, I won't be able to go and interact with my constituents.

Reality. Food and attendance at a widely-attended event is exempt from the ban.

Myth. I will never be able to go on a fact-finding trip to gain information that I need to do my job. In addition, my constituents will not be able to invite anyone but me to speak at their events—even if there is another member of Congress who is more knowledgeable on the issue than I am.

Reality. Travel may be accepted from anyone other than a registered lobbyist, as long as it is specifically related to official business. The travel must be publicly disclosed, and entertainment cannot be paid for unless it is provided to all attendees regardless of Congressional employment. Activities which are substantially recreational in nature cannot be paid for.

Myth. My staff and I will spend countless hours on paperwork requirements required by this resolution.

Reality. There are no record-keeping requirements included in H. Res. 250. The only additional requirement is further disclosure on travel.

I hope this is helpful. If you have any questions, call Allison Clinton (Shays), Bryan George (Barrett), or Linda Toy (Waldholtz).

Sincerely,

CHRISTOPHER SHAYS,
TOM BARRETT,
ENID WALDHOLTZ.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MEEHAN].

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bipartisan bill. Not all lobbying is bad, and not all gifts are given for cynical reasons, but there is no denying that members of Congress are getting too close to lobbyists, and it is up to us to break up the symbolic relationship between legislators and the people hired to influence them.

Many of us were elected promising to change the way Congress does business, because the American people are convinced that Members of Congress take too many free trips, take too many expensive gifts, and have too many free steak dinners.

I am not so sure they are wrong. Just look at all the political wrangling and legislative game playing that has been going on on this issue, all in the name of saving free golf trips and greens fees.

Can you imagine, in the same week that we are closing down the Federal Government, we are thinking about voting to open up free trips for golf and free trips for greens. Last Congress, my freshman class, my Democratic freshman class, led the way of fighting for a gift ban, but that died in the U.S. Senate.

The Republican leadership this year has procrastinated and capitulated and delayed long enough. Working in a bipartisan way, we have this before the floor today. Four times earlier this year we tried to do it through Democratic amendments.

Now is the time to pass it. In the elections last November, voters gave Congress a mandate to change the way Washington does business. It is time to stop the political games and start working together to make this institution more accountable.

Vote against the Burton substitute, and let us vote for real reform. Let us pass it today.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN].

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to speak on the Burton amendment when it comes up. I have listened with great interest today. All of the Members of Congress who are so concerned about ethics in this House, I wonder if any of them have taken the opportunity to read the law? We are talking about a House rule and the law of the United States which says that anyone who is in Congress who accepts any gift in return for any vote on this floor is subject to imprisonment and removal from office.

If anyone is so pious and so convinced that there are Members of Congress who are taking these bribes, it is their obligation to this Congress to name names, to tell us who is doing this. They are doing this to get a headline back in their district, and they are getting a few, but they are making a tremendous mistake.

So get headlines back in your district, and then go back and tell people who you are talking about. Then bring those names to the Attorney General and let us prosecute them.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE].

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I really do not want to prosecute anyone. I simply want to have the U.S. Congress stand up and do their job, and that is to recognize that we are here to do the people's business, and not to be the recipient of all the goodies that may come into our office.

These are honest people here, folks. No one is attempting to prosecute law abiding Members of the U.S. Congress. We know however debate that the in the national arena has been directed at this House improving self-regulation. But this is a simple rule that has a simple face value to it, and that is that we should not accept gifts that may intrude upon the process of government. It simply prohibited gifts except at a certain monetary value. It allows Members to do their job on behalf of the American people, but it says that gift taking from lobbyists and others is just plain wrong. It is a simple fact, and I accept it, and was glad to vote for the rule.

I would ask my colleagues to join together to ensure that the American people will know that this House has cleaned its own self up, that this House is prepared to acknowledge the fact that the business at hand is to save the taxpayers' dollars, and also to be found to be beyond reproach. It is important that we recognize that this is not a harsh rule, simply a fair rule. It is a rule that is simply fair, and simply acknowledges that we are here to work, and to work hard.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask my colleagues to think about what the image has been of this Congress, aside from the fact we have not passed a clean continuing resolution that would allow the Government to keep its doors open, not for us, but for the American people. It is time now then to tell them that we are ready to get down to work and to avoid the aspersions that have been cast upon this Congress that we spend our time taking gifts and not doing work.

It a simple rule, it is a simple process. Clean our own act up. This Congress can do it. Stop the gift. Let us do it today.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Ms. PRYCE], my friend and colleagues on the Committee on Rules.

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

Mr. Speaker, today the House of Representatives will take another important step toward fulfilling our promise to the American people to change the status quo by voting on gift reform legislation.

Now, this is personally satisfying, Mr. Speaker, because many of us in the

sophomore class worked very hard since we arrived to bring about meaningful congressional reform, and now we finally have the strength of numbers to do it. I commend my colleagues and the new freshman class for all the hard work they have done to keep this important issue on the front burner, for working with our leadership to bring this to the floor this year.

Mr. Speaker, before I ran for Congress I was a judge, and when I decided to run for this seat, I called my mother and told her. And there was a long silence on the other end of the phone. And I said, "Mother, what do you think?" and she finally said, "Deborah, how could you leave the bench to go to that sleazy place?"

Now, this was my own mother. I have since convinced her that things are not all that bad, but, unfortunately, I do not believe my mother is the only person in America who held this institution in such low esteem.

Now, for too long our constituents have believed that well-funded special interest groups have maintained undue influence over the legislative process. While I firmly believe that the Members and staff of this body conduct the people's business every day with honesty, integrity, and with high ethical standards, there is still a perception, much like my mother's, that Members' decisionmaking is often clouded by acts of generosity extended to them.

□ 1530

As a result, public confidence in this institution has steadily declined and the taxpayers have issued a renewed challenge to make Congress more open and accountable. As Members of Congress, we have the obligation to respond by setting higher standards for ourselves.

Mr. Speaker, this is a fair and balanced rule. It calls for honest debate on three very different proposals to strengthen current gift restrictions. Each proposal represents its own priorities and represents much hard work and sincere thought and all improve the status quo. I urge adoption of this rule and adoption of pursuant legislation to reform gift reception in this body.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to then gentlewoman from California [Ms. ESHOO].

(Ms. ESHOO asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and the underlying bill and urge Members to support that and vote in opposition to the Burton substitute.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge my colleagues to reject the Burton substitute and support a complete ban on gifts.

Since arriving in Congress, I've made it my office policy not to accept any gifts from lobbyists or allow any of my staff to do so. Earlier this year, I was one of 32 Members who signed a Common Cause pledge saying that lobbyists gifts are forbidden in my office.

Now is the time to turn this voluntary pledge into the mandatory House rules for all of us.

It's important because we need to restore public trust in Congress and its Members. And there can be no better way to begin this process than by giving up lobbyist-provided meals, tickets, vacations, food baskets, and golf outings that have come to symbolize what's wrong with Washington and the way it operates. These gifts should be flat out eliminated.

Mr. Speaker, the Burton substitute is weak tea when what we need is strong medicine. It's time for Congress to give up gifts from lobbyists and get back to work for those who pay our salaries—the American people. I urge my colleagues to place a complete ban on lobbyist gifts.

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS], who has also been in the forefront of this matter.

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

Mr. Speaker, this is a debate I have not looked forward to because there are such strong feelings. This is kind of an in-house debate. We talk one way here and the general public on the outside hears and sees something totally different. We do not win friends, but this is a debate that we have to have.

I say we are at the crossroads in this Congress, and I particularly speak out to my Republican freshmen. They came as reformers, and already some of them are getting sucked up into this place. I believe we have to reform gift ban and lobby disclosure, and I believe the time is now.

Mr. Speaker, I salute the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY] for promising a vote. Little did I realize how many of our conference did not want him to do that. My admiration goes out to him, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], who I call a seasoned veteran with a freshman heart, and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS], for the fine work he has done.

I encourage my colleagues as much as I can to defeat the Burton amendment, and I encourage the staff that are watching to wake up their Members and have them realize that if Burton passes, reform is dead. And tomorrow I know what the headlines will say. They will say this Congress is against reform. And if we do support the Burton amendment, we are against reform.

Mr. Speaker, we need to clean up our own House and we need to act quickly. I urge Members to oppose the Burton amendment. I urge Members to consider the Senate amendment, sponsored by the gentlewoman from Utah [Mrs. WALDHOLTZ] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BARRETT] and others. It is a fine sensible proposal.

We will also have the opportunity to get rid of all gifts, which may be Members' decision, and something that we ultimately all may do, but we do not get to the Senate proposal, the Barrett proposal, the Waldholtz proposal, we do

not get to the Speaker's proposal of no gift if Burton passes. The Burton amendment keeps things the way they are now, except it just discloses how sleazy this place has become.

I urge my colleagues to wake up and understand what this vote is all about. It is about whether we go forward or go backward, and I urge it to happen on a bipartisan basis.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, at this point I urge adoption of the rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise in opposition to this rule. It is not often that I rise in opposition to a rule, as I have a great deal of respect for the gentleman from New York, the chairman of the Rules Committee. I rise in opposition to the rule not because I do not favor gift reform, but rather, I believe in the need for effective gift reform. I have always been a strong advocate for congressional reform and believe strongly in the concept of a citizen legislature. If we are to achieve these goals we must pass gift reform legislation that is truly effective. The gentlelady from Utah has proposed such legislation. Unfortunately, if this rule passes, the opportunity to vote on this truly historic piece of legislation will be greatly limited.

This rule, as presented, favors the substitute. If we wish to arrive at a real solution to the gift reform equation, we must be allowed to weigh each measure on its own merits, without the limits of this rule. Any limits placed on debate should allow each of these measures to be brought to the floor individually. This way, the U.S. House of Representatives can begin the process of removing many of the perks Congress has enjoyed over the last 40 years.

I will support the Burton substitute if it is the only piece of gift reform legislation brought to the floor, even though I believe House Resolution 250, the Congressional Gift Reform Act, to be the strongest piece of gift reform legislation presented to date.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remainder of my time.

Mr. Speaker, just make a few points I would like to speak to very quickly.

First of all, we are talking about House rules, not criminal statute. I say that because there are some who have put out some thoughts that there is the potential of going to jail and so forth because of these House rules we are talking about. Breaking the law is always possible and anybody can go to jail and should if they deserve to, but we are talking about the rules of the House here, not about criminal law.

Second, I would like to point out that volunteers have been brought up in some scenarios. They are subject to another rule and not part of this legislation today.

Third, there was talk about a political convention. That is not covered, as my friend from Texas has talked about. There is a specific exemption from that, and, as we know, we separate our official from our campaign functions very carefully and need to continue to do that.

Fourth, this is a bipartisan event. There are participants from both sides of the aisle and many different points

of view involved, not only in the base legislation but in the amendments that we will be discussing.

Fifth, I would like to point out that even though some have cast aspersions about GOP's leadership abilities to move this forward, we have only been here 10 months and we have it on the floor on the date we promised. The others who have been here for 40 years perhaps did not come to quite as timely a decision on this. So I think we have done OK.

Sixth, I would like to point out that on page 12 of the committee report, an incorrect reference is made to a restriction on the provision of "free attendance" at a widely attended event, which does not exist in House Resolution 250. For the record, there is no restriction on who may provide free attendance at such an event.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 268, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 250) to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to provide for gift reform, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 268, the amendments printed in House Resolution 250 are adopted.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST] each will be recognized for 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON].

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to divide our 15 minutes equally between myself and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON], 7½ minutes each.

I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST] for a similar request.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I will yield up to 7½ minutes to opponents of the legislation during this debate. It is not clear as to whether the opponents at this portion of the debate will be asking for the full 7½, but if they do, for purposes of control, I will yield up to 7½ minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York and the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] is recognized for 7½ minutes.

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

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 250 is the long-awaited House Gift Reform Act. This new rule would place tight new limits on the types and value of gifts that Members, officers, and employees may accept.

Mr. Speaker, let me say at the outset that this is a bipartisan effort. We have

had people on both sides of the aisle championing these new limits for several years now.

That is not to say that our 1989 Ethics Reform Act did not set significant new standards for all branches of the Federal Government. It did as the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN] said. We eliminated the honoraria of up to \$2,000, that Members used to be able to receive for speeches. It outlawed certain types of outside employment for Members, officers, and employees—such as working with or being affiliated with law firms.

And it banned certain types of gifts from all persons and not just from those having a direct interest in legislation, as was previously the case.

But the resolution before us today continues the ethics reforms we enacted back in 1989.

Moreover, this resolution continues the reform revolution set in motion on the opening day of this Congress when we overhauled the rules and procedures of this House, eliminated scores of committees and subcommittees, and downsized our committee staff by one-third. We shrunk the size of this Congress.

As the chairman of the Rules Committee, and one who has been heavily involved in reform efforts since I came to this body, I pledged that January 4, 1995, was just the beginning, that reform was an ongoing and dynamic process, and that we would continue to reform this institution as long as we were in the majority, and we are doing that today.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that we have continued with the reform initiatives that we set in motion on opening day. This gift rule reform resolution is just the latest chapter in that ongoing effort.

I especially want to commend the freshmen Members, like the author of this resolution, the gentlewoman from Utah, Mrs. WALDHOLTZ, an outstanding member of this body, the gentlewoman from Washington, Mrs. LINDA SMITH, the gentleman from Kansas, Mr. SAM BROWNBACK, and especially the gentleman from Connecticut, Mr. CHRIS SHAYS, and a whole host of others.

The people wanted a new Congress with new priorities and a new agenda. And they wanted a Congress that was willing to literally clean its own House.

Notwithstanding the great strides we have made in meeting the demands and expectations of the electorate, there is still a great skepticism and distrust around the country about this Government, and we have to do something about that.

Unfortunately, that public distrust extends to every branch of government, including the Congress. It is not because we have failed, or because this body is filled with dishonest Members. That is certainly not the case. This House is filled with the most honest, bright, and hardworking Members in the history of the Republic.

Notwithstanding that, the people are still skeptical, suspicious, even distrustful of public officials. It is a legacy of the past, and nothing new in our history. The people have seen too many empty promises, too much business as usual, and they want results—sometimes sooner or greater than a democracy can deliver.

Overriding all this is the age-old suspicion that politicians are only out for themselves, are too influenced by special interests, and are too little concerned with the interests of the people.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to say that this 104th Congress is keeping its promises of the last election. We are about to deliver on the most important of those promises—something all the people want—and that is to balance the budget.

But, until we complete action on that, and the other legislation that we have already passed in this House, there remains that public skepticism and distrust. Do we really mean what we say? Will we really see it all through?

The resolution before us is part and parcel of our congressional reform efforts to dispel those public misperceptions that we are somehow not here to do the people's business, and are somehow beholden to those who supposedly lavish us with gifts.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues know that is not the case. They know that they will not be returning to this House in the next Congress if they do not put the people first, and carry out the people's mandate and expectations.

So this resolution that significantly tightens up on the House gift and disclosure rules, is not a great sacrifice, because it does not involve any major alteration in our behavior. We do not have to make any significant changes in our behavior or conduct, because most Members do not now take or accept the kind of gifts this rule would prohibit.

But I am convinced that by adopting tighter gift rules and restrictions we will help to convince the people that we are not being unduly influenced by gifts or meals or trips or what have you. Our greatest gift is the continuing trust and support of the people and the privilege they have bestowed upon us to represent them and their interests in the people's House.

Let's give them a gift in return, and that is this small but significant step to help restore the trust of the people in their Representatives. That is not asking too much. It is the least we can do. Let's pass this gift rule and demonstrate that we are indeed worthy of the trust and responsibility the people have placed in us.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of House Resolution 250. The reform of the gift rules for House Members and staff is a bipartisan issue and one that

has been supported for many years by Members of all political stripes and by many citizen organizations. We have, in years past, made significant changes in our rules, but in spite of those reforms, many Members have recognized that there is still a need to continue to change how this institution does business.

Mr. Speaker, I am very gratified that the persistence of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BRYANT] has finally paid off. His untiring efforts to bring this issue to the full House, along with the efforts of a broad bipartisan coalition of freshman and other junior Members, demonstrates that this issue does not belong to any one political party. My Rules Committee colleague, the gentleman from Utah [Mrs. WALDHOLTZ], is to be congratulated for shepherding this issue through the Rules Committee and to the floor today. I also want to thank my friend, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS], for his steadfast support for bringing this issue to the full House.

And now that the House has finally come to the moment in which it can demonstrate its commitment to reform, I want to urge all of us to think carefully about how we are going to vote today. If, as we all know, there are those in the public who will never be satisfied with what we do here, there are also other Americans who understand that the men and women elected to this institution are honorable and that we are trying to do the right thing. We are here because we want to give something back to this great Nation which has given each and every one of us so much.

Mr. Speaker, the House has three choices today: First, a substitute will be offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON]. His proposal would leave the current gift rules in place but would require extensive disclosure of any gifts received or any trips taken by Members or their staff. Mr. BURTON's proposal, if I understand it correctly, would impose new disclosure requirements which will allow our constituents to decide if we are unduly influenced by lobbyists and other special interests. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. BURTON's heart is in the right place, but that his substitute simply does not get the job done. I would urge a no vote on this proposition.

The second proposition may be offered by Speaker GINGRICH if the Burton substitute does not pass. The Speaker's proposal would zero out accepting gifts. His proposal does, however, contain a number of exceptions which may or may not address the issue of how to deal with small, inexpensive gifts from constituents or other groups.

That proposal is, of course, the proposition reported by the Committee on Rules and which is sponsored by a broad bipartisan coalition. This amendment to the rules of the House reduces the allowable amount of accumulated gifts from any one source from \$250 to

\$100 per year, and prohibits the acceptance of any gift with a value exceeding \$50. With certain exceptions, lobbyists are prohibited from giving gifts to Members and staff. But most importantly, this new rule would specifically bar Members from accepting reimbursement for transportation and lodging costs associated with their attendance at charity golf, tennis, and ski tournaments.

This prohibition directly addresses the lifestyle issue which has caused this institution so much unneeded and unwarranted grief. This prohibition is key to the gift rule reform effort.

The proposal reported by the Rules Committee is not perfect, but it is a significant improvement on the current rule. I urge my colleagues to support the bipartisan proposal reported from the Rules Committee.

□ 1545

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARR].

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Indiana for allowing me to weigh in on a very important topic.

Mr. Speaker, the sound of hands beating against chests today is just deafening. We have before us now something that everybody can beat their chests and say that we cleaning up the cesspool, we are cleaning up the sleaze.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know about the other Members here, but in the 11 months that I have been here I have had a parade of constituents through my offices that are church people, that are members of Little League teams, that are members of Chambers of Commerce, that are members of small and large businesses in my district, and elsewhere in the country, environmental groups, that have an absolute right. They want to come in and see me. They are not coming in with bags of cash. I do not know who my colleagues are hanging out with, those who talk about sleaze and sewers, maybe they are hanging out with a different class of people than I do coming up here from my district in Georgia.

The legislation that we are talking about here today does not address those fundamental issues that we have already addressed that are already addressed in the criminal laws and the ethical regulations in this House.

What we are talking about today is beating our chests and making the public think we are really changing something, when all we are doing is preventing people from coming into our office that may have a baseball cap to show us that they want displayed, because they are proud of something they have done. Now, we have to virtually subject those people to a pat-down search before we allow those people into our office under House Resolution 250 or under the Speaker's legislation, and ask them for a receipt.

One of our staff people cannot go out to dinner, to find some time because they do not have time during the day. They are doing the people's business. They could not go out and have a meal with some folks back home. What we are doing is cutting off our nose to spite our face. We are diverting attention from real issues here. What we are going to end up with is a god-awful piece of legislation that is a lawyer's dream.

Mr. Speaker, I have sat here just trying to focus on one bit of a discussion earlier when we were talking about this rule on whether or not attendance at a political convention is or is not exempted under here. In the space of 2 minutes, we can look through House Resolution 250 and find four different places where it may or may not be covered.

It is a nightmare. Do not pass nightmares, despite the fact that we can beat our chests and make people feel good. The Burton substitute is very proper.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. ABERCROMBIE].

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

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, this is general debate and I will speak again at the time of the introduction of the Burton-Brewster-Clay-Abercrombie amendment, the full disclosure amendment.

Mr. Speaker, the previous speaker just mentioned about beating on chests, and I agree with him entirely. I did not come into this institution as the last person to be sworn in by Tip O'Neill before he retired to have people stand here in the well of the House and say that there is only the "appearance of integrity;" that it is not an honor and a privilege to serve in this House.

Mr. Speaker, I will tell my colleagues if there is a perception out in the country that there are less than honorable people here, it is created by individuals. We cannot account for everybody who comes in here, but the voters see to it whether or not they want those folks to come back in here.

There is nothing in this bill presently before us that provides what our full disclosure amendment provides. As a matter of fact, there is no disclosure provision. I would like to know, all those who have come down here and talked about appearance, restoring integrity, the perception; that it is more important to attack the perception of the House, more important to attack that.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to know all of those who have stood down here so self-righteously proclaiming that they, of course, are ready to assume the mantle of probity; they would not be guilty, not even the odor of mendacity is about their persons.

But for the rest of us, for the rest of us, no disclosure? I would like to know whether any of those Members have

taken any money from any source that they now stand here and say they will take no money from in the form of a meal. How about a campaign contribution? I would like to see now many people who are standing down here saying, "Not me, I would not take a meal or anything from a lobbyist." They would not? Mr. Speaker, then they should come down here and let me see what their campaign contribution form looks like.

Now, far be it from me that there is anything wrong with that, but what we are really talking about here is campaign reform, campaign financing. If that is what my colleagues want to attack, attack that.

There is an exception. There is an exception for campaign activities, as was pointed out by the previous speaker. Will somebody please explain to me how we are going to have an exemption for campaign activities, but at the same time say that we are actually passing a gift rule?

Mr. Speaker, I understand the motivation of someone trying to say that they are cleaning the place up. Yet, every single Member who said that also remarked that they were fully believing that the integrity of the House was intact; it was merely the perception that the House does not have that integrity which was in question.

If that is the case, let us be honest. If there is a Member in here that is a thief and a crook, then stand up and say so. That is what we have a Committee on Standards of Official Conduct for and a Justice Department for.

Mr. Speaker, I say let us have full disclosure, just as we do with our Federal election campaign reports. That amendment will be before Members. Then my colleagues can go back to their constituents and say to them, "Yes, you can examine my record, you can examine what I did, and you make a judgment as to whether I am worthy to be in this House."

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER].

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say for those of us who have not worked as hard as others have on this issue, we compliment the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] on his work. A lot of people put a lot of dedicated time into this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I think we have to meet three tests if we are going to have an adequate disclosure and gift reform. One is it has to be clear. I think gray areas are the worst enemy of everybody. That is what causes problems.

Second, it has to be easy to administer. We get to the point in some of the proposals where the recordkeeping itself is going to be the issue.

Third, I think it has to meet the commonsense test. I think that the record has been, at least with respect to charities and charitable events, that Members of Congress attending as,

whether we call them bait or celebrities or whatever to raise money and to raise help for cancer research, for heart research, and for other good charities, is a good thing; something we should promote and not deny.

Mr. Speaker, I think that the Burton proposal meets the clarity test, the easy-to-administer test, and the commonsense test. That is what I am going to support.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BRYANT].

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

Mr. BRYANT of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this is the third year that we have spent in this House dealing with this issue. We passed it in the last Congress and we passed the conference report. The Senate did the same. As many know, it was filibustered to death in the Senate at the very end. Earlier this year the Senate voted by a margin of 98 to 0 to enact the bill that is before us today.

Mr. Speaker, many, many Members of this House and many, many Members of the other House have worked extremely hard to find a way to put together exactly the kind of bill that the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER] was just describing. One that made sense; one that was reasonable; one that we could live with and work with; but one at the same time that would assure the public that Members of this House were not making decisions on laws based upon their social contacts and the free things which they receive from lobbyists, the very people who are hired to influence our decisions.

There is adequate reason for them to be worried about that. If my colleagues turn on any of these television magazine shows any given night of the week, they are likely to see a sordid picture of Members of Congress all decked out in their golf regalia playing golf at some tropical clime for free, accompanied by lobbyists and representatives of some of the biggest and most powerful companies in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. ABERCROMBIE] I do not believe this place has crooks in it. I do not believe this place deserves what it has been frequently called by its own Speaker, and that is to say the adjective "corrupt." It is not, and I do not believe that it has been in the time that I have been here. But people are given that impression when Members cross the line and spend that much time with lobbyists.

Mr. Speaker, all we have done with this bill is say there is going to be a \$50 limit. Members are not going to be able to get free meals every night of the week from the same guy and they cannot fly across country for the purpose of playing golf.

Mr. Speaker, I have spoken to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] about this. He sincerely believes that

the role of Members in these charity golf tournaments is a public good and ought not to be curtailed in any way, but the price of that is the confidence of the public in this institution.

The fact of the matter is that when Members go to these charity golf tournaments, there is no secret who is playing golf with them, who is in their foursome, who is spending time with them. It is somebody who wants to be able to influence their decisions in this House.

Mr. Speaker, the public wants us to do away with this. The fact of the matter is that a minor inconvenience for some people, and no inconvenience for the majority of us, is all that will result from passing this bill today.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge Members to go ahead and get rid of this last gasp of reactionary talk about the ability of Members to do free things around this institution and around this country. Let us go ahead and pass this bill today and vote against the Burton amendment and let us finish this issue once and for all.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, the Burton amendment is not the end of the world, but the truth is the perception is that it is the end of the world and Members do not want to explain votes around here.

Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] was right on target. If Members are selling their vote for a luncheon, they are subject to a bribe arrest, thrown out of Congress, and going to jail.

But the bottom line is after it is all over and after we cannibalize Congress once again, the truth and the reality is we will ban gifts, but the same lobbyists who cannot take Members to lunch can give them \$5,000 in the primary, \$5,000 in the general, and that is not going to be changed, because that will question the fabric of a free participatory democracy.

Full disclosure is not all bad, and I will deal with the perception. But I took this time because in the companion bill where we are talking about lobbying, foreign interests lobby the Congress. In this next bill I have an amendment that sets stricter guidelines and standards and makes sure they have to register so we know who they are.

Mr. Speaker, I have been trying for 4 years to get it out, and everybody says, "We are for it, but not this time, JIM."

Mr. Speaker, I am going to support this cannibalization, but I believe the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] is right. We have an awful lot of laws and maybe they ought to be enforced and Congress should stop cannibalizing themselves.

Mr. Speaker, a Congress that must cannibalize itself must be perceived by

the Nation as a Congress that might just cannibalize them at some point.

□ 1600

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. OXLEY], my good colleague.

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

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Burton substitute. Those of us who have been criticized for going to events whether they are charity balls or dinners or golf events or tennis events, whatever it is, on behalf of charity I think have really taken a bum rap. When you talk about perception, the perception is not reality.

I remember one of the events I had an opportunity several years ago to participate in out in Idaho was the charity event where we raised money for cancer research. Those of you who are worried that I was going to be playing with some well-heeled lobbyist, I ended up playing with the head of the Mormon Church. I can say with all honesty that, while it was a wonderful experience, he had very little influence over me other than perhaps some of my language, if I might have missed a put.

The fact is that this effort by the Members is a very honorable one. The gentleman from Indiana, gentleman from Oklahoma, others have participated in these events. I am proud of it. I am proud of the fact that I have had an opportunity to help raise money for charity. I see nothing wrong with it as long as you report it.

The gentleman's efforts to tighten the disclosure and the requirements are perfectly applicable. I do not think anybody should take advantage of this. Understand all of these are reportable. All of these rate public scrutiny, and ultimately our responsibility is to the people who elect us. Those are the people who really count.

That is really what it is all about. That is full disclosure under the Burton approach and allow us then to go and explain it to our constituents. Those are the people that elect us. We are not responsible to other members. We are not responsible to the media. We are responsible to people who sent us here. That is what the Burton proposal does. It is full disclosure, gives us an opportunity to represent our constituents the way we think they ought to be represented. If they think that we are representing them well, they will return us to office. If they are offended by that, they will kick us out.

Support the Burton amendment.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the time remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina). The gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST] has 4 minutes remaining, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] has 3½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] has 2½ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN], my dear friend and colleague.

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

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, we are faced today with three alternatives. One, we can accept the current bill. No. 2, we can accept the Burton amendment that he is going to offer. Or No. 3 we can accept the Gingrich amendment which will follow the Burton amendment, if it fails, and have zero gifts; maybe that is best.

I stood here and I challenged those of my colleagues that are so passionate in their belief that we are a bunch of corrupt individuals, that it is your constitutional authority to name names. And if you know of anyone who is selling his vote on the floor of this House for a golf game or for a meal or for anything else, it is your constitutional obligation to notify the Attorney General and incarcerate and make this Member who is violating the law be evicted from this House as the law so states.

So our options, as I see it today, a classical example of—a neighbor of mine, Dr. Les Grier, called me last weekend and he said: "SONNY, the Lions Club is having a membership drive. We would like to have you as a member because you are a Member of Congress, and we think we will be able to attract other members."

I said: "Les, I am never there during the week. I cannot come to the meetings. I cannot afford to pay the \$400 a year because I am never there to eat the meals." He said: "For you we will waive the annual fees."

So under this provision, I could not even join the Kiwanis Club as an honorary member. That, my friends, is wrong. At least under the Burton bill we would be able to accept these types of activities in our home districts. We would still have to disclose them, as the Burton bill requires, but at least we would not be convicted by an accusation by some opponent or by some individual who might dislike us for any reason.

So I encourage Members today to think what they are doing. Accept the Burton amendment as the best alternative to the three alternatives we are facing here today. Remember that this is a rule of the House that the law of the land requires us, as a member of Congress, not to sell our votes. And regardless of all of these innuendoes and regardless of all of these individuals in this House who are doing this for a headline back at home, it is absolutely wrong.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute and 30 seconds to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT].

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, Americans seek genuine reform of this Congress, not another sop or flop. They

certainly seek more than the change of a number, which is little more than the substitute provides to change the level at which disclosure must occur. The problem with disclosure, among others, is that too often the beneficiaries of largess receive so many gifts they have trouble keeping track of all of them. I think of one leader in this body who disclosed his custom-made ostrich boots, but until he was asked by a reporter, he forget that he had a cruise to the Bahamas as well.

Americans do not need to count the number of gifts that people receive and read about more gift through disclosure, about the level of benevolence of the lobby to the Congress. What they want to read is that this practice has stopped.

I have the utmost respect for my colleague from Hawaii, and he is right that dealing with gifts is only part of the problem. We need to deal with campaign finance reform as well.

My colleagues remember that it was in June that Speaker GINGRICH and President Clinton shook hands on genuine reform, bipartisan reform, up in New Hampshire. It took from June until November for Speaker GINGRICH to answer that handshake, and his proposal was the appointment of a new stall commission to stall any reform on campaign finance until next year.

Do not let the need for one reform get in the way of another reform. Let us do what is right and pass some kind of genuine reform of the lobby and gift laws that the U.S. Senate did on an unanimous and bipartisan basis.

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

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BARRETT].

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I just very briefly want to address several issues that were raised on this side, one dealing with the Lions or the Kiwanis. There is nothing in this bill that is going to prevent someone from going to Lions or Kiwanis events in their district. There are Members talking about criminal law coming into effect. That does not come into effect at all in this bill.

This bill deals with the House rules. There are no criminal sanctions contained in this legislation whatsoever. So I think it is important that we keep the debate on what is really going on here. That is whether or not we should be banning these gifts altogether. No criminal sanctions, you can still go to the Kiwanis breakfasts.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, we have no further requests during this portion of the debate, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, Abraham Lincoln once said

With public sentiment, nothing can fail; without it nothing can succeed.

History has proven this to be true time and again.

And that is why restoring the public's faith in this institution must be a top priority. After all, if the people we work for do not believe in us they will not believe in the decisions we make. Despite the fact that almost every individual Member and staffer are honorable—people do not think very highly of us collectively.

Many think we have been out of touch, living in a different sort of world than they face everyday; the kind of world where gifts and meals and vacations are paid for by someone else. And because of that, they do not have confidence that the decisions we make are always in their best interests.

This is a major problem for us, especially at a time when we are seeking to make the tough choices needed to balance our budget.

Public support is crucial to the success of our mission—and in my view, responsible gift reform is crucial to that public support.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of both the Rules Committee and the Ethics Committee, it has been my chore to learn the details behind the principles at issue in this debate. I have studied current rules, the provisions of House Resolution 250, and the provisions of the alternative proposals we face.

I have listened to question and comments by dozens of our Members—in public hearings before the Rules Committee, and in one-on-one discussions. I know Members want to do the right thing—and they do have legitimate concern that we develop rules that make sense, that are understandable and effective and will not trip Members up even as they try to comply. In my view, the type of approach our Speaker may bring forward later today—involving a total ban on gifts—is the cleanest and best way to go toward accomplishing those goals. But I also believe that we could make major progress if we adopt House Resolution 250 as reported by our Rules Committee. Even though this measure has some problems, it does accomplish significant change. It gets a handle on most gifts and meals provided to Members and staff by imposing new limits. It provides for greatly expanded and more timely disclosure on travel. And it creates new restrictions on the actions of registered lobbyists.

These are all positive—and I think workable—provisions. I think they deserve support by this House. Our constituents have asked for such improvements.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, let me say to my friend DAN BURTON, that I understand the concerns he has raised and I respect the effort he has made in crafting an alternative to House Resolution 250. He has some solid ideas, but in my view his alternative is not sufficient to meet the necessity we face.

I worry that Americans will see the \$50 threshold as too high and the allowance of travel to recreational charity events as too generous.

As I have throughout this process, I intend to listen carefully to the debate—we have a series of choices: if BURTON is too relaxed or has image problems then vote “no” and consider Speaker GINGRICH’s full ban on gifts—if that’s too tough then WALDHOLTZ is middle ground. I’ll vote “no” on Burton “yes” on Gingrich because I believe that is where America is and I believe that is where we should be, too.

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, recent days the new House majority has shown a distinct lack of bipartisanship.

However, today, the Republicans are waking up to the need for reform and are offering legislation to ban gifts to Members of Congress. I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting both House Resolution 250 and the Gingrich amendment which will send a strong signal to our constituents that we don’t want gifts, we don’t need them, and, most importantly, that this House is not for sale.

Regrettably, there are those in this House who do not want reform. They want to continue the practices of the past. The want all Members to be tainted by their need to get free travel and lodging at golf, tennis, and skiing charity events. They would have us believe that Members of Congress somehow deserve different treatment than the average American—this is just plain wrong—and I urge my colleagues to reject it.

Today’s vote is long overdue, but there are other reform efforts that need to be acted upon, particularly campaign finance reform.

Last year, I voted for a campaign finance reform bill, supported by Common Cause, which would have set spending limits and reduced the influence of special interests in political campaigns. This bill never made it to the President, but I am hopeful that we can work together in a bipartisan manner to develop a fair campaign finance reform plan this year. We need campaign finance reform if we truly care about changing the nature of politics and encouraging Americans to stay involved in the system.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support true gift ban legislation, and I look forward to passing a campaign finance reform bill. Thank you.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of Speaker Gingrich’s substitute to H. Res. 250, the gift ban legislation. The Speaker’s substitute is the only version that would ban all gifts.

This is a tough issue. There is no easy way to monitor or regulate items that we as Members of Congress receive for free.

Once you start down the path of regulating these gifts, which we already have under current law, it gets messy. We must then ask ourselves: Was the gift under ten dollars? Did I report it in a timely manner? Was he or she a lobbyist?

If we’ve decided it’s important to go down this path, I just think it’s easier, simpler and safer to establish as a general rule that all gifts should be turned down—there are fewer pitfalls to this path. However, you need two exceptions to make it workable. One, a common sense friends and family exception is necessary. Two, we need a widely attended gathering exception to allow us to attend receptions and accept meals, for example at Rotary speeches and political events.

These exceptions are in this amendment. Even with the common sense exceptions,

some wonder whether this path is workable. I think the bright line test is as workable as any other set of rules, and again, is easier and safer to comply with.

I lived under these rules in the Bush White House, where I had the unenviable job of enforcing them, and here in my own Congressional office. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment as the best way to demonstrate that real reform has come to this House.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Speaker, as a servant of the people of the 18th Congressional District of Texas, I strongly support both House Resolution 250 which was sponsored by Congresswoman WALDHOLTZ as well as the amendment offered by Speaker GINGRICH. For many years now, Congress has suffered under the perception by the American public that its Members can be influenced and swayed by gifts from lobbyists and special interest groups. While many Members hold themselves to strict codes of conduct regarding gifts, this bill is an opportunity to strengthen rules which would put to rest all suspicions about the behavior and integrity of all Members.

This bill simply applies good, common-sense rules to the issue. It sets reasonable limits and conditions, as representatives of the people, must accept. Alarmist cries have been raised by some of my colleagues during this debate and I do not agree with, nor do I think they can justify their roars of outrage.

This bill limits to \$100 the total annual gift contribution from any one source. It also allows the attendance for members at conferences, dinners or receptions which are appropriate to our duties. To address the matter of charitable activities, may I remind my colleagues that our participation in charity functions are explicitly allowed, but not transportation or lodging. That is responsive to the American people’s sense of what our real job is here to work for them.

May I remind those in opposition of this bill that this is indeed a truly bipartisan effort with both sides of the aisle coming together to support this legislation. I cannot believe that what this piece of legislation proposes would not be good for this institution.

Gift reform is something that is long overdue in this legislative body and I believe that it is now time to put to rest all issues regarding the public trust. That trust is the very basis of both our Government and our society. Without the trust of those we represent, we have legitimacy and no Government.

Mr. POSHARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Congressional Gift Reform Act. This important resolution would apply more stringent limitations on gifts, meals, entertainment, and travel Members of the House of Representatives and their staff would be permitted to receive.

Americans have long asked Congress to clean itself up and this is an opportunity for us to do just that. As elected Representatives, we have a moral duty to represent our constituents as honorably as possible. It is time to finally put the interests of our Nation and its people ahead of those in Washington with deep pockets.

Current House rules allow Members and staff to receive gifts up to \$250 from a single source each year excluding gifts worth less than \$100 and all meals. I believe this is unacceptable. Under today’s resolution, Members

of Congress and staff could not receive a total of \$100 in gifts from any one source nor could they accept a single gift or meal with a cost exceeding \$50. In addition, the measure bans lobbyists from paying for any travel, regardless of whether it is related to official duties or recreation. While the resolution is not a complete ban on the acceptance of gifts, which I have long supported, I believe it is a strong step in the right direction.

However, during consideration of this resolution, we may have the opportunity to vote on an amendment to completely ban gifts and meals. I encourage my colleagues to join me in supporting this measure, because I believe it would truly reduce the amount of influence lobbyists and special interests have on the legislative process.

Because I support true gift reform, I rise in opposition to the Burton amendment, because it leaves the status quo. It is simply an attempt to gut a bipartisan effort to enact effective gift reform. Under this amendment, Members would still be able to accept \$250 in gifts a year and accept free travel and lodging to certain charity events.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for allowing this very bipartisan effort to be considered today. I believe our action on this measure will demonstrate to the American people Congress' sincere effort to reduce the influence of special interests and lobbyists on Capitol Hill.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, the Wall Street Journal recently reported that more than 70 percent of U.S. voters said they couldn't usually trust the government to do the right thing. This is a serious problem. One of the foundations of representative democracy is citizens trusting and having confidence in their elected officials. When trust and confidence dissipates, democracy cannot thrive.

We have an obligation to try and regain the public's trust. This may not be easy, as public figures are scrutinized more carefully in this media age than ever before in our Nation's history. But we must make every effort to conduct ourselves in a way that is above reproach or suspicion. We must systematically and methodically modify our behavior and our institution in ways that reassure the American people.

One of the most obvious ways to strengthen our institution is to address the issue of gifts to Members and staff. The public can see that current congressional gift rules are, quite frankly, farcical. Members and staff are free to accept gifts up to a cumulative value of \$250 from anyone. But meals do not count, and gifts under \$100 do not count toward the \$250 limit. Recreational trips such as golf, tennis, and ski tournaments, which may be charitable but also give lobbyists unique access to Members and staff, are also permitted under current gift rules. It is extremely difficult to convince the public that this unique access does not influence the policy process.

While few, if any, Members or staff are corrupted by a free meal or tickets to a Red Sox game, given the low regard that Americans have for Congress simply must set higher standards for ourselves.

I strongly support House Resolution 250, which prohibits Members and staff from accepting any gift worth more than \$50, and from accepting an aggregate of more than \$100 worth of gifts from any one source in a year. It does not make the distinctions between whether or not the gift is given here in

the District of Columbia, or back home. It does not make distinctions between gifts from lobbyists or nonlobbyists. The rule is clear, concise, and simple, and therefore more likely to be followed than a rule which is cumbersome or confusing.

The legislation in no way prohibits Members from performing their responsibilities to constituents. They will still be able to travel around their State and meet their constituents, eat a hamburger at a barbecue or crab legs at a crab feast, accept tee-shirts, mugs, and other locally produced products.

The bill recognizes that just because we are Members of Congress doesn't mean that we have no life or personal friends, and it contains a reasonable personal hospitality exemption.

Finally, the bill has passed the test of political palatability, as the Senate fought out the battle of compromise last summer and unanimously passed this bill.

Congressman BURTON will offer a substitute amendment to House Resolution 250 that emphasizes full disclosure of gifts rather than banning gifts. Under the Burton substitute, recreational trips would still be permitted, and Members and staff could accept gifts up to a \$250 annual limit. The Burton amendment is an improvement over current law, but I believe it does not go far enough, and I intend to vote against it.

Will passage of House Resolution 250 alone restore public confidence in Congress? Perhaps not, but we cannot refuse to act simply because we may not achieve our goal promptly. I urge my colleagues to oppose the Burton amendment and support House Resolution 250 so that we can show the American people that we have heard and respect their clarion call for action.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, you have to wonder, really wonder, why the Burton substitute is before us.

The American people know what they want. They want a restoration of trust in the integrity of government. They want an end to business and usual. They want an end to ski trips and golf tournaments and retreats in the Bahamas where Members cozy up to the special interests.

Today, after nearly a year of stalling, the Republican leadership has finally given us two very clear opportunities to meet those expectations. House Resolution 250 bans charity junkets, imposes tough new rules on meals and tickets, and restricts the largesse of lobbyists. We may also apparently have before us a bill banning all gifts, a bill which essentially tracks a rule I have in my office.

But we may never even get to vote on either of those measures. Because the Republican leadership, after trying for nearly a year to dodge this issue, has allowed the gentleman from California [Mr. BURTON] to first offer a far more lenient measure.

If Mr. BURTON's substitute passes, the bad old status quo would be replaced by a bad new status quo, under which Members could continue to take unlimited \$49 meals, day after day after day, because gifts under \$50 wouldn't count.

And if Mr. BURTON's substitute passes, Members could take travel and lodging to golf and tennis tournaments, ski vacations, and fishing trips, so long as the trip is sponsored by a charity and raises at least \$1 for the charity.

Do those who back the Burton amendment really think they can fool the American people that golf tournaments and ski events are "substantially recreational"? Do they think they can fool the American people that these events aren't paid for by special interests? Do they think they can fool the American people that there will be no lobbyists on the tennis courts?

I want to change the status quo. House Resolution 250, of which I am a cosponsor, shatters the old ways. Even the proposal offered by Mr. GINGRICH is, for once, neither too extreme nor too ideological. But the Burton proposal is simply the status quo in a new wrapping. There is no way I can support it, and I urge my colleagues to defeat the Burton substitute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, it shall be in order to consider the amendment printed in part 1 of House Report 104-341 if offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] or his designee, which shall be considered read and shall be debatable for 30 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent.

If the amendment printed in part 1 of the report is rejected or not offered, it shall be in order to consider the amendment printed in part 2 of the report, if offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH] or his designee, which shall be considered read and shall be debatable for 30 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent.

The text of House Resolution 250, as amended, is as follows:

H. RES. 250

Resolved,

SECTION 1. AMENDMENT TO HOUSE RULES.

Rule LII of the Rules of the House of Representatives is amended to read as follows:

"RULE LII

"GIFT RULE

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

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

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

"(2)(A) A gift to a family member of a Member, officer, or employee, or a gift to any other individual based on that individual's relationship with the Member, officer, or employee, shall be considered a gift to the Member, officer, or employee if it is given with the knowledge and acquiescence of the

Member, officer, or employee and the Member, officer, or employee has reason to believe the gift was given because of the official position of the Member, officer, or employee.

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

“(c) The restrictions in paragraph (a) shall not apply to the following:

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

“(2) A contribution, as defined in section 301(8) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 431 et seq.) that is lawfully made under that Act, a lawful contribution for election to a State or local government office or attendance at a fundraising event sponsored by a political organization described in section 527(e) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

“(3) A gift from a relative as described in section 109(16) of title I of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 (Public Law 95-521).

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

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

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

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

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

“(5) Except as provided in clause 3(c), a contribution or other payment to a legal expense fund established for the benefit of a Member, officer, or employee that is otherwise lawfully made in accordance with the restrictions and disclosure requirements of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct.

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

“(7) Food, refreshments, lodging, transportation, and other benefits—

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

“(18) Free attendance at a widely attended event permitted pursuant to paragraph (d).

“(19) Opportunities and benefits which are—

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

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

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

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

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

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

“(20) A plaque, trophy, or other item that is substantially commemorative in nature and which is intended for presentation.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

“(1) the name of the employee;
“(2) the name of the person who will make the reimbursement;
“(3) the time, place, and purpose of the travel; and
“(4) a determination that the travel is in connection with the duties of the employee as an officeholder and would not create the appearance that the employee is using public office for private gain.

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

“(1) a good faith estimate of total transportation expenses reimbursed or to be reimbursed;
“(2) a good faith estimate of total lodging expenses reimbursed or to be reimbursed;
“(3) a good faith estimate of total meal expenses reimbursed or to be reimbursed;
“(4) a good faith estimate of the total of other expenses reimbursed or to be reimbursed;
“(5) a determination that all such expenses are necessary transportation, lodging, and related expenses as defined in paragraph (d); and
“(6) in the case of a reimbursement to a Member or officer, a determination that the travel was in connection with the duties of the Member or officer as an officeholder and would not create the appearance that the Member or officer is using public office for private gain.

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

“(1) includes reasonable expenses that are necessary for travel for a period not exceeding 3 days exclusive of travel time within the United States or 7 days exclusive of travel time outside of the United States unless approved in advance by the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct;

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

“(3) does not include expenditures for recreational activities, nor does it include entertainment other than that provided to all attendees as an integral part of the event, except for activities or entertainment otherwise permissible under this rule; and
“(4) may include travel expenses incurred on behalf of either the spouse or a child of the Member, officer, or employee, subject to a determination signed by the Member or officer (or in the case of an employee, the Member or officer under whose direct supervision the employee works) that the attendance of the spouse or child is appropriate to assist in the representation of the House of Representatives.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

“5. For purposes of this rule—

“(a) the term ‘registered lobbyist’ means a lobbyist registered under the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act or any successor statute; and

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

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

SEC. 2. ACCEPTANCE OF GIFTS BY THE COMMITTEE ON HOUSE OVERSIGHT.

Clause 4(d) of rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives is amended by striking “and” at the end of subparagraph (1), by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (2) and inserting “; and”, and by adding after subparagraph (2) the following:

“(3) accepting a gift, other than as otherwise provided by law, if the gift does not involve any duty, burden, or condition, or is not made dependent upon some future performance by the House of Representatives and promulgating regulations to carry out this paragraph.”

SEC. 3. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This resolution and the amendment made by this resolution shall take effect on and be effective for calendar years beginning on January 1, 1996.

AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. BURTON OF INDIANA

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

Amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by Mr. BURTON of Indiana: Strike all after the resolving clause and insert:

SECTION 1. GIFT DISCLOSURE.

(a) FINANCIAL DISCLOSURE.—Rule XLIV of the Rules of the House of Representatives is amended by adding at the end the following:

“3. Notwithstanding section 102 of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978, each report filed with the Clerk under title I of such Act for calendar year 1996 or any subsequent calendar year shall disclose any gift (including a meal) with a fair market value in excess of \$50 (other than personal hospitality of an individual or any gift received from a relative of the reporting individual), as adjusted under section 102(a)(2)(A) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978.”

(b) GIFT RULE.—Clause 4 of Rule XLIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives is amended by striking “\$100” and inserting “\$50”.

SEC. 2. CONVENTIONS, ETC.

Clause 4 of Rule XLIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives is amended by striking “A Member” and inserting “(a) Except as provided in paragraphs (b), (c), and (d), a Member” and by adding at the end the following:

“(b)(1) A Member, officer, or employee may accept an offer of free attendance at a widely attended convention, conference, symposium, forum, panel discussion, dinner, viewing, reception, or similar event, provided by the sponsor of the event, if—
“(A) the Member, officer, or employee participates in the event as a speaker or a panel participant, by presenting information related to Congress or matters before Congress, or by performing a ceremonial function appropriate to the Member’s, officer’s, or employee’s official position; or
“(B) attendance at the event is appropriate to the performance of the official duties or representative function of the Member, officer, or employee.

“(2) A Member, officer, or employee who attends an event described in subparagraph (1) may accept a sponsor’s unsolicited offer of free attendance at the event for the spouse or dependent of the Member, officer, or employee.

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

“(c) A Member, officer, or employee, or the spouse or dependent thereof, may accept a sponsor’s unsolicited offer of free attendance at a charity event—
“(1) the event is sponsored by an organization which is listed under section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986;
“(2) all Member, officer, employee, spouse, or dependent-related expenses are paid by the sponsoring organization and not by another corporation or individual;
“(3) the proceeds to charity from the event exceed the costs of the event; and

"(4) the participation contributed in a tangible way to the success of the event.

"(d) The restrictions contained in paragraphs (a), (b), and (c) shall not apply to a Member who is attending an event in the Member's congressional district."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] and a Member opposed will be recognized for 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the time allotted to me be divided between myself and the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS].

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS] will be recognized for 7½ minutes, and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] will be recognized for 7½ minutes.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST] will be recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that 7½ minutes of my time be yielded to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BRYANT] and the remaining 7½ minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BREWSTER], and that both gentlemen be allowed to yield time.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BRYANT] will be recognized for 7½ minutes, and the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BREWSTER] will be recognized for 7½ minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

□ 1615

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY], the Republican whip of the House.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Burton substitute and in favor of full disclosure.

The time has come that the American people know exactly what their Representatives are doing here in Washington.

Are they feeding at the public trough, taking lobbyist paid vacations, getting wine and dined by special interest groups? Or are they working hard to represent their constituents?

The people, the American people, have a right to know.

Only the Burton substitute will let the American people decide what is appropriate activity and what is inappropriate activity for their Representatives.

Let us not kid ourselves here today. We are beating ourselves on the heads

to prove we are pure enough to deserve the people's trust. Some Members are so distrustful of themselves and their colleagues, that they would rather we talk with no one in a casual setting, that we set up an artificial wall between us and the public.

I say the best disinfectant is full disclosure, not complete isolation. We serve our constituents poorly if we believe that all Representatives are on the take and need to be taken away from the public, and we serve no one if we set up an ethics minefield that will only bring further dishonor to this House, for activities that most Americans do every day.

Should it be unethical for a Member of Congress to eat dinner with a constituent?

Why do we not let the people decide what is right and what is wrong? Why do we not just tell the people what gifts we get, through full disclosure, and stop this ridiculous charade of public virtue at the expense of common sense.

The American people sent us here to represent them, not to hide every time they call to join them for dinner. Support full disclosure. Support the integrity of the House. Support the Burton substitute.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds to point out that the Burton legislation is not full disclosure. Any gift under \$50 is not part of the disclosure; it is not part of any limit. We can have countless numbers of gifts under \$50.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. BROWNBACK].

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS] for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Burton amendment, and I state as well at the very outset that I think the people that are bringing this amendment and supporting it are doing so in all good faith and what they are trying to do is a positive statement toward this body. I disagree on what they are doing versus another approach, and I also impugn no one's character and suggest that no one is selling their vote for a gift. But to me this issue is about public trust, and the public does not trust when Members of Congress receive expensive gifts, they do not trust that system, and, when we have that failure of trust in a representative democracy, that is a very, very dangerous thing to have.

That is what this issue is about. It is about the issue of public trust and a system and a public that does not trust this system, and that is why I disagree with the Burton amendment even though it is offered in all good faith by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] and those who support it, because it is a disclosure system, but it continues to allow a system of gifts to be able to be given to Members of Congress, a system that the public does not support.

Mr. Speaker, I support rather the Speaker's approach to going to a complete ban on all gifts, and I would urge Members to support that. The Waldholtz approach I think is a good approach as well for as far as it does further limit, but I think it is probably time to do just what the commercial days and just say no to gifts.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. ABERCROMBIE].

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

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BREWSTER] for yielding this time to me.

The reason that there is a perception of corruption, or whatever variation of the word is going to be used on this floor, has been used on this floor, is it keeps getting repeated here, and so people hear that in the general public even though the same people say we are all honorable except for the thieves and crooks among us, and then they do not say who the thieves and the crooks are.

Now let us get down to what the Burton amendment does, and why I am supporting it, and why a broad spectrum of people are supporting it. This has to do with the charitable events.

Now in real life some of us do try not only to do our duty, but to try to justify our existence by our relationship with our fellow human beings. I founded, along with one of the most conservative people in the Democratic caucus, the honorable gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CRAMER], who started the Children's Advocacy Center in Alabama; I heard about it, and I brought it to the State of Hawaii. We had the first statewide children's advocacy center, and any of my colleagues have been a probation officer like I have been, anybody who served in the Committee on the Judiciary who knows what sexual abuse is of children, knows what the Children's Advocacy Centers have accomplished. It takes children who have been abused and keeps them from being abused further.

Now I am to participate in an event in December. I am going to put on a charitable event for the Children's Advocacy Center, and I have appeared for them in other places around the country. I am going to be there, and I am going to put on a little, one of my famous Blues Brothers, acts. I hope some of my colleagues can catch it sometime. It is terrific, I want to tell my colleagues. If my colleagues think I am good down here, they should see me with my dark glasses and my porkpie hat. Mr. Speaker, a lot of people have a good time when that happens, but the main reason for doing it is to see to it that sexually abused children are no longer molested.

And now I am supposed to withdraw myself from that because of some perception that somebody has conjured up as to what kind of person I am or somebody else is?

Now I will tell my colleagues what else we do from Hawaii. We appear for the Aloha United Way, the United Way, that my colleagues have in their community. We have the Aloha United Way, and we went as a congressional delegation to New York City to ask people who do business in Hawaii to help us with the United Way in Hawaii.

Now somebody wants to run against me, and that is what I hear from one Member after another, the reason we cannot vote for this amendment is somebody is going to use it in a campaign commercial against us. Mr. Speaker, I invite anybody who wants to use a campaign commercial against me that I am supporting the United Way to please do so because any idiot that is going to run for office is going to use that for an excuse, and anybody here that cannot contend with an opponent that is going to be against them because they are in favor of charitable events, he deserves, or she deserves, to get elected, and my colleague does not. But I am proud to be associated with these charitable events, I am proud to appear anywhere in the country on their behalf, and I am proud to support the Burton-Clay-Brewster-Abercrombie amendment.

Mr. BRYANT of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BARRETT].

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, this may be a well-meaning amendment, but it guts the bill.

Mr. Speaker, there are millions of people in this country who are involved in the United Way. There are millions of people in this country who care about abused children. There are millions of people in this country who care about all sorts of very valuable things for our society. But do those people get their airfare paid? Do those people get golf fees paid, green fees paid, that could be \$100-\$200? No, of course not, of course not, and that is what the issue is here today.

I think that the people in this body are admirable, they are honorable, people, and most of them got elected here because they are involved in their community, and they have been elected for that, and they should continue to be doing that. But they should not have privileges that the people sitting in this gallery, the people sitting in this country, do not have. It is that simple. The people in this country do not want this regulated, they do not want more paperwork, they do not want more bureaucracy. Mr. Speaker, they want this practice stopped, and that is what we should do.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. BONO], my dear friend and colleague.

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

Mr. BONO. Mr. Speaker, this is a sad state of affairs because when people do honorable things, and then somebody writes some bill and says, "You know,

you have to stop doing that honorable thing, can't do that anymore;" why? Mr. Speaker, because we are writing this extremely righteous bill that will make us honest. I did not know I was not honest.

Mr. Speaker, it is very sad that we cannot look our constituents in the eye and say, I don't do that, I don't do that, I just do what I do, so I'll be happy to show you or tell you whatever I do. I'll disclose that, but please let me take care of my own ethics, and if I'm not worthy, throw me out. But let me be responsible for myself. Don't make me responsible to some poorly written legislation.

Do my colleagues know that when I read this legislation I said, Well, what about my film festival that I founded in Palm Springs? Can I have my party at my house that the film festival puts on?

They said, "We don't know."

Mr. Speaker, if they do not know, how do we know when we are breaking the law with this bill?

I support the Burton amendment.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Washington [Mrs. SMITH].

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I think it needs to be made very clear that no one says that anyone is doing anything illegal, and there are no criminal penalties in this bill. But I do want to say that over the years, as I have been in politics, I know when I spend time with people like we spend on these charity golf trips that we get real close to the lobbyists that sponsor them. It is the time they get, my colleagues, it is not so much the money. It is the time we spend with them that they have our ear. The American people do not have our ear that long. It is the impression. The American people believe in the last poll that I just read that just came out, 90 percent of the people believe we listen to lobbyists more than the people.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. FOWLER].

(Mrs. FOWLER asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. FOWLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Burton amendment.

My State of Florida is known as the Sunshine State, not just because of our favorable weather conditions, but because we have led the Nation with our government in sunshine laws. In Florida, you conduct your business in public and you let the people decide if what you are doing is appropriate.

The Burton bill follows the same approach. It keeps the current \$250 limit, lowers the threshold from \$100 to \$50 and draws open the curtains to let the sunshine in.

Everything else we are doing in this Congress is about sending power back to the people. Giving them more control over their government. That is what this bill does. Disclose every-

thing, then let the people decide if their representative is using their office for personal gain. No other bill on the floor today provides the same level of disclosure as the Burton bill. Vote for sunshine, vote for the Burton amendment.

□ 1630

Mr. BRYANT of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT].

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentlewoman from the other side of the aisle put it quite well with reference to this measure. We now have the opportunity to achieve on a true bipartisan basis, finally, real reform. We should not substitute for full reform something that appears to be full reform, done in the name of disclosure, which really does not change the existing law very much at all.

What the American people want is not to hear more of the details of the kind of business as usual that they have rejected. They want to see it stopped once and for all.

Many of these charitable events are done for a most charitable and worthy purpose. The only problem is that so often, it is the Member who gets most of the charity, and not the good cause that the charitable event is for.

There is still no reason that Members of Congress cannot participate in such events, contribute to their community, but the direction and the purpose needs to be for the benefit of the charity, not for the benefit of the Member. We have the opportunity today to make real progress in this area. Let us do it by rejecting this substitute.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to my colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. SCOTT KLUG.

Mr. KLUG. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding time to me. I would also like to thank the gentleman from Wisconsin, TOM BARRETT, and the other Members of the bipartisan team who have been working on this bill and similar legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I do not doubt the intentions of my colleagues who are offering the substitute but, Mr. Speaker, you know how the road to hell was eventually paved, and in this case we also know how the cart path at Pebble Beach was paved as well.

Wisconsin's legislature has had a zero gift ban in place for a number of years, and I am not sure how I can tell people in this body, but legislation actually gets passed. Members of the Wisconsin State Legislature get laws into place without accepting alarm clocks and trips and gym bags and tee shirts and all the other bric-a-brac that shows up in our office, and they also manage to play golf and play tennis, but they do so and they pay their own way.

Mr. Speaker, our constituents sent us here to do a number of things. They have sent us here to balance the budget, and we are beginning to work on it this week. They sent us here to eventually pass term limits, and before I

leave, I hope Congress will eventually put term limits in place as well. More than anything else, they wanted us to make this a place again that we can be proud of, our constituents back home, and every one of us who serve in this institution as well. I hope we defeat the Burton amendment and pass the substitute offered by the Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, there is one other thing our constituents want us to do, by the way. They want us to pay for our own lunch.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I support the efforts of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] and the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BREWSTER]. I want a tough bill, but I also want to be able to continue to help my friends raise money for charity.

There is a former Congressman around here named Ralph Harding, and Ralph and I and a number of other people have combined under the present system to raise more than \$1 million to help fight leukemia in this country. Senator ORRIN HATCH and I do not see things eye to eye politically, but we are good friends, and I have helped ORRIN for a number of years raise hundreds of thousands of dollars for efforts such as child care centers and halfway houses, safe houses for battered spouses down in Utah.

The system works now. I do not get anything out of this, but it works well, and we really ought to protect and shield those charities so that we continue to raise millions of dollars for needy efforts in this country. That is what the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] and the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BREWSTER] are trying to do. I support them in their efforts.

I have always worked for strong ethics legislation. I am going to continue to do that by voting for the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana and the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. BRYANT of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MINGE].

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make three observations about this legislation. First, those of us that serve in Congress are actually serving in a fiduciary capacity. We represent the people in the congressional districts that sent us. We have a fiduciary relationship with them. It is our obligation to try to observe this in every respect.

Second, I think we should attempt to observe the same standards that are observed in the rest of government. There has been a great deal of criticism of the Supreme Court recently, and judges for accepting trips. As I understand it, the judicial branch is trying to review its rules and tighten things up.

The executive branch has gone through that process and they have a proposal; not a proposal, they have legislation and rules that they live by

that are not consistent with what is being urged by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON]. Instead, it is the same or very close to the underlying bill and the Senate legislation.

Third, I would like to just briefly comment that access is perhaps the critical thing. People are looking for access to Members of Congress. They want our time. I think we have to try to make sure that our time is given to people, not on the basis of their ability to help finance trips, but instead on the basis of our availability in our office and in our district to meet with them on the merits of the cases.

We certainly have many other areas where reform is needed. At the same time, I think we should avoid impugning the integrity of anyone in the Chamber. I do not question the motives of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON]. I think he, too, is interested in improving the caliber of this institution, but we need legislation similar to the Senate's.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. PETE HOEKSTRA.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, we have a vision. We want to restore the trust of the American people and the integrity of the legislative process. For the last 11 months we have been pursuing this. We have reformed welfare, Medicare, regulatory reform. We have a whole series of reforms on opening today. Today we are going to finish a couple of more pieces of business.

The Waldholtz bill is reasonable reform guidelines. We have listened to the American people. They said, "Reform these legislative businesses and items, but also restore the process where you are personally enriched." The Waldholtz bill is a reasonable process. It does not ban participation in charities, it does not ban participation in charity events, it just says that when you participate in charities, just like all the other people that are participating in these events, you are expected to be charitable and carry your own weight at these events.

All the Burton bill does is it protects access to Members of Congress through privilege and special interest. It needs to stop. Vote "no" on Burton.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remainder of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BREWSTER] is recognized for 2½ minutes.

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

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to stand in support of the Burton full disclosure amendment. I am very concerned with the Congress bashing that is quite popular with certain Members and with the media. It makes me angry to watch the news and continually see honest Members of Congress portrayed as crooks who can be

influenced by meals, travel, entertainment, or other gifts in making official decisions.

By even considering this issue, we serve only to reinforce that negative image. People who oppose the Burton bill have called the supporters of the bill the so-called golf and tennis caucus. What I would like to know is how many of those Members who feel it is wrong to accept a cup of coffee from a lobbyist feel it is all right to ask for a \$1,000 campaign contribution?

If a Member of Congress can have his or her vote bought for a cup of coffee or a \$25 meal, then imagine what happens to that individual when they beg for and receive a \$500 campaign contribution, a \$1,000 contribution, or even numerous \$5,000 contributions. Honesty is not for sale. If a Member feels they can be influenced by someone buying their dinner, they should not go. Neither should they call some lobbyist and ask for a \$1,000 campaign contribution.

Mr. Speaker, this is not about keeping golf and tennis trips, this is about restoring credibility to this institution. If it is wrong to play golf with a lobbyist at a charity event, then why do we make it right in this legislation to play at political events that the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee has, the national Republican Campaign Committee has, and we ask Members to call these same lobbyists asking them to bring money? If the first is wrong, so is the second.

We will never satisfy the people who are pushing this issue. You can fire your staff, take an oath of poverty, and work for free, and you will never satisfy some groups on this issue.

The Burton bill allows our constituents to judge us, not the Ethics Committee, but the people who elected us to come here to start with. Mr. Speaker, the answer to gift reform is reporting and accountability. The answer to gift reform is the Burton full disclosure amendment. I urge my colleagues to support the Burton full disclosure amendment.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BREWSTER] has 15 seconds remaining.

Mr. BRYANT of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Oregon [Ms. FURSE].

(Ms. FURSE asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. FURSE. Mr. Speaker, it is so simple. Why pass laws to make Members fill out forms to tell what they took from lobbyists? Zero is zero. No complications, no forms, no gifts.

I ask Members to defeat the substitute and vote for real reform.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Iowa, [Mr. GANSKE].

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

Mr. GANSKE. Mr. Speaker, I will vote for gift ban reform. I believe that

House Resolution 250 is reasonable, and that the Burton amendment just does not go far enough. I will also vote for the Gingrich amendment, which is a ban on all gifts. The Burton amendment basically allows the current system to continue, and I oppose it. If you are for the status quo, vote for the amendment.

Mr. Speaker, lobbyists represent farmers, unions, teachers, insurers, consumers, and others. They provide information on both sides of issues for the common citizens they represent. I will listen to a lobbyist for farmers, just as I do for an individual farmer, but I do not need a fancy meal in order to be well informed. Vote against the Burton amendment and vote for the Gingrich amendment, or for House Resolution 250, or for both.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CASTLE].

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the gift ban reform bill and against the Burton amendment. I would just like to make several simple points. First, the current rules which we have are farcical. Why, gifts under \$100 do not even count to the \$250 cumulative limit we can achieve.

No. 2, the executive branch lives by tough gift rules. Gifts over \$20 are banned, and the cumulative value of gifts which can be accepted is \$50.

No. 3, this reform bill is not overly restrictive. Gifts over \$50 are banned, and gifts under \$50 may be accepted up to an aggregate of \$100.

Finally, and maybe this is most important of all, the public, our constituents, probably get no unsolicited gifts whatsoever. We are arguing about the amount of the gifts we should get. I think we should not be afraid to restrict ourselves in terms of these gifts. Mr. Speaker, I urge us to consider that.

I would also urge us to look at the fact that the Senate passed this same bill unanimously last year. I would urge us to defeat the Burton bill, to consider the Gingrich amendment, as you please, and to make absolutely sure that we all vote for the reform bill in the name of the public when it comes up at the end of the day.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLAY].

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. BRYANT of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remainder of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BRYANT] is recognized for 3½ minutes.

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

□ 1645

Mr. BRYANT of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I think it is heartwarming at this contentious time in this House's business to find so many Republicans and Democrats coming forward on the same side, and frankly on both sides, but particularly on the side of reform, because this bill has been a bipartisan effort for three years. I think if we can pass it today intact, it will be a bipartisan credit to this House, one of which we can all be very, very proud.

Mr. Speaker, the refuge that has been taken by the proponents of the Burton amendment in charitable activities I think is clever. In a few ways, maybe it is even deserved. But by and large, I think it is clever, because it suggests that all of these activities are really being done only for the benefit of charities.

The fact of the matter is, there is no prohibition in this bill for charitable activities. None whatsoever. All of the charitable activities that have been referred to which are all very fine efforts can continue to be done.

The fact of the matter is, though, that this particular charitable activity that these Members are talking about does not involve any sacrifice on their part, it involves them being flown by this charity, which is normally a charity activity sponsored by a major corporation that lobbies this House every day of the week, flown by them clear across the country to a beautiful place to play golf for several days and then home again, and then usually they get a bag of gifts at the same time.

I do not care whether it influences your vote or not. I do not think in most cases it does, but the public sees it that way and the public loses confidence in this institution. Why in the world would anybody come here and ask that they be able to continue playing charity golf at the expense of the reputation of this institution?

The fact of the matter is that the Burton amendment will allow unlimited gifts, unlimited free tickets, unlimited meals, et cetera, from lobbyists as long as they are under \$50 all year long.

Do I think that that kind of thing corrupts Members or makes them always vote with the lobbyists? No, but I do know this: It has a regular and certain subconscious effect on anybody to constantly be in the company of somebody else who is paying the bills. That is just human nature.

Mr. Speaker, it is our job here to pass legislation and rules that give the public confidence that we are not legislating in the interests of those people that are hanging around, but we are legislating in the interests of those people that sent us up here and, by the way, pay us a nice salary for doing this job.

I say to my colleagues, if you want to go on these charity golf trips, if you want to be in this activity, pay for it yourself. I urge Members to vote against the Burton amendment. Let us

pass this bill and have a bipartisan project that we can be proud of.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS].

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, this partial disclosure that is proposed by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON], my friend and colleague, has two things in it that I think Members should know about. First of all, we have a fairly significant new disclosure requirement that means reporting any gift over \$50, that includes meals, will have to be reported. There is no such provision now, that is something new, and before you vote for this, I would urge that you think about that if you are planning to vote for it.

Second, Mr. Speaker, there is no exemption from disclosure requirements for gifts over \$50 from personal friends. Members should know that they and their staff would be required to disclose any gift, including a meal, over \$50 from a personal friend. That is also new.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to point out that a vote for the Burton amendment is a vote against reform. It allows gifts of up to \$250 each year, or \$500 per term. It allows any gifts under \$50, countless gifts under \$50; it allows paid vacations in the name of charity, in many cases funded by lobbyists.

The passage of the Burton amendment prevents a vote on the Senate bill and the Waldholtz-Barrett bill. It also prevents a vote on the Speaker's bill of no gift. I urge an absolute no vote on the Burton amendment.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, this has been a very civilized debate and I appreciate that from all of my colleagues. There are some things, though, that have not been explained that I think need to be explained.

Mr. Speaker, we are not talking about just prohibiting access from lobbyists, we are talking about our constituents' access, because the legislation that the gentlewoman from Utah [Mrs. WALDHOLTZ] and the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS] and others are sponsoring is going to limit access by our constituents. If they come to Washington and want to take us out to lunch or to dinner, we are going to have to say no in many cases, especially if we have a long-term relationship, if they are not a dyed-in-the-wool friend.

In addition to that, my colleagues, remember this: It says, gifts and meals valued at \$10 or more count toward the cumulative limit of \$100. Now, it says you do not have to keep records on that, but I am telling you that you are going to have to keep records on that, everything over \$10. Everything over \$10. Now, how many in this place are

going to be watching everything over \$10?

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I would inquire of the gentleman, would it not be just as easy to buy them lunch?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I would say to the gentleman from Mississippi, of course. The fact of the matter is we have constituents coming in here by the hundreds and everybody here knows that, and if my colleague has the money to buy every one of them lunch, then congratulations. I do not.

The fact of the matter is, you are going to have to keep track of everything over \$10, because at some point in the future, you may be called up before the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, and you are going to have to answer.

Now, in addition to that, remember this: If you violate the ethics laws, and we did not think when we had the House bank scandal we were going to have problems, but we did, and a lot of people were defeated and some even went to jail over it. I am telling you, we are going to have problems with this, and there is going to have to be legal fees paid.

Now, if you go before the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct and you have to plead your case because of some of these improprieties or alleged improprieties, you are going to have to hire an attorney and you are going to have to pay for it and it is going to cost you a lot of money.

Now, let us talk about my bill, my approach. It has been said by the proponents of the Waldholtz bill that they have broad bipartisan support. Well, we have broad bipartisan support on my substitute. We have over 100 cosponsors, because Members, when they find out what they are going to be up against, realize that it is better to have complete and full disclosure than to start worrying about everything over \$10 that we are going to have to be accountable for.

Now, what is wrong with full disclosure? Who are we answerable to? Who put us here? Our constituents. Our constituents put us here. If we do something wrong and it is in the paper, they are going to hold us accountable. So what is wrong with disclosing everything?

Mr. Speaker, what my bill says is that everything above \$50 we keep track of, if it is a meal or a gift or whatever it is. We keep track of it and we report it on our FEC report. I guarantee you, these people up here are going to be watching our FEC reports because they already do, and if we abuse our privileges in the House, they are going to report it on the front pages of our papers, and we are going to be held accountable by our constituents and maybe even thrown out of office.

So that is the way to handle it. Have full disclosure. Do not mess with this minutia that is going to get us into trouble before the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct.

Now, I would like to talk about these charities. I go to about two of these charity events a year. One is the Danny Thompson event in Sun Valley, ID. I do not even know who I am going to play with when I play in that event, because it is drawn by lottery. You do not know if it is a lobbyist or a businessman or who it is.

So this idea that we are being lobbied all the time is crazy. We have more of these lobbyists in our office every day than we do on the golf course, so that is a bogus argument. The fact of the matter is the Danny Thompson Golf Tournament has raised collectively over \$3 million for cancer research, and with the private foundations that give matching funds, that translates into \$30 million that has been raised for cancer research. In this past year they found a cure for kids who have lymphatic cancer that is going to save thousands and thousands of young kids' lives.

Now, is the Federal Government going to pick up the tab for that? What is wrong with us playing in a charity event that helps those things and helps those kids? I see nothing wrong with it.

The answer, my friends, is complete and full disclosure. Let those people, let the American people know what we are doing and let them be the judge, not some Committee on Standards of Official Conduct.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina). Pursuant to the rule, the previous question is ordered on the amendment.

The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

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

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

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 154, nays 276, not voting 2, as follows:

[Roll No. 807]

YEAS—154

Abercrombie	Boehlt	Burton
Allard	Boehner	Callahan
Bachus	Bonilla	Calvert
Baker (CA)	Bono	Chambliss
Baker (LA)	Boucher	Clay
Barr	Brewster	Clement
Barton	Brown (FL)	Clinger
Bateman	Bryant (TN)	Clyburn
Bevill	Bunn	Coburn
Bishop	Bunning	Collins (GA)
Billey	Burr	Collins (IL)

Collins (MI)	Kelly	Pombo
Combest	Kim	Quillen
Cooley	King	Radanovich
Crane	Kingston	Rangel
Crapo	Klink	Regula
Cubin	LaFalce	Rogers
Cunningham	LaHood	Rohrabacher
Danner	Latham	Ros-Lehtinen
de la Garza	Laughlin	Rose
DeLay	Lewis (CA)	Roth
Diaz-Balart	Lewis (KY)	Saxton
Dickey	Lightfoot	Scarborough
Dooley	Livingston	Schaefer
Doolittle	Lucas	Shuster
Ehrlich	Manton	Skeen
Emerson	Martinez	Spence
Everett	McCollum	Stearns
Ewing	McCrery	Stenholm
Fattah	McDade	Stockman
Fields (TX)	McHugh	Stump
Fowler	McInnis	Tanner
Frisa	McIntosh	Tauzin
Funderburk	McKeon	Taylor (NC)
Gekas	Meek	Tejeda
Gillmor	Mfume	Thomas
Hancock	Montgomery	Thompson
Hansen	Moorhead	Thornberry
Hastert	Moran	Towns
Hastings (FL)	Murtha	Trafficant
Hastings (WA)	Myers	Volkmer
Hayes	Nethercutt	Vucanovich
Herger	Ney	Watt (NC)
Hilliard	Norwood	Watts (OK)
Hostettler	Ortiz	Whitfield
Houghton	Owens	Wicker
Hunter	Oxley	Williams
Istook	Packard	Wilson
Jefferson	Parker	Young (AK)
Johnson, E. B.	Pastor	Zeliff
Johnson, Sam	Payne (NJ)	
Jones	Payne (VA)	

NAYS—276

Ackerman	Doggett	Hefner
Andrews	Dornan	Heineman
Archer	Doyle	Hilleary
Armey	Dreier	Hinchee
Baessler	Duncan	Hobson
Baldacci	Dunn	Hoekstra
Ballenger	Durbin	Hoke
Barcia	Edwards	Holden
Barrett (NE)	Ehlers	Horn
Barrett (WI)	Engel	Hoyer
Bartlett	English	Hutchinson
Bass	Eshoo	Hyde
Becerra	Evans	Inglis
Beilenson	Farr	Jackson-Lee
Bentsen	Fawell	Jacobs
Bereuter	Fazio	Johnson (CT)
Berman	Filner	Johnson (SD)
Bilbray	Flake	Johnston
Billirakis	Flanagan	Kanjorski
Blute	Foglietta	Kaptur
Bonior	Foley	Kasich
Borski	Forbes	Kennedy (MA)
Browder	Ford	Kennedy (RI)
Brown (CA)	Fox	Kennelly
Brown (OH)	Frank (MA)	Kildee
Brownback	Franks (CA)	Kleccka
Bryant (TX)	Franks (CT)	Klug
Buyer	Franks (NJ)	Knollenberg
Camp	Frelinghuysen	Kolbe
Canady	Frost	Lantos
Cardin	Furse	Largent
Castle	Gallegly	LaTourette
Chabot	Ganske	Lazio
Chapman	Gejdenson	Leach
Chenoweth	Gephardt	Levin
Christensen	Geren	Lewis (GA)
Chrysler	Gibbons	Lincoln
Clayton	Gilchrest	Linder
Coble	Gilman	Lipinski
Coleman	Gonzalez	LoBiondo
Condit	Goodlatte	Lofgren
Conyers	Goodling	Longley
Costello	Gordon	Lowe
Cox	Goss	Luther
Coyne	Graham	Maloney
Cramer	Green	Manzullo
Creameans	Greenwood	Markey
Davis	Gunderson	Martini
Deal	Gutierrez	Mascara
DeFazio	Gutknecht	Matsui
DeLauro	Hall (OH)	McCarthy
Dellums	Hall (TX)	McDermott
Deutsch	Hamilton	McHale
Dicks	Harman	McKinney
Dingell	Hayworth	McNulty
Dixon	Hefley	Meehan

Menendez	Reed	Stark
Metcalf	Richardson	Stokes
Meyers	Riggs	Studds
Mica	Rivers	Stupak
Miller (CA)	Roberts	Talent
Miller (FL)	Roemer	Tate
Minge	Roukema	Taylor (MS)
Mink	Roybal-Allard	Thornton
Moakley	Royce	Thurman
Molinari	Rush	Tiahrt
Mollohan	Sabo	Torkildsen
Morella	Salmon	Torres
Myrick	Sanders	Torricelli
Nadler	Sanford	Upton
Neal	Sawyer	Velazquez
Neumann	Schiff	Vento
Nussle	Schroeder	Visclosky
Oberstar	Schumer	Waldholtz
Obey	Scott	Walker
Olver	Seastrand	Walsh
Orton	Sensenbrenner	Wamp
Pallone	Serrano	Ward
Paxon	Shadegg	Waters
Pelosi	Shaw	Waxman
Peterson (FL)	Shays	Weldon (FL)
Peterson (MN)	Sisisky	Weldon (PA)
Petri	Skaggs	Weller
Pickett	Skelton	White
Pomeroy	Slaughter	Wise
Porter	Smith (MI)	Wolf
Portman	Smith (NJ)	Woolsey
Poshard	Smith (TX)	Wyden
Pryce	Smith (WA)	Wynn
Quinn	Solomon	Yates
Rahall	Souder	Young (FL)
Ramstad	Spratt	Zimmer

NOT VOTING—2

Fields (LA) Tucker

□ 1719

Messrs. LONGLEY, WHITE, NEUMANN, HALL of Texas, WYNN, BUYER, Ms. HARMAN, and Messrs. METCALF, RAHALL, SERRANO, GILCHREST, CONDIT, SISISKY, and CHRYSLER changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. OWENS, Ms. DANNER, and Messrs. WATTS of Oklahoma, NETHERCUTT, and ALLARD changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

(Mr. GEPHARDT asked and was given permission to speak out of order and address the House for 1 minute.)

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask for this time to inquire about the schedule for today and the rest of the week.

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

Mr. GEPHARDT. I yield to the distinguished majority leader and ask about the schedule for the rest of the day and the week.

Mr. ARMEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, of course, the Members are very concerned about what will be our schedule, and we have worked very hard to come to a point where now I can give a pretty good outline of what the rest of the week and the early part of next week will look like.

If the gentleman will continue to yield, it is our hope to finish the Gift Reform Act and the Lobby Disclosure

Act this evening, Mr. Speaker. Tomorrow we plan to consider the conference report on the Balanced Budget Act of 1995 and also to consider H.R. 260, legislation regarding American troops in Bosnia.

On Saturday, the House will be in session and voting, beginning about 12 noon.

The House will not be in session on Sunday, but will be in session on Monday and Tuesday.

Given the circumstances, I cannot divine further than next Tuesday, although we will inform Members early next week about the balance of the week, and I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. GEPHARDT. I would like to ask the gentleman if he has a good estimate on when Members might expect to be able to leave here on Saturday afternoon or evening.

Mr. ARMEY. I thank the gentleman for his inquiry. I can only regret that it was not directed to someone else.

But my best estimate is that our work would be completed around 6 on Saturday.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Could the gentleman further inform us what might be on the schedule for Saturday and what time Members might be expected to be here on Monday?

Mr. ARMEY. The most certain thing we would have under consideration on Saturday would be further consideration of the Balanced Budget Act of 1995, upon action of the other body, and then, of course, we have some very important conference reports we would hope to get to on Saturday as well.

Mr. GEPHARDT. On Monday, what time would the gentleman think we might come in?

Mr. ARMEY. I am pleased to announce to my colleagues that we expect no votes before 2 on Monday.

Mr. GEPHARDT. And finally, could the gentleman answer about what would be the estimated time of the first vote on Saturday?

Mr. ARMEY. Saturday, I should think that we would probably have the first vote between 12:30 and 1 o'clock.

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

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

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from yielding.

I wonder if we could learn about the activities later this evening. My understanding is that there are some 20 amendments that have been listed as possible amendments to the lobby reform bill which will follow the gift rule. Does the gentleman have a time certain tonight that we would terminate our activities, or do we just go through the evening into the morning hours dealing with the amendments, many of which have been heard but some of which are new?

Mr. ARMEY. I appreciate the gentleman's concern. Let me just say, first of all, of course, it is an open rule, and as

is often the case in an open rule with a great many amendments, the managers of the bill can often work things out with the Members with amendments, and that is always the best way to come to an arrangement on time.

What I would propose doing is watching to see how well that progress can go and then perhaps making a decision about completing the bill or perhaps, in fact, giving it further consideration.

It is our hope and our desire to complete the bill tonight, and I am placing a great deal of confidence in the collegiality of the bill managers and the Members with amendments.

Mr. GEPHARDT. One more point or question. With respect, I would just urge the distinguished majority leader to perhaps look at the idea of coming in Saturday a littler earlier so that Members would have a chance, if they were going to go back to their districts on Saturday night, to be able to accomplish that.

Mr. ARMEY. It appears that the gentleman's point is well taken, and I will take it under consideration.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Let me say to the distinguished majority leader that I would hope that it might be possible, and I know the President made statements today, and the Speaker and the Senate majority leader, about trying to figure our way through this business of a continuing appropriation.

If something could be arrived at on Saturday, I assume that if that can be accomplished for a period of time that would get us past Thanksgiving, that we might be able to avoid a session on Monday and Tuesday. I know that is a very tough thing to get done and will take some time. But if that could be done, does the gentleman think we might be able to avoid Monday and Tuesday?

Mr. ARMEY. I believe that it could be possible should an accord be reached on a continuing appropriation, but at this point I have to say we have a very clear and a very important schedule before us that we would intend to work on.

Mr. FAZIO of California. If the gentleman would yield further, I have had some Members suggest that perhaps we could work on Sunday, if it would be possible to be out of here next week; in other words, keep working until we have completed our work. Is there any possibility that that could be entertained?

Mr. ARMEY. At this point, we have no plans to work on Sunday.

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

Mr. GEPHARDT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. Could the gentleman tell us what the plans are for Wednesday and Thursday for next week? Could the distinguished gentleman from Texas tell us what the plans of the leadership are for Wednesday and Thursday of next week?

Mr. ARMEY. I thank the gentleman for his inquiry.