

and we hope to get out by 6. I presume we are going in at 10 on Thursday?

Mr. ARMEY. Yes.

Mr. HOYER. Does the gentleman have any idea as to how much debate will be allowed on the Medicare bill on Thursday? Under the rule?

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, at this time I cannot say for certain because the Committee on Rules has not met, but it would certainly be a couple hours at least.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I say in all due respect to my friend, the majority leader, this is a bill that I understand exceeds 450 pages. The bill has not received any days of hearings because it was not drafted. But there were no hearings in the Committee on Commerce.

I say with all due respect to my friend, the majority leader, does the majority leader believe that 2 hours or so of debate on a bill of this magnitude is sufficient to fully inform the Members on all the issues that will be incorporated in the bill?

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, yes.

Mr. HOYER. The problem we have on this side is that we do perceive this as a bill which will have very serious impact on millions of people in this country. Obviously, we have had bills on this floor of relatively small consequence which have been debated, frankly, for days on this floor. Is there any possibility that we might get at least a guarantee of maybe 4 hours of general debate on this bill?

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, If the gentleman will continue to yield, of course, I can understand the gentleman is interested in such a request. I think the appropriate place to make the request would be before the Committee on Rules. They will write the rules, and I would welcome the gentleman to make his case before the committee.

Mr. HOYER. Well, Mr. Speaker, I will tell the majority leader that we certainly intend to ask the Committee on Rules, and I hope the majority leader and the Speaker who, of course, will advise the Committee on Rules, as we did, as to what they believe to be the appropriate time and rule under which the Medicare bill ought to be considered. But I hope, in all seriousness, that the majority leader and the Speaker would advise the Committee on Rules that a sufficient time be allotted for debate on this bill which gives the Congress the opportunity to fully explore the effects of the legislation on each of its parts on the people of this country and on the budget and on the health care security of our senior citizens.

I would urge the leader to do that this week and next week when we talk to members of the Committee on Rules.

Furthermore, nearly 2 weeks have passed since this body passed a continuing resolution. We have approximately a month remaining until that continuing resolution expires.

To date, only one bill, appropriation bill, has been signed by the President,

as we all know, which means that 12 still remain unsigned. The last bill, last week, only one bill has passed the House. As a member of, for instance of the Treasury Postal bill, that bill has been ready, in my opinion, to pass out of conference for the last 15 days. And it is my understanding that the President has indicated, if the bill passes without the Istook amendment, that it will be signed.

Now, it seems to me, the gentleman talked a little bit on NPR this morning about cooperation and about moving ahead on those issues where we could reach agreement. That bill and some other appropriation bills, if they could move forward, we would serve the American public's interest in having their government funded in a timely fashion.

The fiscal year, of course, ended 2 weeks ago. We had no appropriation bills signed by then. And is the majority leader aware of what the plans are to see that appropriation bills move in a timely fashion so that we do not have to be confronted on November 16 with the necessity to pass another continuing resolution?

I know the majority leader in the past has stated his deep concern about continuing resolutions. I tend to share that concern. I am wondering whether or not we have plans to preclude that from happening.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his observations. Let me just say, we are working on all these bills. We are making good progress. Having just completed foreign operations today, I am pleased to hear that the President has stipulated the conditions under which he might sign one of the other bills. I look forward to hearing from the President on that matter. I am sure he will want to communicate that to me.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I will tell the majority leader that I believe that has been essentially communicated to the committee.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I will look into it.

Mr. HOYER. I will certainly see if we can get information directly to the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his information and would simply again urge him to provide for the opportunity for this House to fully debate a bill on the consequence of the Medicare proposal.

□ 1930

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE AND COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS TO HAVE UNTIL MIDNIGHT, MONDAY, OCTOBER 16, 1995 TO FILE REPORTS

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce and the Committee on Ways and Means may have until midnight on Monday, October 16, 1995, to file reports to the House.

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

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT FROM FRIDAY, OCTOBER 13, 1995 TO TUESDAY, OCTOBER 17, 1995

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Friday, October 13, 1995, it adjourns to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Tuesday, October 17, for morning hour debates.

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

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

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

There was no objection.

THE OTHER AMERICA

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

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I know that some of you may have seen the "60 Minutes" report on CBS Sunday night about what was called the other America, a report about the shameful developments along our border known as colonies.

I only wanted to take this time this morning to come before my colleagues on both sides of the aisle and to simply say on behalf of so many men, women, and children who have been helped by the action of this Congress, thank you. It is true that Democrats and Republicans have come together on an issue of extreme importance, and that is to provide water and sewer service, the basic necessities of life to so many in the United States who live along the United States-Mexico border, who are indeed American citizens, but who have been the subject of much greed by developers who sold them land without having dedicated the very basic necessities of life for their future habitation.

Unfortunately, the "60 Minutes" report did cloud the issue somewhat by suggesting that our dollars were going to help the developers. Nothing could be further from the truth. What we have done on both sides of this aisle is to provide the services to the people who really need it, and for that I say thank you.

Some of you may have seen the "60 Minutes" report on CBS Sunday night about the other America—a report about the shameful

developments along our border known as colonias.

Throughout my tenure in the U.S. Congress, throughout my public service—I have sought to make the American people aware of the fact that, as the result of the indefensible greed of developers, these communities lack the basic necessities to sustain life—water and sewer services.

The colonias are breeding grounds for deadly diseases most of the United States never sees—cholera, typhoid, tuberculosis, and others that occur mostly in the poorest nations of the world, not, one would think, on our very own border from Texas to California. These diseases and the impoverished communities in which they fester are a threat to every American.

It is for these reasons that I have fought and even pleaded with some of you not to forsake victims of the colonias—thousands of people who risked their financial resources for a small slice of the American Dream that has, all too often, turned out to be an unsanitary patch of desert that has robbed their babies of childhood and them of their hard-earned dollars.

As a result of our efforts to give local communities and the victims of colonias the resources for the basic water and sewer services that any home requires, some \$250 million has given thousands of colonias residents not just running water and toilet facilities, but hope.

And it's been worth every penny of it and it's been worth every one of the countless hours I have spent trying to explain the need just to look in the eyes of a colonia child who is healthy today only because of Congress.

And Texas, too, has responded by enacting legislation similar to that I proposed in the Texas Legislature more than 20 years ago to make it impossible to develop more colonias that fail to offer water and sewer services.

Not one penny of America's tax dollars has gone to colonia developers. All of it has gone to help their victims and to help protect all Americans from diseases no American should be exposed to.

Although "60 Minutes" made some of these points and raised the consciousness of viewers about this issue, it made some suggestions it knew to be false—including that I threatened the attorney general of Texas.

Attorney General Morales knows that I never directly or indirectly threatened him in any fashion about this or any other issue, nor participated in any conference call with him about colonias or any other matter. The attorney general knows this and "60 Minutes" and other news media would, too, if they only bothered to investigate.

"60 Minutes" could have helped colonia residents and the public health crisis caused by colonia. Instead, it muddled the water with false charges and innuendos that careful, accurate reporting—or attention to the facts provided it—could have avoided.

Because my intentions with regard to colonias—helping the victims get water and sewer services and putting the developers out of business—has clearly been a matter of public record for 25 years, I ask you, my colleagues, and you, the American people, not to turn your backs on the children and struggling families living along our southern border in the abominations called colonias.

SPECIAL ORDERS

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

ISTOOK AMENDMENT TO HAVE FAR-REACHING EFFECTS

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

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, today I circulated to my colleagues in the House the following document entitled "The Istook Amendment, New Regulation of Your Business."

One of the myths about the so-called Istook-McIntosh-Ehrlich proposal is that it has only to do with nonprofit organizations. In fact its reach will be much broader than that. I think my colleagues ought to be aware of exactly how extensive and pervasive and perverse that reach would be.

This fact sheet outlines what businesses could expect under the regime that would be imposed by the Istook amendment. Many people think it has only to do with grants. Of course grants do go to many businesses. Just to point out a few, Lockheed Martin gets research grants from the Defense Department; Chrysler, Ford, W.R. Grace from the Commerce Department. Thousands of others would be affected by grants.

But because of the other language in this proposal, many, many other companies would also be subjected to its extraordinary regulatory regime. That is because not only do direct payments count but also the receipt of, quote, anything of value.

So, for instance, a farming business that gets irrigation water from the Federal Government would be included, as would, in my part of Colorado, several major businesses who happen to get irrigation water from Bureau of Reclamation projects.

Farmers getting emergency livestock feed during severe weather would be affected, and some other things that you really would not think of initially as a thing of value until you examine carefully.

For instance, publishers of newspapers and magazines getting second class mailing permits, a benefit from what would otherwise be their mailing costs. Broadcasters getting television or radio licenses, companies getting patents, and so on. Many, many things that do not necessarily occur to you right off the bat as being a grant or a thing of value would suck you into the regulations.

How would that affect your business? Well, it would mean that you would be restricted from spending even your private business resources to protect your private business interests whenever the government was involved. Because anything you might do to try to change or

influence or reverse any decision by any level of government that might affect your business would be subjected to this restriction against your use of your private money, if you got any grant or thing of value from the Federal Government.

So appealing a State administrative or local administrative decision would count as political activity that would be restricted. Participating in any kind of campaign, even a local referendum affecting the business climate, would be covered.

But much more significantly than that, you would have to find out not only accounting for your own political activity, but you would have to find out about the political activity of anybody with whom you did business, your employees, your vendors and so forth. Because if they were hyperactive politically, if they happened in one year or another to exceed a 15-percent limit, then anything you spent with them would count against your own limit. If you exceeded your own limit, then you would be in violation of the law and, among other things, would be subject to a kind of vigilante lawsuit that is authorized under this bill by incorporating the Federal False Claims Act.

It is much broader, as I say, than just a regulation of the lobbying activities of nonprofits getting Federal grants. That is the mask behind which the proponents of this language wish to hide. In fact, it is entirely likely that the Istook-McIntosh-Ehrlich proposal would affect virtually all businesses in this country in one way or another.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following document for the RECORD:

THE ISTOOK AMENDMENT: NEW REGULATION OF YOUR BUSINESS

To stifle critics of their political agenda, House Republicans have come up with what may be the most intrusive regulatory scheme ever. Although often described as applying just to nonprofit organizations, the "Istook amendment"¹ is written so broadly that it would regulate many (or even all) American businesses.

ARE YOU REGULATED?

With few exceptions, your business will be regulated if it gets money or any "thing of value" from the federal government.

The only relevant exceptions: you wouldn't be regulated for receiving payments for property or services you provide "for the direct benefit or use of the United States," or for receiving "payments of loans, debts, or entitlements."

Does your business get federal grants? Then you're regulated.

Lockheed-Martin (Defense Department research grants); Ball Corporation (NASA); Alcoa, Amoco, Chrysler, Food, General Motors, W.R. Grace & Co., Dow Chemical, and U.S. Steel (all Commerce Department); and thousands of other companies would be regulated.

Other federal payments? You're regulated. Agricultural exporters in the Market Promotion Program, fishermen compensated

¹The Istook amendment is title VI of H.R. 2127, the House-passed Labor-HHS-Education appropriations bill. House conferees have also proposed it as a conference-committee addition to the Treasury-Postal Service-General Government appropriations bill.