

want to do it, do it on their time and on their own dime.

□ 1615

REPORT CARD ON CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EVERETT). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, what we have seen here in the House of Representatives today is truly remarkable. With the Federal fiscal year drawing to a close, the Republican leadership had a responsibility to put on President Clinton's desk 13 appropriations bills. How did they do?

Well, they got 2 of 13. Where I come from, 2 out of 13 is not a very good grade. In fact, I do not even know that it is high enough to earn an F. Down in Texas we would probably give it an F-minus for 2 of 13 bills, and the quality of Republican leadership that it represents. And when you look at those two bills, you find the quality is as sorry as the quantity.

The first bill they sent over there was the legislative appropriation, protect the Congress first, worry about the rest of the country last. And the second one was a military construction bill so loaded with pork barrel you could hear the pigs squeal all the way to Arlington, TX.

Today, this Republican leadership has had a truly unparalleled accomplishment, perhaps in the entire history of this country. They have come forward with conference reports on two appropriations bills for consideration in this House this afternoon, and they have had two appropriations conference reports defeated. Two up two down. Two very down. In fact, the last one of those appropriations bills, they could not even command a majority of the Republican Members, much less the Democrats.

So, here we are this afternoon, exactly 1 week after Speaker GINGRICH went up to New York and declared "I do not care what the price is. I do not care if we have no executive offices and no bonds for 60 days. Not this time."

We have had plenty of alarming rhetoric, but not very much responsible leadership. On appropriations, that leadership is 2 bills out of 13, as this fiscal year draws to a close this week-end.

Much of this is because at every stage in the budget process, the Federal Budget Act, the statute on the books, has been looked at as something to flaunt, something to ignore, something to violate from top to bottom. The keystone of this Republican plan to balance the budget is to take \$270 billion out of the Medicare system.

Can you believe that at this late date the Republicans at the end of the fiscal year have yet to even introduce the bill, to take that \$270 billion out of the pockets of America's seniors and America's disabled? They have not even filed

the bill that is the centerpiece of their budget.

From at least the first morning that the Committee on the Budget considered their budget, it was presented on a take-it-or-leave-it basis. Bipartisanship was out the window, because they had their plan and they were going to accomplish it no matter how many seniors or disabled people or people they viewed as powerless got in the way and got run over.

What about that great successful campaign ploy, the Contract on America? Well, they have not had quite as much success once they rolled it out here in the Congress. We have had 2 bills passed out of 11 in the planning. The first one was to repackage a Democratic idea that would have been law at the beginning of this Congress if the Republicans had not killed it last time. It is called the Congressional Accountability Act. It is a good bill. It passed on day 1 of this Congress and became law.

The second, an unfunded mandates bill, which passed with significant Democratic support. We have a third bill, a line-item veto bill, but Speaker GINGRICH is afraid that President Clinton will use it to slash and slice out some of that pork barrel that has been put into the bill. So he held up and delayed appointing conferees for that bill.

So we have two bills passed, two bills dead and gone, and seven lingering somewhere in the legislative process.

But nowhere has the lack of leadership been more obvious than when it comes to lobby control, when it comes to gift ban, with the relationships between legislators and lobbyists, when it comes to ethics. There we find, as we have just heard this afternoon, that the lobbyists they want to control are the Girl Scouts, the National Council of Senior Citizens, Catholic Charities, and the YMCA.

What about the polluters, what about the lobbyists who keep writing special loopholes in the Tax Code? What about those that loaded up these bills with pork barrel? That lobby control is nowhere. It has not been brought to the floor of this House. And we have the chairman of the Committee on Ethics telling us in her own words this week the letter of the law is not compelling to me; my goal is to have a process that the committee members feel good about.

Well, America does not feel good about what this Congress is not doing or what it is doing, and the way it has ignored ethics and proceeded to pursue a right wing extremist agenda.

WELFARE FOR LOBBYISTS AND A BALANCED BUDGET

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

Mr. TATE. Mr. Speaker, once again on the issue of welfare for lobbyists,

the facts remain, the President of the United States does not want to balance the budget. My good friends across the aisle are not serious about wanting to balance the budget. The fact is the Republicans have shown a proposal to want to balance the budget. What I do not understand is when we are \$4.9 trillion in debt, and if my daughter Madeleine continues to live to 72, which she will live probably to 172, she will have to pay in her lifetime \$187,150 just to balance the budget.

So why in the world would we subsidize lobbying, when we have all of these other needs out there? Why would we provide taxpayer funds for lobbyists?

Basically in my district, as you can see, they are running advertising, \$85,000 in television ads and Medicare ads and telephone calling. But it is the National Council of Senior Citizens that shows up again as one of those groups that receives over \$70,000.

Mr. MCINTOSH. If the gentleman will yield, are you telling me this group who receives 96 percent of its funds from the Federal Government has bought television campaign ads in your district?

Mr. TATE. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. MCINTOSH. That is incredible. No wonder it is difficult to get to a balanced budget when you have all these federally subsidized lobbyists out there fighting us tooth and nail.

Mr. TATE. The point to keep in mind is we are sending out tax dollars to groups to lobby for more of our tax dollars. There is something wrong there.

I would like to yield to the gentleman from Minnesota, also a member of the subcommittee that held the hearing yesterday.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. I would like to thank the gentleman from Washington for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to talk a little bit about some of the testimony we have heard. I do not remember the exact number, Chairman MCINTOSH, of hours of hearings we have had about this issue, but there are several things that surprise me, and frankly just shock me, in the testimony we have heard.

First of all, there are, in fact, groups out there receiving over 96 percent of their entire budget in Federal grants and then turning around and engaging almost exclusively in what I would describe as political activity. That is shocking enough.

But I will tell you what surprises me even more, and that is that some groups have come to Washington and have lobbied against this bill, and some good groups that do good things that we all know the names of, the YMCA, the Boy Scouts, that they would come to Washington and in effect defend this kind of activity. This is an affront I think to every taxpayer. It is in an affront to every democratic loving American, that groups can literally use and abuse the taxpayers' money to advance

their political agenda. It is almost as big an offense to me to see groups coming and defending this kind of activity.

Now, I will be the first to admit that the legislation that is being advanced may not be perfect, but it is hard for me to imagine anybody saying that there is not a serious problem. This is a serious problem.

This is probably only the tip of the iceberg. As the gentleman indicated, we are talking about \$39 billion that is being disbursed. Much of it is being funneled back into political activity. This may only be the tip of the iceberg. I think the taxpayers of the United States would be outraged if they knew this was going on.

I appreciate the fact that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MCINTOSH] has had the courage to bring this bill forward with the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. EHRLICH] and the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ISTOOK]. As I say, I think this is something that has been simmering beneath the surface for too long, and I am glad we brought it forward.

Mr. MCINTOSH. I thank the gentleman for his comments. One of the things we found out in our hearing yesterday is that many of the groups like the Red Cross and the United Way and the YMCA who were testifying before us yesterday, would, in fact, not be affected in the amount of advocacy that they could engage in. Because we have a 5-percent de minimis rule, they do not spend that much in lobbying.

My point essentially is that these groups would not be affected in their political advocacy because they are not big lobbying groups. But it is somewhat surprising that they are opposing this. I asked the YMCA do they disclose to their donors that they do a lot of advocacy and that they want to protect the ability of charitable groups to be lobbyists, and they did not really tell me how much they disclose that to their donors. They said they do a lot of mailings, but it was not quite clear when they asked them to give a donation if they tell somebody, "You know, we might spend up to 5 percent of that to be a lobbying group." I think some people would want to know that when they are giving money to these groups.

LAWS GOVERNING NONPROFIT LOBBYING ADEQUATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EVERETT). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. SLAUGHTER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, persons who are watching this afternoon, I have to tell you, if you are really going to find out what happened at that subcommittee meeting yesterday, I am afraid we are going to have to send you copies of the committee transcript. Because, frankly, you would have to be like Alice in Wonderland, who can believe six impossible things before

breakfast, if you believe what has been said here.

It was made clear by the witnesses yesterday that the law that is already on the books that governs nonprofit agencies is more than adequate. If there is any problem anywhere, if there is some kind of enforcement problem, deal with it.

The truth of the matter is, there has been no complaint to the IRS at any time that these laws have been on the books that any nonprofit agency in America broke that law. There is simply no indication of that at all.

What we have here is a bill that is intended to punish people who do not agree with the other side. They have made it clear. They have beaten up on the National Council of Senior Citizens as though they were the scourge of the earth and were going to bring down the country. We yesterday went through listening to people who headed up agencies, and we have had letters from people like the Girl Scouts, Catholic Charities, the YMCA, that this bill implies they are an enormous threat to the United States because of the grants they get.

Let me just tell you what it means to be a nonprofit agency and what you have to do under current law with Federal money. For example, you may not have any communication with the public and direct communication with legislators in an attempt to influence the introduction, enactment, modification or defeat of new or pending legislation in Congress or State legislatures. That does not apply to universities. We will get to them a little bit later.

You are prohibited from legislative liaison activities, including attending the hearings, gathering information, analyzing effects of such activities that support lobbying or are in knowing preparation for it.

You may not electioneer, directly or indirectly. This covers both attempting to (a) influence a Federal, State or local election, referendum, initiative, or similar procedure and, (b) to establish, support or administer a political campaign party, political action committee, or other organizations.

It's another matter what they do with their own money. It is not the Federal money. They have done nothing wrong with their Federal money. There is no indication anywhere that they did anything wrong with the Federal money that they got.

In addition, there is about a 5-page questionnaire which really smacks of McCarthyism frankly. I just learned today when a similar thing came up in the Justice Committee, that several Republicans took great umbrage at the questionnaire, things that had been asked of citizens of the United States.

For example, this questionnaire wants to know of every nonprofit agency, who do you associate with? Is that any of your business, who you associate with? Second, they have to contact every vendor with which they do business and get from them a written

statement on how much they in their private business spend for any lobbying activities.

In the case of the YMCA, the director told us yesterday that she does business with 148,000 vendors. She said that the onerous restrictions in this bill would obviously meet the purpose, which is to not allow nonprofits like the Boy Scouts and Girl Scouts and others who have always been perfect citizens, who are really always encouraging the community, to not let them have any say in this Federal Government—to give them an awful choice, to give up their citizenship or what little Federal money they get.

Now, how much do they get in a grant? Well, the first thing we need to know is the State and local governments in the United States get 90 percent of all the Federal grants. Do we ask them how they spend it? No. If they suddenly build something that does not go well, or a train that does not run, or a bridge that collapses, do we say how shameful this is to do this? No. We ask nothing in the world about them. The only restriction that we put on Federal grant money to a State and local government is to not let them charge their membership dues to an organization.

Contrast that to what I just read for you about what a nonprofit organization in this country has to do. Now, if you are a university, you are not even prohibited from paying your membership. Indeed, you can do that.

But when it comes to the misuse of Federal money that goes into the contracts, Mr. Speaker, since I have been in this House, and I am starting my ninth year, the misuse of Federal money that has been talked about most has come in two groups. First, the military contractors—which you all know the stories about the coffee pots, the toilet seats and the hammers; and universities who spent a lot of their research money or grant money for remodeling the university, for the President's salary, for putting dogs in kennels, or whatever other things they have done.

□ 1630

Did we call them before Congress and jump all over them and take the money away? No. We merely said we wished they would not do that.

Mr. Speaker, we have reached a new low. I want to tell everyone what Washington's dirty little secret is.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EVERETT). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

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