

They wear a badge of courage, and they are now my additional warriors, who may not be in the 11th congressional district, but they are warriors nonetheless for that which is right. In the gallery, aside from State Senator Donzella James, who participated in the special session and who spoke out so eloquently against what happened, we also have State Senator Connie Stokes, who represents a portion of the 11th congressional district.

And I would like to take this moment to thank my own State Senator for her actions on behalf of preserving the 11th congressional district of Georgia. The members again of the Georgia Legislative Black Caucus worked day in and day out, and they only had one goal in mind. And that goal was to make sure that all of the folks of Georgia at the end of the day had an opportunity to cast a vote, a meaningful vote, for the representative of their choice.

And so while the venue has moved to a new place and a new time, the camaraderie, the loyalty, the love, the cohesion of the Georgia Legislative Black Caucus, and the way that I was able to interact with all of the members, I will never forget.

From that, I know, will come a new and stronger, more lasting relationship. And also a better relationship will come from the Democratic leadership of the State, that saw that under no circumstance were they able to break the glue that struck the members of the Georgia Legislative Black Caucus together. And that was their loyalty to the people of the State of Georgia.

In conclusion, I would just say that it is a pleasure for me to serve in the U.S. House of Representatives, and I have come to love, to truly love many of my colleagues with whom I interact daily. I appreciate all of them for their strong shows of support, for their kind words of support, and I want them to know that no matter how this fight ends, they have a friend in me.

---

#### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Edwin Thomas, one of his secretaries.

---

#### GRANT REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EHLERS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. EHRlich] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. EHRlich. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to engage two freshmen colleagues personal friends and people I have high regard for, in a colloquy concerning grant reform. I want to take this opportunity to publicly thank the gentleman from Washington [Mr. TATE] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MCINTOSH], the chairman of the

subcommittee, for their wonderful leadership on this issue.

Let me begin the colloquy by making an observation. It seems as though there are a lot of people paying attention to what we have done in the House so far, with respect to grant reform, Mr. Speaker. Every major newspaper in the country has editorialized with respect to grant reform over the last few weeks, and we certainly hit a nerve with the American people.

Now I direct my first question to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MCINTOSH], the chairman of the committee and one of the leaders along with our friend, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ISTOOK], in our effort, and, of course, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. TATE], being one of the more recent victims of the opposition with regard to this issue.

□ 1615

My question to you, my friend, is a lot of people thought we would never get this far. And here we are. We had a resounding victory on the House floor. We are now in the Senate conference committee.

I see the gentleman from Washington [Mr. TATE] putting up a piece of demonstrative evidence we have used on this floor in the past. I know my chairman of the subcommittee wants to make a few remarks at the beginning here, and I will yield to him.

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for taking the lead in making the American people aware of what, quite frankly, has been a dirty little secret in this town, that Federal taxpayer money has been going to lobbying groups in the form of grants.

The chart that our colleague [Mr. TATE] has shown how this welfare for lobbyists works. The taxpayers paying \$39 billion, some people estimate it would be as many as four or five times that amount in grants to many special interests.

Now, some of them are very worthy charities who are doing the right things in their communities, but there are a lot of those groups who are really lobbying and political front groups who are taking taxpayer dollars and using them to engage in political tactics.

Now, let me say I think everyone has a right to speak out in this country, but they do not have a right to speak out with somebody else's money and to be funded by the taxpayer.

One of the things that our committee is committed to doing is holding a series of hearings on this, looking into these groups and finding out some answers to some basic questions. Those groups that are lobbyist groups, we want to know, is it true that you are segregating the grant money you are receiving from political activities? Is it true that you have safeguards in place to make sure that you do not violate the current law that prohibits that direct funding? And then we also want to know what plans that group has been

engaged in to encourage lobbying by other groups.

Mr. EHRlich. Of course, that is the problem. That is really the problem.

Mr. MCINTOSH. Exactly. And it is a continuous cycle that has led to huge deficit spending in this country.

Then there is another group who say, we are not lobbying groups, but we do not like this reform. And what I want to know from those groups is, what do they do to ensure that their donors have accurately been informed of what lobbying they do do?

There are some very highly regarded groups in this country. I am thinking of groups like the United Way, the Red Cross, the Girl Scouts, the Boy Scouts, who also receive Federal grants, and they engage in very worthy and noble activities. Some of them tell us they also want to be lobbyists, not extensively, but part-time. And I think we need to tell their donors, did you know that they also want to lobby with some of the money that you have given them? How much of that money is spent on lobbying? Is there a problem with the Washington groups lobbying, whereas the groups in the States and the communities do not do that but are, in fact, engaged in charitable activities?

We are going to try to develop a record in our committee on those issues.

Mr. EHRlich. If the gentleman would yield, really is that not the threshold fundamental problem here? It seems as though we have addressed this both here on the floor and at various times we have had to discuss this issue off the floor, and it seems for some reason, and the reason appears to be Federal money, to have developed over the years a distinction between acting as an advocate and fulfilling the mission of the particular organization.

I believe it is fair to characterize our piece of legislation as an attempt to return these groups. And we are not talking about, by the way, many groups out of thousands, tens of thousands of groups, only a few hundred who, in our view, have violated both the letter and the spirit of the law, by trying to get rid of that distinction, trying to limit that distinction to return these groups to their fundamental mission, which is to provide service for the less fortunate in our society.

Mr. MCINTOSH. The gentleman is exactly correct.

We heard testimony in one of our hearings in July from Mrs. Arianna Huffington who told us that there was a serious problem in the charitable community that, rather than doing good works, helping the elderly, helping clean up the environment, helping the young people, and you may remember she talked about Mrs. Hannah Hawkins here in Washington who had used her own money to set up a home for children after school in the inner city neighborhoods. They are moving away from those charitable missions into becoming lobbyists and advocates that

the Federal Government take over those programs, and she thought that was, in fact, corrupting the spirit of charity in this country and that our bill would do a lot in this country to restore the true sense and purpose of charity.

So I think you are exactly correct on that point.

Mr. EHRLICH. Now, I know we have a lot to say about some of the misinformation our opposition has used, but I think probably the best Member to talk about that is our colleague, Mr. TATE, and I yield to Mr. TATE.

You have been a victim. What happened?

Mr. TATE. Well, first of all, I would like to thank the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. EHRLICH] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MCINTOSH]. Mr. Speaker, these gentlemen, along with the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ISTOOK], have done a phenomenal job of bringing this issue to the forefront.

Some of the arguments, and I will get into some of the attacks that are occurring at home by some of those organizations that are receiving public grants, mind you. Some of the opposition, for example, is: Well, you are violating free speech if you are limiting at some capacity what they can do with their private dollars.

The point is, how can it be free? Once again, how can it be free if the taxpayers are subsidizing it? The taxpayers are paying for this so-called free speech.

I am not here to tell an organization what they can do and cannot do with their own money. The point is, they are being subsidized by the taxpayers. So we have an obligation to watch out for what is going on.

The other point is that somehow it is intrusive in some other capacity, that somehow it is Orwellian to tell these organizations what to do.

I can think of nothing more intrusive to me or the people of the Ninth Congressional District of Washington State than to reach into my pocket and take my hard-earned money, to give it to some organization or to the Government that gives it to some organization that turns around and lobbies for things I do not believe in.

I mean, we have some great examples, if I may. The American Bar Association, for example, just this year as we were working on the flag amendment. We can argue whether we should have an amendment to protect the flag or not to protect the flag. That is part of our political system. What I find very offensive is when organizations like the American Bar Association receive millions of dollars in public grants and then turn around and lobby against legislation. That is wrong.

It hit close to home the last couple of weeks, I can tell you, in my particular district; and the Washington Times has done a good job of chronicling what has been going on.

Basically what is going on is taxpayer funding of the big lie. They are

attacking me back in my district. The attacks have ranged from anywhere that there would be a greater chance of workers maybe being killed by the legislation being passed to somehow Medicare is being cut. Two lies. Two lies. And they are being subsidized by the taxpayers.

I can give you a couple of examples of the organizations and how much money they have received in public grants. For example, in my particular district, the AFL-CIO, under the guise of Stand Up For America, spent over \$80,000. These on are ads back in my district.

Another organization called Save America's Families spent over \$85,000 on television and radio ads, not counting the amount of money they spent on Medicare events, spreading the big lie at taxpayer expense.

For example, the AFL-CIO, which is the umbrella group for these organizations, received in grants last year, 1994, \$1.2 million; and so far this year that we can document, they have spent \$1.4 million in attack ads spreading the big lie across the country.

So, basically, what we are doing is, once again, hard-working people send their money to Washington, DC. They turn around, the Government turns around and gives it out to organizations that spend it attacking people trying to change the status quo.

So those are the kinds of changes that we are trying to make back here. I guess we should be judged by our enemies. Those organizations that are the defenders of the status quo do not like what is going on back here, and it is a sign that we are doing our job. If you are not making some enemies in Washington, DC, you are not doing your job.

I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MCINTOSH].

Mr. MCINTOSH. You mentioned that this advertising was going on in Washington State in your home area, and that in many cases they were, in fact, misinforming the public about what was happening and doing so from groups who have been receiving a lot of grant money.

I had received some information that there are a list of eight different groups who have received nearly \$100 million in grants, who have spent over \$6 million in lobbying and political activities, giving people bad information about what is happening.

One of the groups that is not listed there is 60 Plus, and they commended us for our effort to try to end the subsidy for these groups that are engaged in this type of political activity. The 60 Plus Association represents senior citizens in this country. They felt seniors were being misled by a lot of this.

Was the National Council of Senior Citizens one of the groups that was involved in this type of political advocacy?

Mr. TATE. It is my understanding that they have been involved. In fact, the Save America's Families Coalition,

which includes Citizen Action, the National Conference of Senior Citizens, the AFL-CIO, the Service Employees Union, and others, are the ones that are paying for the millions of dollars of ads across this country. And the thing to keep in mind with that organization is that they receive over \$70 million every year, which makes up 96 percent of their entire budget, and then they turn around, and they are spending money with advertising.

Mr. MCINTOSH. Do you mean to tell me that they receive over \$70 million of taxpayer funding?

Mr. TATE. Absolutely. Taxpayer money, \$750 million every year in taxpayer money, 96 percent of their entire budget, and then they are turning around and using money to lobby against reforms that preserve and protect Medicare. Taxpayer funding of the big lie.

Mr. MCINTOSH. So this group has been receiving all of this taxpayer money, and yet they are spending it on commercials that are not even truthful to senior citizens?

Mr. TATE. You are exactly right.

Mr. MCINTOSH. That is incredible.

Mr. EHRLICH. If the gentleman would yield, I think I speak for all three of the sponsors of this rider when I say we have a great deal of confidence that your constituents will see through all of these misrepresentations, because facts are dangerous to demagogues.

Mr. TATE. If the gentleman would yield, we have received, I think as of mid-yesterday, about 660 calls on this particular commercial that is running back in our district, and over 640 of the calls were saying, RANDY, stick to your guns; do not give up; we elected you to go back there and make real change. What they are outraged about is the outrageousness of the lines and the fact that the opposition has no plan and that it is all being paid for, these ads, or at least subsidized, by their own tax dollars.

Mr. EHRLICH. The moral here is that these people are smarter than these organizations give them credit for.

Mr. TATE. Exactly.

Mr. EHRLICH. I see we have been joined by our colleague and friend, Mr. ISTOOK from Oklahoma, and I know he has a lot to say on this subject. And I know I join my colleague, Mr. MCINTOSH from Indiana, in congratulating him on his great leadership on this bill, and I would like to recognize him.

As a lead-in to his comments, I would just like to point out the fact that I sat next to Mr. ISTOOK on the floor when we had our debate here a few weeks back, and we were frustrated. Obviously, we had a time limitation with respect to how we could respond to some of the charges from other side. I believe we were termed as fascists, one of the more interesting adjectives used to describe us on the floor that day.

I know it has been very, very frustrating for all of us involved in this

issue to have to respond to simple representations about what this rider is about. We have heard that it stops all advocacy, that Pell grants are affected, that specific groups are affected, that entitlements are affected, that the courts are affected, that States and local governments are affected, educational grants.

Is there any end to the misrepresentations we have heard on this floor? I direct the question to our colleague from Oklahoma.

Mr. ISTOOK. Well, I thank the gentleman. I appreciate people standing firm on this effort, because you hear outrageous things. You hear people saying, well, if you receive some sort of farm assistance or if you receive a student loan or if you receive welfare benefits. And yet the legislation clearly states that we are not talking about government assistance payments to any sort of individual. We are merely talking about government grants which go to organizations.

The situation is such that we have had what I feel is a perversion of the true reason for the existence of charities in this country, and Chairman MCINTOSH and his subcommittee has had hearings that has helped develop this. People talking about, you know, we were part of a group that was formed to be a nonprofit charity. We raised money trying to help people, trying to do good. Then we found people trying to take it over and saying, the way we can really do good is to spend all of our time and effort, or most of it, anyway, and our resources lobbying government for more government programs, more resources, higher taxes to pay for it, and they call that charity.

□ 1630

That is not charity. We need to help the private charities in this country to fulfill their true mission by helping separate them from those that are masquerading as charities, but are really extensions of the Federal Government and extensions of lobbying groups and political advocacy groups. We need to draw a clear distinction between them.

If someone says we want Federal money, now they are not forced to ask for Federal money, they are not forced to take Federal money, they voluntarily say they want Federal grants to further a purpose, which is different from so many other charitable groups. Yet at the same time, they want the Federal handouts, but they say nevertheless we want to continue to be political advocates rather than true charities.

There is a difference. There is a crucial difference in who we ought to be providing assistance to, and it really scares me that there have been some reports that say that the typical nonprofit group today receives a third of its money from the government. Now, that frightens me. We do not want people to be saying they are charities

when actually they are extensions of government agencies. If they are an extension of the government, they should accept the same type of safeguards which would control a Federal agency if it were carrying out a particular program.

They would never be allowed to engage in the type of advocacy that is involved there. So if they are carrying out a private function, that is great. They ought to be satisfied with the private dollars. If they want public dollars, then they ought to accept the types of limitations that accompany public dollars.

It is wrong to ask taxpayers to subsidize political viewpoints through this. Thomas Jefferson had a statement on this, and he said to compel a man to furnish funds for the propagation of ideas he disbelieves and abhors is sinful and tyrannical. I have no desire, and I know you do not either, to try to limit the ability of people to exercise their free speech rights with their own resources and their own money. But if they want to be dependent upon Federal funds instead, then they need to decide they should not be political advocacy groups. That is the key distinction that we are trying to address in the legislation.

I thank the gentleman for the chance to speak to that and want to yield back the floor to him.

Mr. SKAGGS. May I ask the gentleman one question. I do not want to waste a lot of time. If it is the gentleman's intention not to yield at all, I will leave the floor.

Mr. EHRlich. It is our intention not to yield.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman does not want to defend any of this with anybody with another point of view?

Mr. EHRlich. Mr. Speaker, since the gentleman trekked over from his office, we will yield.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time.

I think the point that the gentleman from Oklahoma was just making is very, very revealing of the fundamental distortions that are going on in this debate. Does the gentleman believe that the efforts made, for instance, by the American Red Cross to work with local and State governments on emergency planning is political advocacy that is somehow a problem in this country? Does he believe that the efforts of the American Red Cross to work with all levels of government to ensure that regulations are in place to make the blood supply safe, is that somehow political advocacy that warrants restrictions? That is what the legislation will do.

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Speaker, I think our colleague from Colorado makes a very good point there. There has been a lot of misinformation about the content of the bill.

No, I do not think those activities of helping to plan for emergency preparedness and working with govern-

ment agencies to implement a safe and effective blood supply in this country are political activities that are a problem. I do not think they should be defined as political activities.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, but that is what the legislation does.

Mr. MCINTOSH. If the gentleman would let me finish, Mr. Speaker. No, we have carefully, carefully crafted this bill to make it very clear that those activities are not covered. We have worked with the Red Cross and their attorneys in letting them know that it is our understanding that that would be the case.

What we are worried about are groups that would take Federal grants for those activities and then would begin running television advertisements or running media campaigns where they are advocating a particular point of view. So let me assure the gentleman we do not intend to cover those types of activities. We have worked with language that we think does not apply to them and have offered with the Red Cross to specify that very clearly.

Interestingly enough, even when we did that, they said, no, we still could not support this bill because we are concerned about the ability to be advocates. Then my question is, have they let their donors know that that is one of the things they have in their mission statement? Have they done a good job when they have done fundraising for these other activities of protecting the blood supply, working on emergency preparedness, of telling people, well, we also think it might be important that we could preserve the right to be a lobbyist? If they have done that disclosure, then they have acted in good faith with their donors.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield.

Mr. MCINTOSH. Yes, I will yield for a question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EHLERS). It is the gentleman from Maryland's time. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. EHRlich. The gentleman will yield for a short followup.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman not understand that very facile shift from advocacy to lobbying? Now, advocacy presumably does include the work of an organization like the Red Cross to make sure that we are prepared for an emergency or we have a safe blood supply. But with the nice easy elision to lobbying, we are suddenly into a whole different range of activity.

Why is it that we should restrict the ability of an organization like the Red Cross to advocate, not to lobby the Federal Government with Federal funds, that is against the law already, but to advocate for good emergency preparedness at the State and Federal and local level, what is wrong with that? Is that not absolutely consistent with what their donors expect them to be doing?

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

Mr. EHRLICH. Mr. Speaker, I will yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Speaker, of course the key is to understand, as we were careful to point out in the legislation, despite many misrepresentations that different people have made, is that we did not put in the legislation an absolute prohibition recognizing that some people may say, well, there is a gray line between things that are giving information back to government, and so forth. Some people may see some gray area between that and being an advocate, not an advocate for safety, not an advocate for emergency preparedness, but a political advocate.

So we specified in the legislation that we were not saying there is an absolute prohibition. We simply said that you should not be expending more than 5 percent of your non-federal funds, which is a threshold that has previously been adopted through courts and through the IRS as a key and reasonable threshold.

So we never said that a group could not engage in any type of political advocacy. We just wanted to make sure they were not engaging to any significant degree in that, and that very well takes in any type of gray area with which anyone may have a concern. So the opponents of this bill unfortunately have grossly misrepresented and overstated it, calling it, for example, a gag rule, which is totally absurd.

We have tried to take a common sense approach to it and understand that reasonable people may differ. Yet, I think that just about every American taxpayer who studies the issue would agree, it is wrong for taxpayers' money to be used for lobbying. It is wrong for taxpayers' money being used to prop up and be the difference between success and failure for an organization.

With that in mind, I would like to refer to an audit report which was part of the audit report, and I understand it was an internal audit report for the National Council of Senior Citizens which receives 95 or 96 percent of its budget from the taxpayers. Their own internal audit said the heavy reliance on governmental grants poses a potential danger to the long-term structure of NCSC. Absent such grants, the council would be unable to continue its current level of operations.

This is a group that is heavily engaged in lobbying in this country, and yet without government grants, they would not be able to sustain themselves. They do not have enough private sector support. They depend upon taxpayers' money, and I think that is wrong.

Mr. EHRLICH. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, I yield to our friend and colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN].

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the clarifying things about this aspect is what type of lobbying, and I under-

stand our colleague from Colorado picking an easily discussed case, the Red Cross. To my knowledge, the Red Cross has never put PAC money for or against any Republican or Democrat in either Chamber on this Hill.

There are groups sustained 95 percent by taxpayers' money that give not only 100 percent money to Democrats, but they have to be of a liberal ideological bent. They are not just lobbying for a cause like Red Cross earthquake assistance. They are lobbying to fatten their own coffers, particularly whiplashing senior citizens. If we cannot reform that in this Congress, then there are going to be people coming up here with torches as though this were Dr. Frankenstein's castle to burn this place down in about 4 to 6 years.

Mr. EHRLICH. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

I have a question for our colleague from the State of Washington. He has earlier described some of the ads being run against him. This has really hit him in a very personal way, and the good news being that of the, I believe, 660 phone calls he received?

Mr. TATE. Mr. Speaker, there were 640 positive saying, stick to your position.

Mr. EHRLICH. Mr. Speaker, with respect to the negative calls, the 20 or 30, did they actually buy what the commercials were trying to sell them? Was the staff able to articulate what these organizations were about and who was funding these organizations?

Mr. TATE. We are getting that message out as each call comes in. Mr. Speaker, our phones light up each time the commercials run. Like I said, 99 percent of the calls are positive. When we do get someone who is misled by what I call the big lie at taxpayers' expense, we spend the time to talk to them and let them know that they are being subsidized basically by their own tax dollars, and that alone is enough to outrage them. But when they find out that the advertisements are a complete misrepresentation of what the truth is, they are even more outraged.

Mr. EHRLICH. Mr. Speaker, The short follow-up question, the gentleman is one freshman.

Mr. TATE. Right.

Mr. EHRLICH. How much money with regard to the gentleman's best estimate at this time has been spent by all of these organizations just in his district within the last month?

Mr. TATE. Mr. Speaker, within the last month, we estimate about \$165,000. That is the estimate that comes out of the newspaper by these particular organizations in their press conferences; \$80,000 by Stand Up For American Families, which once again is an umbrella group for the AFL-CIO, which received millions of dollars in ads. The other one was for the Saving America's Families Coalition, another organization made up of the national seniors, the Council on Senior Citizens, the organization that receives over 95 percent of their money from the Federal Government.

So, to answer the gentleman's question, \$165,000 that we can identify just from newspaper reports, not counting the countless Medicaravans and other misrepresentation of the truth that are subsidized once again by the taxpayers, \$39 billion every year is being spent on lobbying, welfare for lobbyists.

Mr. EHRLICH. Mr. Speaker, I believe the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MCINTOSH], has a comment as well.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, after that I would like my friend from Maryland to yield.

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Speaker, if I could point out one thing that I think is undermining a lot of the public confidence of charitable groups, that is when they see activities like we are describing where groups who are supposed to be engaged in charity in fact turn themselves into political groups and engage in that type of activity.

That comes on the heels of a few years ago tremendous scandals with the United Way and groups where they were misappropriating funds. By the way, they have cleaned up their act. I certainly hope they end up supporting our effort to end welfare for lobbyists to reassure people that they have changed and do not want to see the continued practice where a charity says they are doing one thing and then in fact does something else with the money they have raised. In this case it is engaging in political tactics that are totally unacceptable because they are misleading the public about very key and critical issues.

So there is a question of confidence about what can citizens expect from charitable groups. We heard from a lot of the charities who are very active in a day-to-day basis in helping people, saying they want to see this bill passed because they want to restore that confidence. They want us to go forward in this area and clearly separate lobbying and political activities from charitable activities.

So I think we can do them a tremendous favor in this country by helping to restore that confidence.

I also appreciate the gentleman from Washington being willing to share with us his experience in his State as an example of what has been happening there.

Mr. EHRLICH. Although this is highly unusual, out of an overabundance of friendship for my colleague, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER], I will yield to him for a brief question.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate very much my friend from Maryland yielding. We are pleased to have him as a member of our delegation, even though from time to time we may disagree.

I ask my friend from Maryland, I have a letter here addressed: Dear STENY. It makes some comments, but it concludes with this: "To unduly restrict our ability to work with governmental representatives and agencies through the additional regulation envisioned by the Istook amendment would

not be in the best interest of millions of people who rely on the Red Cross when help cannot wait. Sincerely, Elizabeth."

□ 1645

All of us know that Elizabeth Dole, the wife of majority leader of the Senate, is head of the Red Cross. Throughout this letter, as the gentleman may know, she is very concerned about the Istook amendment's proscription on the ability of the Red Cross to advocate positions which it believes to be in the best interest of the people of this country.

Mr. EHRLICH. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Maryland for asking a very legitimate question and I know my colleague from Oklahoma, who has had very, very recent communications with the Red Cross, as well as my colleague from Indiana, wants to answer my friend's question.

Mr. ISTOOK. Surely.

Mr. Speaker, I think what we have seen is there has been a vast disinformation campaign that has been stimulated by groups receiving Federal funds. They have made contracts, they have made some, frankly, scurrilous statements to all sorts of organizations, trying to use scare tactics, and certainly they have prompted concern to be expressed by those groups. What we have certainly done, in working on this legislation, is to have an open door policy, whether a group is for us or against us or in between, for an explanation.

We have certainly been working with the Red Cross both to explain to them the difference between what was told to them prompting their communications and what is really being pursued, and to make sure, of course, that the final form of the legislation is a form that does not put any undo restrictions on any sort of legitimate charitable organizations. What we have to do is make sure that the legislation has the appropriate filter to separate the good from the bad from the ugly.

Mr. Speaker, just because a group is organized with a so-called nonprofit structure does not mean that it has the reputation of the good deeds that the Red Cross, of course, is noted for. So we are working with the Red Cross and other organizations to address all legitimate concerns that are brought to our attention, and I think that is going to be reflected in the final product.

Mr. HOYER. Would the gentleman yield so I can enter into this colloquy?

Mr. EHRLICH. Yes, I would yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I understand what the gentleman has said. Presumably, Mrs. Dole, who has an ability to find out about the substantive legislation, in her letter to me of September 11 understood the legislation as it was then crafted; is that what the gentleman says? And if that is the case, have there been changes made since September 11 to the Istook amendment?

Mr. ISTOOK. What we have said, and the gentleman is aware, of course, from being a conferee with me on the Subcommittee on Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government, what we have said, I have said it to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] and to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS], I have said it to Members of the Senate and the House, and conveyed it to White House representatives, that anyone who has constructive recommendations to make sure that this legislation is put in its best possible form so that it does not have unintended consequences, we want to listen to and we want to work with.

We do have a problem sometimes with some groups, rather than trying to make constructive recommendations, they make a knee-jerk reaction just opposing it, and, frequently, that comes from organizations that are heavily dependent on Federal funds and there is, as the gentleman knows, a lot of discussion about it and a lot of representations made to people about what is or is not in the bill.

We want to work with all persons that are concerned, and that will be reflected in the final product.

Mr. EHRLICH. Mr. Speaker, in further answer to my colleague from Maryland's inquiry, I recognize my friend, Mr. MCINTOSH.

Mr. MCINTOSH. And let me say, Mr. Speaker, in the effort of being constructive in this, our subcommittee of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight will be having hearings further into the application of this bill. One of the hearings will be taking place next Thursday. We have invited Mrs. Dole to come and talk with us about areas where she thinks she might be hindered in her legitimate charitable activities so that we can address that problem.

We will also be asking if there are areas where she wants to cross over into the lobbying area, and is that more than 5 percent of their budget or would they be protected with that provision. I think that will allow us to build a record there of exactly how this bill would work, and, hopefully, reassure her of that.

I am looking forward to next Thursday and, hopefully, Mrs. Dole will be able to join us at that hearing.

Mr. TATE. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman yield.

Mr. EHRLICH. Mr. Speaker, I want to further yield to my colleague from Washington, but I think my colleague from Maryland raises a very legitimate point. I want to enlarge it, however, because one of the prime criticisms of our initiative has been, quote-unquote, defunding the left.

If anything has occurred over the last few weeks, Mr. Speaker, it is a fact that groups from the right, the middle, and the left have problems with this legislation. I was driven by no particular philosophical orientation in becoming a cosponsor, along with these two gentlemen, of this bill, other than my

philosophical orientation to give the American taxpayers a break.

We have groups, I know, on the right who have opposed this bill; now we have groups on the left and in the center. I believe the "defunding the left charge" is now an empty charge. And certainly if we look at the groups actively lobbying against this bill, it just does not make sense.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleagues from the State of Washington.

Mr. TATE. Mr. Speaker, I have two quick questions in response to the comments from across the aisle to the chairman of the committee. What is the threshold, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. MCINTOSH. The key threshold is that for groups who take no Federal money at all, they are not covered by this provision. They can lobby. They can do whatever they would like to with their money.

For those groups who do take a Federal grant, are subsidized by the taxpayer in their activities, they can spend up to 5 percent of their own funds, no money from the taxpayer but 5 percent of their own funds, to lobby, and we are allowing that so they can be advocates at the local and Federal level. But when they start becoming predominantly a lobbying group and go over that 5-percent threshold, we are asking them to give up that taxpayer subsidy.

They make a choice, Mr. Speaker, they can be a lobbying group or they can be a charity, but we are not going to let them lobby with taxpayer dollars.

Mr. TATE. One last question, I guess a two-part question. One is, the 5 percent, up to the first \$20 million. That would work out to be a million dollars in lobbying, is what we are talking about. Not exactly shutting down lobbying, as we know it. They would still be able to lobby. They should be able to get the job done on a million dollars.

And after that first \$20 million, as I understand it, it is 1 percent after that. So we are talking about a significant amount of money. We have not ended it all together. We are not limiting free speech, but we are putting some limits so they cannot abuse the process, if I am not mistaken.

Mr. MCINTOSH. That is correct, and if the gentleman will continue yielding.

Mr. EHRLICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MCINTOSH. Let me also point out another key feature of the legislation. If a group decides to spend up to a million dollars in lobbying, they have to disclose that to their donors, so that we cannot have this secret effort on lobbying on the one hand with a group that is posing as one that is doing good works in charities when they go out to solicit money from the public. I think the donors have a right to know about that activity when they are making contributions as well.

Mr. EHRLICH. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, the gentleman just analyzed the various categories of recipients, and it is true, is it not, that category A, those groups who do not take any Federal grants, account for 9 percent of all the groups we are talking about; is that correct?

Mr. MCINTOSH. That is correct, although, as the gentleman from Oklahoma pointed out earlier, those small percentage who do receive Federal funds receive enormous amounts of Federal funds, and yield a disproportionate influence.

Mr. HOYER. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. SKAGGS. Would the gentleman yield on that point about who is covered?

Mr. EHRLICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my good friend from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. I thank my good friend from Maryland, Mr. EHRLICH, who makes a point that this legislation was originally perceived as defunding, trying to defund the left. He points out correctly that those in the middle and those on the right have now raised similar concerns to those on the so-called left.

As a matter of fact, I have in my hand another letter from Fred Kammer, Father Kammer, who is president of Catholic Charities of the United States of America. I do not know whether the gentleman from Maryland puts them on the left or on the right or in the middle. I would suggest they probably have a number of views which fall into maybe all of those categories at any given time.

Mr. EHRLICH. Depending on the issue, I guess.

Mr. HOYER. Depending on the issue. That is the point I make. I would suggest this is a very serious issue, and we are discussing it seriously, and I think that is important for the American public.

I have read a number of legal opinions, or CRS reports, including Professor Cole from Georgetown University Law Center, the law center from which I graduated. I have not seen a case that justifies or condones or holds constitutional the proscription of private dollars, nonpublic dollars, on lobbying or contact of government or trying to impact on policy activities of nonpublic groups.

Furthermore, let me suggest not only is that why it is a serious issue, because whether it is left, right or middle, we believe this is violative of the constitutional right to free speech and the right to petition one's government, but, in addition to that, I say to my friends, who I know feel very strongly about this, that the issue here is the reason so many of these groups have public funds is because we have decided as a Congress and as a people that it is better to give to the American Red Cross or the Catholic Charities or some other group funds to solve certain problems.

They are not necessarily doing us a favor. We are not doing them a favor

by giving them these resources. In fact, we have judged that Catholic Charities does good work, and we want to give them resources because we believe they will more effectively distribute those funds than will the government.

So I say to my friend, as he can see, it is not just that, yes, they have Federal funds, because we have decided that we believe they can apply those funds effectively. As a matter of fact, I think that is consistent with some of the philosophy that Members on the other side of the aisle have discussed recently.

Mr. EHRLICH. Reclaiming my time, I intend to yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma, who is chomping at the bit over there, but, first, two points.

First of all, the gentleman raises a very legitimate point, again, with respect to the mission of these nonprofits and for-profits we are talking about, because that also has been lost in this dialog, the fact that we also cover under our version of this initiative for-profits.

Mr. SKAGGS. And individuals, too.

Mr. EHRLICH. No, no.

Mr. MCINTOSH. Actually, they are expressly exempt.

Mr. SKAGGS. Wrong.

Mr. EHRLICH. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is right. Over the years, there has built up a momentum so that certain organizations have not only assumed a responsibility for their original mission but also a dual responsibility to advocate on behalf of their mission.

That is the bottom line philosophical question here when we get down to it, where that line really should be drawn. We believe that line has gone out too far, and I think we have some evidence presented with respect to Members of the freshman class, particularly concerning advocacy efforts around the country today in support of that point.

Also, the gentleman from Maryland, being a learned lawyer of good reputation, I will have delivered to his office tomorrow a memorandum from Professor Harrison, I believe from Virginia concerning the constitutionality of the Istook-McIntosh-Ehrlich initiative, which the bottom line is that it is constitutional. In fact, government does this all the time, attaches specific requirements, and I will yield in a moment to the gentleman from Indiana, but I will be glad to engage my friend from Maryland in a colloquy after he has an opportunity to read that memorandum as well.

I will at this time yield to my friend from Oklahoma, Mr. ISTOOK.

□ 1700

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

I would like to address the two points that the gentleman from Maryland mentioned, one regarding court decisions. In 1983 the U.S. Supreme Court, in the case of Regan versus Taxation With Representation, addressed that point when a group wanted to engage

in lobbying and wanted to have Federal subsidies for that through the Tax Code.

The Court noted that Congress does not have to subsidize lobbying. In fact, the U.S. Supreme Court specified that "The Federal Government is not required by the First Amendment to subsidize lobbying. We reject the notion that First Amendment rights are somehow not fully realized unless they are subsidized by the State."

The notion that the government has to buy you a microphone or buy you a newspaper or give you funds with which to carry on your lobbying activities, I think is blatantly absurd. The taxpayers are not required to subsidize lobbying. If a group wants to lobby, that is fine. That is their constitutional prerogative, but it is not free speech if they say, "We want the taxpayers' money." That is a clear delineation and distinction.

The gentleman also mentioned, of course, Mr. Speaker, something from someone at Catholic Charities, U.S.A. He may not be aware, Catholic Charities, U.S.A. annually receives from the taxpayers, from the government, almost \$1.3 billion. It is two-thirds of their operating budget. I think there is a bona fide question, anytime an organization has that level of funding, whether they are really an organization separate and apart from the government, or themselves have become an extension of the government.

If we have that kind of money flowing through the Department of Health and Human Services or HUD or the EPA or the Labor Department or Education or anything else, we would insist upon safeguards to limit its use, to assure it is not used for lobbying or political advocacy.

When any group has that level of its funding, \$1.3 billion, just a little under that, two-thirds of its budget coming from the U.S. Government, we have a serious question at what point do they cease to be a private group and become an extension of the government.

We are talking about safeguards with taxpayers' money. We are trying to be very reasonable and prudent in the approach. We are open-minded, we are listening to that, but this is a severe problem that does need to be addressed.

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

Mr. EHRLICH. I yield again, for the third time, to my colleague, the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. I want to thank profusely my colleague from Maryland, because I know this is their special order, but this is an important issue. We need to discuss it back and forth.

I would say to my friend, the gentleman from Oklahoma, for whom I have a great deal of respect, because he is one of the hardest working Members of this House, he has a good intellect and is industrious in applying that intellect, but I would say to my friend in this instance, he does reference language, but that language refers, as the

gentleman knows, specifically and exclusively to taxpayers' money. The gentleman's amendment relates to nontaxpayers money, because it would not be necessary, because under present law, taxpayers' money is already legally precluded from being spent on lobbying activities.

The gentleman seeks to get at non-Federal taxpayers' money. That is the very significant and important distinction that the Court draws. It drew it in *Russell versus Sullivan*, it drew it in the *Regan* case that you referred to, and it has drawn it in every case that I have reviewed.

Mr. Speaker, I would say to my friend, I thank him for yielding, and look forward to reading the memorandum that he is going to provide me with, but that is the nub of this issue. We are not talking about taxpayers' funds, we are talking about private funds.

Mr. EHRLICH. There is also a question here with regard to fungibility, and I know my colleague is going to address it.

If you read the *Regan* case, it was not a question of whether the subsidy would be received in the form of a check. The question was whether the organization would enjoy the tax-exempt status which, as the U.S. Supreme Court said, is a form of subsidy, just as a Federal check, a direct payment, would also be a form of subsidy.

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, speaking both in terms of money received from private sources but protected by the Tax Code, private money but therefore, a form of Federal subsidy, or direct payments from the Government and therefore also a Federal subsidy, the Court applied the same standard in the language of the *Regan* case to both of them when it mentioned and held that taxpayers are not required to subsidize political activity or lobbying activity, whether that subsidy came in the form of a direct payment from the Government or whether it came in the form of favorable treatment through the Tax Code, even though you were talking about the use of privately earned money.

So I would submit to the gentleman that the Court was addressing funds from a private source as well as funds directly from a public source.

Mr. EHRLICH. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman from Maryland, I am happy to have had his part of the colloquy. This is a very important issue. He has raised some very important questions. I know you disassociate yourself from some of the terms that were used to describe the three of us during the debate on this floor a few weeks ago. That is why I specifically recognized both the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS] and the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER]. They are both well respected and we appreciate their input.

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

Mr. EHRLICH. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MCINTOSH. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

This is really in response to the question from our colleague, the gentleman from Maryland. One of the things we heard in our subcommittee over the summer when we had hearings on this was that there are groups out there who receive Federal funds and actually violate the provisions of their grants, and end up using those funds to, in the case that came before us, to conduct a symposium on how to lobby local governments. When the agency was notified of this, they did nothing to prevent that and did not ask that the grant be repaid and, in fact, were implicitly condoning that type of activity.

Therefore, I think some of the bill's provisions we have are aimed at, first, forcing disclosure on how both the private and the public sector funds are spent; and second, making it a very, very clear demarcation that if you are receiving a Federal taxpayer subsidy, you should not be lobbying. That, I think, is a very simple formula that underlies all of this effort, and one that I am very convinced the American people want to see.

Some of the editorial boards in my district have been commenting on this. By the way, they do not agree with a lot of the things I have been trying to do as a freshman Republican in reforming this, but in this area they do think we are on the right track, because, quite frankly, they did not know this lobbying was going on and they do not think it is appropriate to be doing it under the subsidy of a Federal taxpayer grant.

Mr. EHRLICH. It is certainly a new issue, and I think, quite frankly, that has been part of the problem. I know the gentleman from Indiana would agree with me, that certainly has been part of the problem. People were not ready to interpret this issue, to hear the terms of the debate. They really did not know what the status quo was. You may have received some opposition from your local editorial boards, but it is nice to know.

Mr. MCINTOSH. If the gentleman will yield, in this case the editorial boards are strongly in favor of it.

Mr. EHRLICH. That is nice to know, as well.

Mr. MCINTOSH. I will submit for the RECORD some of the editorials they have written. In this case, fairly liberal folks are saying, "You are on the right track, we need to clean up the outfit in Washington and end this government subsidy of lobbying."

Mr. EHRLICH. In addition to your local editorial boards, it is nice to know that groups, highly respected groups like the National Taxpayers Union, Citizens Against Government Waste, the National Association of Wholesale Distributors, the Eagle Forum, the Competitive Enterprise Institute, the 60-Plus Association—in fact, we have two senior citizens orga-

nizations supporting this initiative—the National Association of Manufacturers, and the list goes on and on, a lot of these groups appreciate the importance of this particular initiative. That is why they have come forward to support us.

I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I realize our time is running low. I just want to say that I applaud my colleagues for working on this effort, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. TATE], the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. EHRLICH], and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MCINTOSH]. I think this is an extremely important issue.

Again, the heart of the matter I think was summed up, I am told, and I did not witness it, but I am told by a colleague that the President was good enough to appear on a local talk show recently while he was visiting another State. The first question asked him was how he felt about groups that are lobbying receiving Federal grants, taxpayers' money being used to subsidize that. His response was to say, "Well, I am in favor of free speech," and then changed the subject.

The essence of this point is it is not free speech. If you have organizations sometimes receiving a half a million dollars, \$1 million, \$10 million, \$76 million, \$100 million, over \$1 billion, in one case, that is not what we categorize as free speech. We are talking about public money which has to have public protection. If there were a Federal agency engaging in these matters with taxpayers' money, everyone in this body, I would hope, would be outraged. When Federal money is being used to more or less have extensions of Federal agencies or extensions of a political party to do their bidding, that money deserves to have the same safeguards as if it were being spent directly through a Federal agency, and we are trying to honor that principle.

Mr. EHRLICH. What we are really talking about, at a very bottom line, fundamentally, is the Federal taxpayer's dollar being spent on direct service, actually helping the American people. I congratulate the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ISTOOK] for his great leadership on this bill as well.

I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MCINTOSH. The gentleman is exactly right. We are talking about using this Federal money for real services that help people, in contrast to what our colleague, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. TATE] pointed out, where they are funding the big lie and misleading the public about very important issues.

Mr. EHRLICH. What better lead-in to close our colloquy than to yield to our friend, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. TATE].

Mr. TATE. Batting clean-up on this, I just want to thank the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. EHRLICH], the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MCINTOSH],

and the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ISTOOK] for their leadership on this particular issue, and once again to reiterate \$39 billion every single year is spent on lobbying. It comes in many forms, whether it is lobbying against the flag amendment, which we recently had on the floor, or right back in my own district where they are funding \$165,000 in radio and television commercials spreading the big lie. And once again, that is taxpayer-funded, if not directly, indirectly, subsidizing the spreading of the big lie.

What we are trying to do, as the chairman, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MCINTOSH], has said, is bring trust back in Government. People will know that when money is sent to the Government, it is being spent as it is designed, not for partisan politics. It should be spent to help the people of the United States and spent wisely. What we are trying to do is bring trust and responsibility back to Government, and this really puts faith back in Government. I am excited by what you folks are doing, and I just want to commend your work on this issue.

Mr. EHRLICH. Directed to the gentleman from the State of Washington, you have helped me to regain some of my faith; not that I have lost much, it has been a great 8 months here, but your constituents can still discern the difference between the truth on one hand and a lie on the other, and I think you will be all the better for it. I thank my colleagues very much.

#### AMERICAN CITIZENS RECENTLY SENTENCED TO IMPRISONMENT IN COMMUNIST VIETNAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, we have a tragic situation going on, as this, the most powerful, deliberative body in the free or democratic world, meets. We have American citizens sentenced to 7 and 9 years of imprisonment in Saigon, and some day it will be renamed Saigon again, not named after a Communist killer named Ho Chi Minh. Just as Lenin's name was removed from beautiful St. Petersburg in northern Russia, and as Stalin's name was removed from a strategic battle area in World War II, Stalingrad, and the city has back its less bloody name of Volgograd, some day it will be Saigon again. So as a free man, I will continue to call it Saigon.

In Saigon, and I want to speak slowly for our official recorder of debate here, so we get these names right, and unfortunately, the Americans sentenced to prison in Saigon are naturalized Americans; as was Alexander Hamilton naturalized, as is Henry Kissinger, as are a lot of great Americans who have invented things and fought and died for this country and our liberty.

Unlike Harry Wu, who I had a chance to meet as he was testifying before the

Committee on International Relations of the gentleman from New York, BEN GILMAN, they did not affect Christian first names, probably because they are not Christians, they are Buddhists. But if they had taken an anglicized name, it would be easier to imprint in the consciousness of the American people and freedom-loving people in Europe and around the world the name of a victim of Communist tyranny, as we were able to do with Mr. Wu, because he took my father's first name, Harry. "Harry Wu" became a battle cry for liberal Democrats like the gentlewoman from California, NANCY PELOSI. It got all mixed up with the trip of the First Lady over to the Beijing Conference, the very controversial U.N. conference.

□ 1715

So much international pressure that the Chinese communists in Beijing knew there would be no trip of Hillary Clinton if they did not release Harry Wu.

But meanwhile, in the other Chamber, and I am going to go slow here so that I do not skirt a line and violate comity with the other Chamber on the north end of this building. But how is it that the Senate could vote yesterday blocking Senator BOB SMITH of New Hampshire's reasonable amendment, endorsed by the chairman of Foreign Affairs, Mr. HELMS, the chairman of Defense, Mr. STROM THURMOND, and the leader of the Senate and leading presidential candidate, BOB DOLE? How is it that a bunch of Republicans over there could dismiss Senator SMITH of New Hampshire's reasonable amendment that no trade negotiations could be furthered with United States taxpayers' money, let alone setting up an embassy in the communist capital of Hanoi, unless these human rights violations are reversed and these two Americans are set free, as Harry Wu was set free in China, and that we get a fullest accounting, that is a very key word. Not "full" or "fully." But "fullest" means reasonable accounting with the communist giving up the politburo and the Communist Central Committee records on our missing in action.

Unless those two things, and a handful of other reasonable small things, are conformed with by this communist government in Hanoi, as we put tremendous pressure on Castro and the communist government in Havana Cuba today, unless these reasonable requests are taken care of, then no money from the taxpayers of the United States Treasury should be provided to the communist government in Hanoi.

There is a cover story on a national magazine in the last couple of weeks about communism being far from dead. Not as long as it is persecuting 1,260,000,000 people in China. That is the United States plus a billion people. Not as long as Russia is rebuilding its KGB apparatus under a new name, under one of their old leaders, Yevgeniy

Primakov. I have met with him in KGB headquarters with HENRY HYDE some years back. He is now helping to build up the intelligence capability of terrorist states like Iran, so designated by the State Department, even under liberal leadership under Clinton's appointed secretaries and under Secretaries.

Not only do we have that emerging problem in the much-reduced empire that is now down to Russia and a few adjoining countries they consider within their hegemony, countries that rely on them for gas and oil and other critical things to keep cities running. There are terror regimes still, depending on how you count the numbers of people that are terrorized, in Cuba, North Korea, we do not get much argument on North Korea, and communist Vietnam.

Very few, if any, Democrats in the other body, and most of the Republicans who voted against Mr. SMITH, all of them as a matter of fact, they dropped the word "communist" from any discussion of Vietnam and Hanoi, using it occasionally because "socialist" is in their title, as it was with all the communist countries at the height of the cold war when they were killing and jailing people by the tens of thousands, and killed hundreds of thousands, if not millions, in the Vietnam Southeast Asia area and in the Korean War. They always substituted the word "socialist" for "communist." Even they knew the dreaded impact of the word "communist."

But with Cuba, North Vietnam, now all of tortured Vietnam, North Korea, and communist China still engaging in massive human rights violations, why are two naturalized United States citizens written off, rotting in prison for 2 years this November in Saigon?

Here are their names: Nguyen, N-G-U-Y-E-N which is the Vietnamese cultural equivalent to Jones and Smith combined. It is the most common name in Vietnam society. Nguyen Tan Tri. Not a hard name to remember. Nguyen Tan Tri.

He was given a 7-year sentence. Tran Quang Liem. My ninth grandchild is named Liam, Irish-Gaelic. Liem should not be so hard to remember. Mr. Tran and Mr. Nguyen, 7 and 4 years respectively sentenced, and the U.S. State Department said it was unwelcome; that it was an unwelcomed deed.

Further on in the press release from an Associated Press story on August 16, the day after they were sentenced during our break; no one here to speak up for them on the House floor, myself included, the State Department statement goes on further to say that it was "disappointing." "Disappointing and unwelcomed."

Disappointing, because the sentence happened 6 days after the U.S. Secretary of State, in the job that was first held by Thomas Jefferson, whose beautiful marble medallion is up here, Warren Christopher posed in front of a bust of communist killer, Ho Chi-Minh,