

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.

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

#### TOP 10 GOP OUTRAGES REGARDING MEDICARE REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WISE] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, before I begin my next text, I yield to the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. SLAUGHTER].

#### FORGERY OF NATIONAL ALLIANCE FOR JUSTICE DOCUMENT

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WISE] for that, because I want to tell everyone what Washington's dirty little secret is, since they have been talking about it all afternoon.

The committee staff of this group over here forged a document yesterday. They took a letterhead from an organization that they had asked to come in to testify, took it, as though it was from this organization, copied down the board of directors and listed their members and put next to some of them millions of dollars that they claimed they got in Federal grants.

Mr. Speaker, when we heard from the the National Alliance for Justice, the woman who heads it up, she told these people over here that she does not get a dime's worth of Federal money. She said that she not only resented the fact that they forged that document with false testimony, but she also said, I will not tell you what these people get in Federal money. I do not know. But there is one person here, she said, this afternoon, that has given me permission to tell you how much Federal money she gets. It is the Arts Alliance. Zero. Zip.

Mr. Speaker, do the people care on this committee? Not a bit. I sat as a member at the Waco hearings.

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Speaker, would the gentlewoman yield?

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, I control the time, and the gentleman will have time later.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from West Virginia controls the time.

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman has made a very serious—

Mr. WISE. Regular order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EVERETT). The gentleman from West Virginia controls the time and has yielded to the gentlewoman from New York.

The gentlewoman from New York may proceed.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, on the Waco hearings we found that the committee had turned over lots of its responsibilities to the NRA, and now we find this same committee staff is

forging documents to be given out to the press purporting to be a true statement. Mr. Speaker, in the name of all the men and women who served us before in this House, who stood on this floor and with truth and with eloquence did the best they could for the American people, I am more than outraged at the dirty little secret that this subcommittee would stoop to crime in order to make their point.

I am sure they are going to have an hour more of it this afternoon, but if people want to know the truth of the testimony, they should let us send them the record of that hearing.

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, I am going to address an issue because, as this Congress heads off for recess, I think it is time to talk about the Republican excesses.

What has been going on here for the last few weeks, Mr. Speaker, it suddenly occurred to me, I hear a lot about Medicare when I am home, and I hear a lot about Medicaid, and they are very, very important topics. But I think it is also important to look at some of the other things taking place that affect middle-income and low-income men and women in this country and to talk about exactly what is taking place.

It occurred to me it is a lot like watching a freight train go by. The train builds up speed, and when it starts rolling, a person cannot pay attention to what is in each car, they just know there is an enormity. There is a big train going by. I want to talk about what is in each car. So I have compiled a list here, and with apologies to David Letterman, we have titled it the top 10 GOP outrages, because I think the people in the country, Mr. Speaker, ought to know exactly what has taken place.

This is not a complete list. This is only a quick culling of the various committees to see what we consider to be the top 10 outrages. Top 10 outrage No. 1, this is the most incredible one, in some ways, to me, because it is the idea that came about in the Senate finance committee called child support surcharges.

People are not going to believe this one. This is if an individual has to get the State to get child support for them and to track their deadbeat spouse down someplace to get that child support, they will now pay a 10 percent surcharge under this one. They will pay a 10 percent commission. Child support surcharges. I like it. It turns every human resource worker into a bounty hunter. Put a star on them, send them out, 10 percent right off the top. They are already down, let us put them down a little more.

No. 9 sort of follows up on this. This does get into the Medicaid area. No. 9 is liens on Medicaid families. This one may boggle people's minds a little bit. Medicaid families, by definition, for the most part, are already low income. In many cases they may be middle-income families that have their mother

or father or grandparent in a nursing home. This takes all the Federal protections that are built in against putting them into poverty.

What it would do, Mr. Speaker, is to permit Medicaid to put liens on the elderly and their families in this way. There would be no more guarantee under the Medicaid block grant of coverage for nursing home care after an individual or family has spent its savings. Right now if a family spends their assets down to a certain level, they do not get kicked out of the nursing home. This would remove that protection. It eliminates current protections that stop the States from imposing liens on personal residences. That is homes and farms.

States would be required to require adult children of nursing home residents to contribute toward the cost of their parents' care, regardless of the financial obligations. Regardless of the financial circumstance or family obligations of the adult children. The States could be allowed to do this.

There would, finally, be no more guarantee, it is gone, that spouses of nursing home residents would be able to retain enough monthly income to remain in the community. Presently, there is some protections for families from Medicaid. Those protections under the Medicaid legislation would be removed. That is No. 9.

Now, Mr. Speaker, continuing in the same vein let us go to No. 8. No. 8 is no more Federal nursing home standards. That one, I know, is hard to believe, that anyone, in their right mind, would say that after all the years that it took to finally get some nursing home standards, some minimal standards so that people are no longer lying in their feces, so that they are guaranteed adequate care, so that they cannot be strapped down without adequate due process, so that a whole lot of other things cannot happen to the loved ones we put in nursing homes, I know it is hard to believe, but, yes, it is true there would be no more Federal nursing home standards. It would strictly be up to the States.

I happen to think States are quite capable of the job, but the reality is, in many cases, it took the Federal Government to make sure there were adequate nursing home standards. So that is No. 8, no more nursing home standards.

To continue this juggernaut, No. 7, if an individual cannot get in the nursing home to get warm, they should not go home, because there is no more energy assistance. The LIHEAP program, the Low Income Heating and Energy Assistance has been stricken by the Republican leadership. It has eliminated all funding for LIHEAP, the Low Income Heating Energy Assistance Program that provides heating assistance for low-income senior citizens.

Mr. Speaker, in my State of West Virginia alone last year, LIHEAP served 190,000 people in the coldest