

bipartisan way on this agriculture bill. We brought it to the floor without a rule so that we could have unlimited debate on these issues. And what we find when we come to the floor is everybody wants to talk about everything but agriculture.

And the fact is, when we brought this bill up last week, the dilatory tactics that were undertaken by the minority precluded any substantive debate on agriculture. It was all about, we got one after another after another, motion to rise, motion to rise, motion to rise.

We could have been debating the gentleman from Massachusetts's amendment. We could have been debating the gentlewoman from Ohio's amendment and the gentlewoman from New York's and the gentleman from Wisconsin's, but we could not get a vote. We could not have any debate because of the dilatory tactics.

Now we come in today. We are prepared to debate the agriculture bill again, and we have a series of suspension votes, which normally means that we just voice vote them because everyone basically agrees to them. We are forced to vote on every single issue, rollcall votes that tie everybody up in knots, that preclude us from doing our committee work, that preclude us from having a substantive debate on agriculture. And now we propose, if we cannot have a substantive debate, we will have to limit the rule so that we can get back to the issues at hand and the minority complains.

You reap what you sow on the agriculture bill and every other bill. If we cannot work in a bipartisan way, then we have to have a rule.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I will not yield to the gentleman. He has had all night.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I am grateful that the Appropriations Committee has reported continued funding for the Agricultural Development in the American Pacific [ADAP] project and the Tropical and Subtropical Agricultural Research Programs, both conducted by the Cooperative State Research, Education and Extension Service within the USDA.

With committee provisions reporting ADAP funding at \$564,000, as in previous years, the American Government demonstrates its continuing commitment to provide funds and grants to its communities in the Asia-Pacific region. These include not only Guam, but also Hawaii, the Northern Marianas Islands, American Samoa, the Federated States of Micronesia, and the Freely Associated States.

ADAP funds a number of activities for the Asia-Pacific communities. These include financing research of regional agricultural problems common to members of the five land-grant institutions in the American-affiliated Pacific, strengthening market information systems, producing instructional materials development and distribution, and providing scholarships for land-grant faculty and staff.

I commend the committee's continued support for ADAP, however, I am disappointed with the decreased funding it has reported for

the Tropical and Subtropical Agricultural Research Programs. Not only does this program impact Guam, it also affects Hawaii, Florida, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. For the people of Guam, the Tropical and Subtropical Research Programs fund numerous activities. These include financing research contributing to the establishment of energy and labor efficient irrigation and fertigator systems, watermelon disease control, modeling crop production systems, market surveys, and the biological control of pests in order to increase productivity.

Although I have stressed the benefits Guam receives from these programs, I also point to the implications the Tropical and Subtropical Research Programs have on the neighboring regions. Knowledge and expertise culled from these studies not only improve Guam's local agricultural industry, they are disseminated throughout Micronesia, Asia, and Africa.

American tropical and subtropical regions face agricultural needs unique to other areas. Continued support for the Tropical and Subtropical Research Programs are necessary steps to improving not only the livelihood of the people of Guam, but also other tropical regions of the world.

I will continue to actively support funding for ADAP and the Tropical and Subtropical Agricultural Research Programs. These programs are fundamental vehicles for improving standards of living not only on Guam, but also other tropical regions of the United States.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN], chairman of the Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PEASE) having assumed the chair, Mr. LINDER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2160) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

#### A DOUBLE STANDARD

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

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot of talk recently in Washington about the influence of foreign money on Members of Congress and on the administration. The most recent media reports indicate that there may have been complicity between the government of the People's Republic of China and Mr. John Huang to influence our elections and certain Federal officials of our Government.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues may have missed a recent report in The Hill newspaper which reported that as

much as \$86 million was spent by foreign governments to lobby and conduct public relations with both private and public officials of our Government. It is ironic, Mr. Speaker, that it is perfectly legal for foreign governments to spend over \$86 million to lobby the Congress and the White House, but no one ever questions the ethical aspects of the process.

So while we are pointing fingers at China for alleged misconduct to lobby and influence our policymakers, there appears to be a standard that is confusing to me and I am sure to the American people. I call it a double standard.

[From The Hill, June 25, 1997]

FOREIGN STATES SPENT \$86 M TO LOBBY U.S.

(By Robert Schlesinger)

Foreign governments, led by Japan, reported spending in excess of \$86 million on activities including lobbying and public relations in the United States during the first six months of 1996, according to filings made to the Department of Justice under the Foreign Agents Registration Act (FARA).

Overall, foreign interests, working through more than 330 separate registered entities, reported \$430,867,734 in activities reportable under the FARA in the first half of last year, according to an analysis by The Hill of the attorney general's report to Congress on FARA filings.

Individuals or groups must register as foreign agents if they perform certain activities, ranging from lobbying to trade promotion, on behalf of a foreign entity, such as a government or corporation.

"The U.S. is definitely uniquely open and user friendly to official foreign lobbyists from all over the world," said Alan Tonelson of the U.S. Business and Industrial Council Educational Foundation (USBICEF). "This situation is not even close to being reciprocated anywhere."

The government of Japan, mostly through entities like the Japan External Trade Organization (JETRO), reported spending at least \$17,840,878—more than twice as much as any other government.

JETRO reported \$14,117,208 during the first six months of 1996. Their activities are typically along the lines of "research in matters concerning foreign trade between Japan and the U.S.," as a filing for JETRO states.

Other countries spent their resources on lobbying or "monitoring and analysis" of issues of interest to them. Mexico, the sixth-largest spending government at \$3,576,368, paid Burson-Marsteller \$563,000 for public relations on the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), which will be up for expansion in the near future. Mexico, which has been wracked recently by charges of corruption and narcotics problems, also spent a great deal of money on broader PR efforts to burnish its suffering image.

Burson, which made slightly over \$1.2 million over all from foreign entities, ranked only 11th in line in the 13 law/lobby/PR firms to gross more than \$1 million from foreign clients.

Most of the other top-spending governments devoted at least some of their expenditures to tourism-related activities. For example, the Bahamas and the Cayman Islands, the second and third largest spending governments at roughly \$8 million each, spent virtually all of their money promoting tourism, as did Ireland, the number four country.

New York City-based advertising agency DDB Needham Worldwide pulled in more than \$18 million, most of it from the National Federation of Coffee Growers of Colombia, which paid them \$13,965,723.68.

New York ad firms O'Leary Clarke & Partners and FCB/Leber Katz Partners Inc. were second and third respectively, making slightly over \$5 million each from the Cayman Islands (O'Leary) and Jamaica and the British Virgin Islands (FCB).

Washington law/lobbying firms also fared well. Patton Boggs, home of super lobbyist and name-partner Hale "Tommy" Boggs, pulled in more than \$3.5 million from such clients as Oman, Qatar, the Philippines and Pakistan. Other Patton Boggs clients who did not pay them during the six month time period include Hong Kong, Italy, the United Arab Emirates, France, Germany and Taiwan.

Other law/lobby/PR firms grossing over \$1 million with numerous active foreign clients were Fleishman-Hillard (including clients from Canada, France, Angola, Turkey, Northern Ireland and Japan), Cassidy & Associates (France, Australia, Japan, Saudi Arabia and Taiwan), the Bozell Sawyer Miller Group (Canada, the Bahamas, Bolivia, Japan and Indonesia), Arnold & Porter (Canada, Israel, Panama, Turkey and Venezuela), Burson-Marsteller (Hong Kong, Great Britain, Indonesia, Mexico, Pakistan, Turkey and Portugal), Washington & Christian (Antigua & Barbuda, Gabon, Guinea and Nigeria) and Hogan & Hartson (Canada, France, Panama, Russia, the Bahamas, Haiti, Japan, Great Britain and Taiwan).

Registerable activities include engaging in lobbying, "political activities," or public relations in the United States. A foreign agent must also register if he or she "solicits, collects, disburses or dispenses contributions, loans, money or other things of value . . ." This includes the promotion of trade and tourism.

Furthermore, ostensibly domestic entities don't have to register with the Department of Justice.

USBICEF's Tonelson noted that many domestic companies have become almost proxy foreign agents. "The China trade debate is a perfect example . . ." said Tonelson.

He added that, "the positions that they're lobbying for hard have become almost indistinguishable from the Chinese government, and in fact they've become the most effective voice for the Chinese government."

So, for example, while the Chinese Embassy paid a paltry \$18,750 to the law and lobbying firm of Jones, Day, Reavis & Pogue for keeping up on issues like Most-Favored-Nation (MFN) trade status, groups like the U.S.-China Business Council and large multinational corporations lobby the U.S. government in favor of the MFN renewal.

As of June 30, 1996, 595 active registrants (totaling 2,825 individuals) were registered to represent 871 foreign principals.

*Lobbying, law and P.R. firms grossing over \$1 million from foreign clients*

DDB Needham Worldwide ..	\$18,343,333
O'Leary & Clarke & Partners ..	5,139,405
FCB/Leber Katz Partners ..	5,131,928
International Registries Inc ..	4,709,640
Merkley Newman Harty ....	3,670,489
Patton Boggs ..	3,574,939
Fleishman-Hillard Inc ..	2,619,152
Cassidy & Associates ..	2,060,465
Bozell Sawyer Miller Group ..	1,786,831
Arnold & Porter ..	1,614,937

*Foreign governments spending over \$1 million*

Japan ..	\$17,840,878.31
Bahamas ..	8,722,043.54
Cayman Islands ..	8,212,662.99
Ireland ..	5,546,970.00
Marshall Islands ..	4,376,538.87
Mexico ..	3,576,368.31

*Foreign governments spending over \$1 million—Continued*

Canada ..	2,716,742.50
Hong Kong ..	2,569,187.99
Bermuda ..	2,473,473.71
India ..	2,273,449.09

### SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

### CHAOS IN MAJORITY AFFECTS FLOOR SCHEDULE

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I would simply like to take this time to correct the impression left by the previous speaker, the gentleman from New York, about what happened on the House floor tonight.

The fact is, the votes on suspensions which occurred tonight, to which the gentleman from New York objected, occurred at the insistence of the majority party, not at our insistence. In fact, we suggested five different propositions which would have enabled the Republican leadership of this House to close debate on measures in an orderly manner and at a reasonable hour tonight, and all five of those suggestions were rejected by the majority party leadership.

We, in fact, specifically asked and our party leadership specifically asked that the majority party consider not having the votes on suspension until tomorrow, and that was also turned down by the majority party leadership.

So lest the gentleman from New York be under the impression that this protracted session tonight occurred at the wish of the minority party in the House, that is specifically not the case. My staff tried. The staff of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT] tried. The staff of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] tried suggestions which would have avoided this meaningless extension of debate tonight. All of them were turned down by the majority party leadership.

I regret the chaos which has afflicted the House on the latter part of this day. It seems to be simply an extension of the chaos which is occurring within the majority party caucus.

I would note that I find it strange indeed that the Committee on Appropriations seems to be able to do its work in committee on an almost totally bipartisan basis on bill after bill after bill. But then when those bills come to the House floor, they are in fact first taken to the Committee on Rules and the Committee on Rules establishes a set of rules under which the bills can be debated which systematically denies to the minority member who has the re-

sponsibility for carrying the bill the right to participate in any meaningful way in the debate on the House floor.

As the gentlewoman from California said the other night in discussing this, almost without exception the amendments that were allowed the minority party by the Committee on Rules on appropriation bill after appropriation bill are only those amendments which everyone understands will lose. Any time there appears to be an amendment that we want to offer that has a chance of winning, the Committee on Rules rules it out. That is what has caused the problems around here.

I would suggest if you want the House to work, the majority party and the Committee on Rules needs to work out the same kind of working relationship with the minority that we have been able to work out on the Committee on Appropriations between the majority and minority.

We manage within our committee to get our work done. And then every time it is frustrated by the overt and undue partisanship that permeates the way the Committee on Rules handles its business. That is the reason why I was told by a member of the majority party in the Committee on Appropriations that the reason the agriculture appropriation subcommittee came to the floor without a rule was to avoid the chaos in the Committee on Rules.

I would suggest we have a fundamental problem with the leadership of the majority party in this House which is apparently in chaos. That chaos is spilling over into an incredible exhibition of arrogance on the part of the majority party in the Committee on Rules. Until that chaos is eliminated, until that arrogance is eliminated, we are not going to be able to proceed apparently in any orderly fashion to deal with the House's business. I regret that, but that is in fact the case.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR].

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

As ranking member on the agriculture subcommittee, I have to say what a true tragedy it is that a subcommittee that has labored hard to bring a bill to the floor that can pass has now been handcuffed under this rule, and tomorrow it is almost laughable that key amendments will be limited to 5 minutes on each side, not even enough time to explain to our colleagues what the content of these amendments are and to fully appreciate the debate on both sides.

Whether we are talking about crop insurance, peanuts, whether we are talking about the WIC Program, our Members will be handcuffed and it is wrong. It is wrong for the Committee on Rules to do this to the Committee on Appropriations.