

ELIMINATING FLOOR PRIVILEGES OF FORMER MEMBERS AND OFFICERS

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H.Res. 648) to eliminate floor privileges and access to Member exercise facilities for registered lobbyists who are former Members or officers of the House.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 648

Resolved,

SECTION 1. FLOOR PRIVILEGES OF FORMER MEMBERS AND OFFICERS.

Clause 4 of rule IV of the Rules of the House of Representatives is amended to read as follows:

"4. (a) A former Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner; a former Parliamentarian of the House; or a former elected officer of the House or former minority employee nominated as an elected officer of the House shall not be entitled to the privilege of admission to the Hall of the House and rooms leading thereto if he or she—

"(1) is a registered lobbyist or agent of a foreign principal as those terms are defined in clause 5 of rule XXV;

"(2) has any direct personal or pecuniary interest in any legislative measure pending before the House or reported by a committee; or

"(3) is in the employ of or represents any party or organization for the purpose of influencing, directly or indirectly, the passage, defeat, or amendment of any legislative proposal.

"(b) The Speaker may promulgate regulations that exempt ceremonial or educational functions from the restrictions of this clause."

SEC. 2. PROHIBITING ACCESS TO MEMBER EXERCISE FACILITIES FOR LOBBYISTS WHO ARE FORMER MEMBERS OR OFFICERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The House of Representatives may not provide access to any exercise facility which is made available exclusively to Members and former Members, officers and former officers of the House of Representatives, and their spouses to any former Member, former officer, or spouse who is a lobbyist registered under the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 or any successor statute or agent of a foreign principal as defined in clause 5 of rule XXV. For purposes of this section, the term "Member of the House of Representatives" includes a Delegate or Resident Commissioner to the Congress.

(b) REGULATIONS.—The Committee on House Administration shall promulgate regulations to carry out this section.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) and the gentleman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry, if I might. Because of the State of the Union last night, and we always have the tradition of lots of former Members, I have two or three parliamentary inquiries that I would like to ask about the rules of the House governing this debate today.

Under rule IV, clause 4, if I might read it, because I think most Members may not have looked at this in a while: "former Members, Delegates and Resi-

dent Commissioners; former Parliamentarians of the House; and former elected officers and minority employees nominated and elected as officers of the House shall be entitled to the privileges of admission to the Hall of the House and rooms leading thereto only if,

"(1) they do not have any direct personal or pecuniary interest in any legislative measure pending before the House or reported by a committee; and,

"(2) they are not in the employ of or do not represent any party or organization for the purpose of influencing, directly or indirectly, the passage, defeat or amendment of any legislative measure pending before the House reported by a committee or under consideration in any of its committees or subcommittees."

In Mr. DREIER's proposal today, it specifically includes all registered lobbyists, any former Members that are registered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. What is the gentleman's inquiry?

Mr. SNYDER. My inquiry is this: Under the current rules that we are operating under today, do the rules prohibit any registered lobbyist who is a former Member from being on the floor of the House today or in the rooms adjoining thereto?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under certain circumstances, yes.

Does the gentleman have another inquiry?

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I would like a further amplification on that. Clearly, a registered lobbyist, since Mr. DREIER's legislation specifically refers to registered lobbyists, who are former Members, have a direct personal interest in this legislation pending today. I am not sure how that application, perhaps I have not been clear in my question, how a registered lobbyist who is a former Member could be on the House floor today when Mr. DREIER's legislation specifically involves registered lobbyists who are former Members.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. What is the gentleman's inquiry?

Mr. SNYDER. My inquiry is: Are those Members, former Members, who are registered lobbyists, are they not under current rules prohibited from being on the floor today because they would have, obviously, a personal interest in this, the intent of Mr. DREIER's bill?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Would the gentleman restate his question.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, my question is: If a former Member, who is currently a registered lobbyist, may that former Member, who is currently a former lobbyist, be on the floor today during the consideration of this bill?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Such a former Member should not be on the floor given the pendency of this motion.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, that is what my understanding was.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman have another inquiry?

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I do. Under the rules that I just read, it refers to the Hall of the House and rooms leading thereto. I assume that means the Speaker's Lobby and the two cloakrooms. Is that the Speaker's interpretation of that rule?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct. It also includes the Rayburn Room, just off the House floor.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, my third parliamentary inquiry, under current rules, I see no exemption, under the current rule, for any kind of an educational function to occur during the consideration of this measure; is that correct?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, my fourth parliamentary inquiry, this bill is now under our suspension calendar. Is it the Speaker's ruling that no amendments are allowed to broaden the application of this rule?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct.

The gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) may proceed.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, let me begin by thanking my friend from Arkansas for pointing to some of the important aspects of this legislation.

We are committed to bold, strong, dynamic reform for this institution. The Republican Party, Mr. Speaker, has stood for reform ever since I can remember. When I was in the minority, we had the privilege of working on the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, and that committee made a wide range of recommendations that would have focused on improving the deliberative nature of this institution, the transparency that is necessary, and the accountability. Unfortunately, when we Republicans were in the minority, they were not implemented. When we won the majority in 1994, we proceeded with very sweeping reforms which focused on lobbying and a wide range of other areas.

I have always argued, Mr. Speaker, that when we are completed with reforms, what we should do is proceed with more reform; and it needs to be done in a way in which we recognize the deliberative nature of this institution. I love this institution, Mr. Speaker. I proudly describe myself as an institutionalist. But we have a problem that needs to be addressed.

We have just begun this process of beginning the reforms for the Second Session of the 109th Congress. We have been working on reforms in the past session of Congress and in Congresses before that, but today we begin the work following the President's great State of the Union message on the issue of reform; and that is why this measure that we are moving forward with is one that we believe is very important, very transparent and gets at a problem that does exist.

The fact of the matter is, every single American has the constitutional right to petition their government. It is a precious right that we need to protect, and we need to do everything possible to ensure that every American can in fact come to their elected representative and state their opinion.

Concern has come forward from a number of Members, and this has existed really since the beginning of time, or since the beginning of this institution, where we have now seen former Members who are registered lobbyists come to the House floor and engage in lobbying activity. It is against the rules, it is not supposed to happen, but in fact it has happened. That is why this resolution is designed to ensure, Mr. Speaker, that former Members of Congress who are registered lobbyists do not have any kind of advantage over the average American when it comes to access to Members of the United States House of Representatives.

This resolution is clear. It says for the House of Representatives, the House floor and the gym, that former Members of Congress are not able, if they are registered lobbyists, to have access there. We believe that this is a concern that needs to be addressed; and I hope very much that we will be able to, as I have been very pleased in the past several weeks to work in a bipartisan way on the passage of this measure.

Let me state, Mr. Speaker, that this is the first step in our process of greater reform. My friend from Arkansas has come forward with some very interesting ideas. He testified before the Rules Committee. I will say to him right now that I am very happy and pleased to look at the proposals that he has offered and consider them legislatively.

This is the first day of the Second Session of the 109th Congress, but there are a wide range of reforms that Speaker HASTERT and I and others have proposed. There are a wide range of reforms that have been proposed by our colleagues on the other side of the aisle.

So I am convinced we can, in a bipartisan way, work to increase the level of transparency and make sure that there is a greater degree of accountability to this institution. This step is one that we can begin with; and it is one that should enjoy, as I said, strong bipartisan support.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1315

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, just over a year ago, on the very first day of the last session of Congress, I stood on the floor and watched the Republican majority force through a new set of House rules, rules designed to destroy the House Ethics Committee and to protect the leadership and their Members from any measure of real accountability.

And ironically they called it an ethics reform package. As a result of that package we still do not have a working ethics committee today.

On that day the word "corruption" became synonymous with Congress in the minds of many of the American people. 2005 went on to be a year defined by corruption in a way never before seen. The magnitude of the Republican culture of corruption overwhelming this House has only been exceeded by the high cost of that corruption for every man, woman and child in this country.

From the Medicare legislation affecting the health of our seniors, to the safety of our troops in Iraq, to the energy bills that determine if families can afford to heat their homes during the winter and drive their cars, nothing has proved too precious to avoid being sold for a price.

But despite this shameful record today, the Republican majority asks us to believe they have now seen the light and they are suddenly committed to producing an ethical Congress. And so we are opening this year with another ethics rules change.

It is a reform that I support, because the stranglehold lobbyists have over our process is indeed a tremendous problem facing our Nation.

The fact that there are 34,000 registered lobbyists in Washington today, 63 for each Member of Congress, demonstrates just how much power special interests wield in this Congress. And clearly, former Members of this body who lobby should not have special access to lawmakers on the floor or the gym.

But let me be clear, that this rules change is so minor in relation to the magnitude of the problem that it does not amount to a drop in the ocean. In fact, I suspect it is illegal already.

First, we know that they should not be here, but we have ignored that rule and done nothing to enforce it. But more importantly, shifting the blame for the rampant corruption in Washington only to lobbyists is part of an effort to avoid the central issue.

Corrupt lobbyists like Jack Abramoff have done much harm to this country, but they can only be as corrupt as those in power allow them to be. Let me say that again. They have done a lot to harm the country, but they can only be as corrupt as those in power allow them to be.

A true responsibility for corruption begins and ends here in this Chamber with those who pull the strings. Lobbyists are simply the symptom. The disease is here. Because after all, lobbyists are writing the bills that come out of this House because the Republican leadership wanted it that way. House rules are being ignored and our ethics process destroyed because the Republican leadership wants it that way.

We now have a government that is too corrupt to sustain itself any longer, too undemocratic to even pretend to be a democracy. We simply can-

not allow Band-aid packages like the one presented today to take the place of real reform. It is self-evident now that those who put America up for sale have neither the ability nor the credibility to lead us in a new direction.

It is going to take a lot more than preventing former Members from going to the House gym to produce an ethical Congress. If we ever hope to restore true democracy to our government, it is going to take a fundamental change in the culture of this institution, one devoutly to be wished and felt and certainly a thing that we will work hard for on this side.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to my good friend and classmate, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Financial Services.

(Mr. OXLEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have no particular problem with dealing with former Member/lobbyists on the floor of the House. This is where we do our business. The rule frankly has always been that there is no lobbying on the floor of the House. And, frankly, in 24 plus years here, I have never had that experience, even since I have been committee chairman. So to some extent we are somewhat tilting at windmills.

My big concern really is what the message is in terms of Members, former Members who are lobbyists in the wellness center, as we call it. I happen to chair that, and I have been for a number of years, one of the last vestiges of bipartisanship and camaraderie in this institution that many of us share, many times with former Members who have continually been members of the wellness center and have come down and enjoyed the camaraderie, the exercise.

Not once in that time have I been lobbied, nor have I heard any complaints since I have been chairman of the wellness center about lobbying taking place. I think it is a perhaps unwritten rule. Maybe it ought to be a written rule, but to ban these distinguished former Members that we all served with on both sides of the aisle, whether it is Lee Hamilton or whether it is Jack Fields or Jack Quinn or Bill Archer, former chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, I think really does a disservice to this institution, and I am really concerned about it.

Let us take a look at the language of this proposal. It basically says if you are a former Member/lobbyist, a Bill Archer or a Jack Fields, you are no longer welcome in the wellness center, you can just go ahead and clean out your locker. But if you are a convicted felon, and not a former Member/lobbyist, you can participate in the wellness center. It seems to me rather incongruous and rather upside down towards trying to come to grips with some of these alleged problems that are out there.

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

Mr. OXLEY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, as I said at the outset, I thank my friend for yielding, this is the first step in the beginning of the 109th Congress second session in dealing with this issue of reform, and we are open to making any kind of modification. I will tell you the notion of having convicted felons having access to the House floor obviously we find that abhorrent, and so I will just assure my friend that that is an issue that we are more than happy to address.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OXLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I do suggest a possible compromise, because there is a certain self-interest. Let us be honest among the Members. Perhaps the modification could be that any former Member using any piece of equipment would have to yield to a current Member.

Mr. OXLEY. Well, I think the gentleman from Massachusetts makes a good point. I think once we start down this slippery slope it is really not in the best interests of this institution. And I think, talking to Members privately on both sides of the aisle, I think that we have clearly overreached here. I have no problem with the floor privileges, but the wellness center is a different animal.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN).

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge my colleagues to support comprehensive lobbying reform. Over the past few years special interests have had a larger and larger say over who gets what in America, and the voices of average citizens are being shut out.

The worst excesses of the Congress of the 1980s pale in comparison with what is going on in Washington today. K Street has become Congress' back office. That is where the bills are written and the deals are made. Lobbyists from the energy companies wrote the energy bill to increase their already excessive profits, and lobbyists from the pharmaceutical industry wrote the prescription drug bill that actually makes it illegal for the Federal Government to buy drugs in bulk for the 40 million Americans who are on Medicare.

Sadly, today's proposal does nothing to address the abuses of power that have allowed lobbyists unfettered access to government. Something barring former lawmakers, current lobbyists form the gym or the floor of the House and calling it lobbying reform is sort of like putting a Band-aid on a broken leg. It does not even begin to address the real problems that have allowed the system to get so out of control.

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

Mr. MEEHAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I will be happy to yield the gentleman additional time if it is necessary. The gentleman was not here on the floor when I gave my opening statement, and from the private conversation that you and I have had, I would like to again state for the record, Mr. Speaker, that this is simply a first step in dealing with the issue of comprehensive reform of the lobbying and ethics process to which my friend referred.

I would like to for the record say that. I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I look forward to working on bipartisan lobbying reform, but it seems to me pretty clear that we need real lobbying reform. There is no reason why, given the discussions we have been having across the Capitol over a period of 6 or 8 months now, why we cannot come in with a comprehensive proposal and have an opportunity to debate it.

We need to make the process more transparent, through disclosure. We need to have tougher restrictions on gifts. We need a tougher enforcement program and, most importantly, we need to fix the badly broken ethics system. So it seems to me if we are really committed to reforming the House, then putting this Band-aid really does not get at the crux of the issue.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to enter into a colloquy with the gentleman.

I want to simply say once again, Mr. Speaker, that all of the items that he has outlined, whether it is dealing with the issue of a gift ban, greater transparency and accountability, looking at the issue of privately funded travel, all of these are issues, as the gentleman knows and as others know, that Speaker HASTERT is committed to addressing in a comprehensive way.

And it is our intention, I hope very much that as we craft legislation, that we will be able to do so in a bipartisan way. We felt strongly, Mr. Speaker, that at the outset here, as we begin the second session of the 109th Congress, that this issue which falls within the jurisdiction of the Rules Committee, which I am privileged to chair, could be addressed on the opening day to make it clear that we are committed to comprehensive reform.

And so anyone who would lead someone to believe otherwise is just plain wrong. So I would simply say to my colleague that I do look forward to working. He has very, very creative, good, interesting and important ideas in the legislative package that he has put forward, and I am committed to looking at every single one of those as we craft our legislation.

I am happy to yield to my friend.

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to hear all of that, but the crux of the issue here is that there is no way that not allowing former Members, for example, to be in the gym and to be on the floor would have undone what was done in the energy bill, for example.

There is no way that that would stop the \$8 billion of tax credits for the oil industry. There is no way that we would not have passed a Medicare prescription drug bill that actually makes it illegal to buy prescriptions in bulk if somehow former Members were not allowed to come to the floor.

All I am saying is, while I recognize the fact that this is one of the ideas that is out there, we really need to, and I am willing to sit down, I would love to work with the majority on this, but we need to have comprehensive reform.

Mr. Speaker, I am worried that by taking little pieces here that sound like could be, might be some kind of reform, we miss the crux of the issue, which is changing that system that allows legislation at 3 o'clock in the morning and a vote is left open.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time.

Mr. Speaker, I would simply say that the Republican Party has been and continues to be the party of reform. We are committed with this first step that we are taking today, with this package, that addresses something that is just not right.

Former Members of Congress, who are registered lobbyists should not have access to the floor of the House of Representatives, and that is something that we are going to do. It is not a Band-aid. No one is arguing that this is comprehensive reform. This is a first step towards the large process which will allow us to address the concerns that have come forward.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK).

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the problem that we are dealing with is exemplified by what we are dealing with today, a bill that comes to the floor under suspension of the rules. I do not think the party of reform distinguishes itself by bringing up this issue in a way that does not allow amendment. Why not bring this to the floor in an open rule?

The fact is that we have had in this House for years now, under Republican rule, a suppression of democracy, a failure to throw things open. Why was there a necessity to have this under a suspension? Why should not this be open?

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

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, let me just state that the process of suspension of rules is a time honored structure that has existed here which requires a super majority. This measure will not pass unless two-thirds of the Members, a bipartisan coalition of Members, vote in support of it.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, the gentleman misses the point entirely. The

question is not whether we pass something, which frankly seems to me rather trivial. I am going to vote for it, I think it is better than not. It is interesting it took the party of reform, what, 11 years to stumble across it.

But what is important is what is not here. The gentleman misunderstands the legislative process if he thinks that he satisfies it by saying, okay, we will take one piece of this and we will bring it up and we will decide what is up and what is not, and we will open it up to debate.

It is the lack of debate that has been a problem. It is also the case, of course, that the corruption we are dealing with goes very deep. And I have to say that the suggestion that the Republican Party, the assertion, is a party of reform simply does not square with the facts.

Let us talk about some of the legislation. The problem frankly has not been former Members. When you came to prescription drugs and dealing with the pharmaceutical industry in general, it has been future former Members.

□ 1330

That is current Members who plan to be former Members in the arms of the industry that they were voting to regulate.

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, we have got a serious systemic problem of corruption that I am prepared at this point to correct myself. I am one of those who talks about in Washington a vast right-wing conspiracy. It now seems clear to me that we instead have had a vast right-wing kleptocracy, and putting people out of the gym is not a beginning of dealing seriously with that problem.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART), the distinguished vice chairman of the Committee on Rules, my friend from Miami.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished chairman for the time. I was walking by here and then stumbled here on this interesting debate.

I think our friends have to decide which of two arguments that have been propounded is really the argument they have to come down upon in support of.

One is, we have heard, that we offer lack of democracy. We just heard that. I guess that means insufficient input, ability for Members, et cetera. Another debate we just heard is that the legislation that we brought forth should do more.

We have presented this resolution the first day that we are back to do what we are able to do on the first day we are back, having done it through regular order. In other words, the Rules Committee had a hearing on this resolution and brought it forth yesterday for the consideration of the floor today.

With regard to the other aspects that have been mentioned here, it is pre-

cisely because of our offer of full democracy, regular order, the committee process that the Speaker has instructed that this legislation go through, the ethics reform go through, that it is not before us in its completion today. In other words, with regard to all these other ideas that have been mentioned, precisely they are going to be considered, not only under regular order by the appropriate committees, but the Speaker has asked that all of those committees act with great promptness; in other words, that they report back within 4 to 6 weeks.

So we are offering what we are offering today, which is important, which I am glad as my friend from Massachusetts says he is going to vote for and I will join with him in voting for. In addition, we are offering so much democracy that we are submitting to the regular order the consideration of all of these ideas that have been mentioned by the distinguished Member from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN) and others.

So substantive ideas of importance, the first day we are back we have brought forth to the floor, due to the leadership and instruction of the Speaker, who has demanded that we act immediately, and with regard to input ability, ability for discussion, for thought, et cetera; in other words, plenty of democracy, we are also offering that, Mr. Speaker, with regard to all of these other important ideas which our friends on the other side of the aisle have mentioned. They have mentioned some of them.

So in summary, Mr. Speaker, this is an important piece of legislation that I am glad we are bringing forth today. It shows the seriousness of the Speaker of the House, of the chairman of the Rules Committee, of the Committee of Rules generally and the leadership to consider this important issue. So I am glad we are considering it the first day we are back.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the Chair how much time is remaining on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) has 6 minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) has 12 minutes remaining.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE).

(Mr. PRICE of North Carolina asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I first want to commend my colleague from California, Mr. DREIER, for introducing what he rightly says is a first step toward reining in the culture of abuse and corruption that has been laid bare by the various scandals currently surrounding this institution.

I know that broader lobbying reform is on the way, but I want to suggest

that lobbying abuses are only part of a more comprehensive problem that is going to require a more comprehensive solution.

Congressional scholars Norman Ornstein and Tom Mann put it this way in a recent article: "This is not simply a problem of a rogue lobbyist or a pack of them. Nor is it a matter of a handful of disconnected, corrupt lawmakers taking favors in return for official actions."

"The problem starts not with lobbyists but inside Congress. Over the past 5 years, the rules and norms that govern congressional deliberation, debate and voting have routinely been violated, especially in the House of Representatives, in ways that mark a dramatic break from custom."

Lobbying reform alone is not going to right this ship. We need a comprehensive plan that gets to the root of the problem, the deterioration and mismanagement of our institutions of governance, particularly this institution.

Congressional Democrats have offered such a plan in the Honest Leadership and Open Government Act, introduced today. Yesterday I joined my colleagues Mr. OBEY, Mr. FRANK and Mr. ALLEN, along with 127 other original cosponsors, in introducing H. Res. 659, a 14-point plan that would address many of the abuses of power that we have witnessed in recent years. Among many other things, our plan would reform the earmarking process, end protracted rollcalls, require House-Senate conference committees to actually meet and vote, and ensure Members that they have time to read and understand what they are voting on.

I will gladly support the first step that we are taking today, but unless we enact meaningful and comprehensive reforms of the way this Chamber conducts its business, Jack Abramoff will be the least of our concerns.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire if my colleague has more speakers.

Mr. DREIER. I do not have any more speakers on this side. We are expecting no requests.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. SNYDER).

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. SNYDER).

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) for the time. I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) for his courtesy yesterday in letting me testify before his committee and then this discussion today.

Unfortunately, this has been a rushed process. Our first day back in the new session and we start out with a bill being presented without amendment, with very little understanding of it. As the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) pointed out, it already is against the rules of lobbying that we have been hearing about on the House floor, as he indicated in his floor comments just a short time ago, is already

against the rules. The problem on the House floor is enforcement, and so any changes we are making about lobbying on the House floor is essentially just a repeat of what is already the rule.

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

Mr. SNYDER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I will just clarify again. If former Members of Congress, who are registered lobbyists, being paid to represent interests, are not allowed to even enter the Chamber when we are doing our work here on the House floor, it is very clear there will not be a problem. I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, as you pointed out, you indicated, under the current rules the activities you have heard about are already not allowed under our current rules.

Mr. DREIER. Right, but the best way to enforce this, of course, is just to ensure that those who are paid lobbyists do not even get to come on to the House floor.

Mr. SNYDER. Well, that is what the current rule is. It is not just about lobbying on the floor. It is privilege. This is the current rule, the privilege of admission to the hall of the House. That is the current rule.

Let me continue with my comments.

To me I agree with the gentleman from Massachusetts' (Mr. MEEHAN) comment. This is probably not the greatest place to start but it is a place to start, but our goal ought to be this. Our goal ought to be for Joe Q. Arkansas back home, that wants to come to the Nation's capital and lobby, how can he be treated fairly and equally alongside everyone else. We have a situation now where former Members, who are well sought after when they leave this body or the Senate to be lobbyists, they have privileges that Joe Q. and Jane Q. Arkansas do not have.

What are some of those? First of all, when they pull their car into one of the House parking lots, they show their former Member's ID, they are waved right in. They get a parking place. They do not have to stand in the security lines. They can just walk. They are bypassed on around. They can roam all through the halls of the Capitol or any of the office buildings in the House or the Senate side. They have access to the Members' dining room where only Members, and I have been lobbied at the Members' dining room. They have access to memorial services. I have been actually lobbied at the memorial service for a former Member that had passed away. They can roam the halls at all hours, day or night. They can go to the rooms behind the committees that Joe Q. Arkansas cannot do.

So our goal ought to be to provide equality with people from back home.

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

Mr. SNYDER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, just a quick comment. I will say that every

single one of those items that my friend from Arkansas has mentioned, Mr. Speaker, we are more than willing to look at and consider as we work on this issue of comprehensive reform. I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, based on that comment, I am going to vote for the gentleman's bill today. I am very disappointed if we come to the end of this year and I do not have an opportunity to present these ideas on the floor of the House for debate.

I have an alternative I filed yesterday, and I encourage Members to take a look at, H. Res. 663, and it says if you register as a former Member to be a registered lobbyist, you do not get the former Members' privileges. Once you no longer are a registered lobbyist you get them back. It seems to be very, very clear, and we do not have to get into this mumbo-jumbo about the gym versus not the gym and all those kinds of things.

There is also a section of the bill being proposed today that I think may be a weakening of current law. Under current law, this is what it says currently: The Speaker shall promulgate such regulations as may be necessary to implement this rule and to ensure its enforcement. That language is being changed under the proposal by Mr. DREIER, and it says, "The Speaker may promulgate regulations that exempt ceremonial or educational functions from the restrictions of this clause."

First of all, we will not have the opportunity, I do not believe, to vote on whatever regulation the Speaker puts out. Educational function can be all kinds of things in this body. For example, my fear is that it could be interpreted to be, during the heat of a close vote on a Medicare prescription drug bill, that very well respected former Member Billy Tauzin could be brought over here to meet with 12 undecided Members, not to lobby, but to educate these undecided Members on what this bill means. Somebody is going to have to explain to me, it is very clear from the way of the language of this bill is written, that the intent is that former Members who are registered lobbyists who have a personal or pecuniary interest or are lobbying on behalf of whatever is on the floor of the House would be allowed, under the Speaker's exemption to come and perform an educational function in one of these rooms back here.

I do not think that Joe Q. Arkansas is going to have that opportunity. Jane Q. Arkansas is not going to have that opportunity. That is the problem when we pick on one little portion about this. We do not have hearings, we do not have discussion, we do not get people like Thomas Mann and Norm Ornstein and the Heritage Foundation to really thrash this stuff through and have the Members thrash it through.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would further yield, I am just reading from the committee report

here, Mr. Speaker, and it is very specific in saying that you referred to "educational functions from the restrictions of this clause, such as a joint meeting to receive a message from a foreign head of state," and last night the State of the Union message would have obviously been an exemption; "a tour when the House is not in session" when no Members of Congress are on the House floor. I suppose they could be conceivably when the House is not in session but I do not know when they have ever been. Or for Former Member's Day, when there is a conclave of former Members of the House and Senate who come here to the House floor for the former Members' meeting.

So we are very specific and I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, the language of the bill says educational functions. There are already exemptions for ceremonial events, but you are still going to have to explain to me when we have a vote on whatever regulation the Speaker comes out on this, and why Billy Tauzin, coming over here during the heat of a close vote on Medicare, would not be able to have scheduled for him in the cloakroom an educational function to educate undecided Members at 2 a.m. on what a bill means, not to lobby.

So I think that is one of the things that people have not talked about, are not aware it is in the bill. I am going to support this bill, but I think this is a very, very poor way, in a rushed manner, in a nontransparent manner to begin this discussion of reform of this body.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, let me yield myself such time as I may consume to respond to the gentleman by simply saying we all know what it is that we are trying to do here, and I believe that we are in a position where we will address those things.

The prospect of the kind of gathering taking place in the cloakroom, which my friend just outlined, is obviously outrageous, and I will say that I am determined to make sure that it does not happen. I will say that, again, all of the issues that my friend has brought forward we look forward to addressing in comprehensive legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1345

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT).

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, this bill is the fox adjusting the lock on the hen house door. I intend to submit for the record before the end of the day an article from 1995 when the then Speaker of the House set up the K Street Project. K stands for kleptomania or kleptocracy. I'm not sure exactly what the K stands for, but this project was set up in 1995; and what is going on today is an absolutely predictable result of what was done in 1995 when the

lobbyists were told, Don't hire any Democrats. You only hire Republicans. You only give to Republicans. You don't give to Democrats.

For us to come out here today and put a bill up here as though it were going to do anything, when it is proposed by the people who put the K Street Project together in the first place, is absolutely unbelievable. This House is in a delusional state that anything is changing on behalf of the people.

The fact is that this is what you get when you have a K Street Project in place. And they are not fixing it this way, and they want to wrap us all around it and say, well, you'll help us fix it this way by keeping some old Member out of the gym from playing basketball with me. Come on, they have all got my phone number. They have got everybody's phone number in this whole building. And for you to think that this silly little piece of legislation is going to do one thing about cleaning up this town is simply nonsense.

We ought to be talking about public funding of elections. Then we would be talking about reform. But you are not going to reform it by keeping a couple of guys off the floor or a couple of guys out of the gym or whatever. That is simply not going to work, and it is foolish. Everyone should vote "no" on this rule.

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 27, 1995]

SPEAKER AND HIS DIRECTORS MAKE THE CASH FLOW RIGHT

(By David Maraniss and Michael Weisskopf)

In the annals of the House Republican revolution, a pivotal moment came last April when an unsuspecting corporate lobbyist entered the inner chamber of Majority Whip Tom DeLay, whose aggressive style has earned him the nickname "the Hammer." The Texas congressman was standing at his desk that afternoon, examining a document that listed the amounts and percentages of money that the 400 largest political action committees had contributed to Republicans and Democrats over the last two years. Those who gave heavily to the GOP were labeled "Friendly," the others "Unfriendly."

"See, you're in the book," DeLay said to his visitor, leafing through the list. At first the lobbyist was not sure where his group stood, but DeLay helped clear up his confusion. By the time the lobbyist left the congressman's office, he knew that to be a friend of the Republican leadership his group would have to give the party a lot more money.

It didn't take long for the word to spread around town about the Hammer and his book. By some accounts—apocryphal as it turns out—DeLay even made lobbyists turn to their contribution totals and initial them, like a report card. Such stories actually make DeLay's job easier. When an aide once asked whether efforts should be made to quell the legend, DeLay leaned back in his chair and said, "No, let it get bigger."

Inside the House Republican leadership, the former pest exterminator from Houston is the enforcer. His mission is to ensure that money flows along the same stream as policy, that the probusiness deregulatory agenda of the House Republicans receives the undivided financial support of the corporate interests that benefit from it. His motto is an

unabashedly blunt interpretation of the dictums of Speaker Newt Gingrich: "If you want to play in our revolution, you have to live by our rules."

The role of money in the revolution has been obscured by the titanic clash with President Clinton and the Democrats over balanced budgets and the reshaping of the federal government, but it is part of that larger struggle. Money is at the center of Gingrich's transformation of the House. With the new alignment of ideological allies in the business and political worlds, there are unparalleled opportunities for both the people who give the money and the people who receive it.

It is such an obvious quid pro quo that it goes almost unnoticed. From House Republicans come measures that gratify industry: weakening environmental standards, loosening workplace safety rules, limiting the legal liability of corporations, defunding nonprofit groups that present an opposing view. From the beneficiaries of that legislation come millions of dollars in campaign contributions.

"The Republicans have a wonderful situation," said one trade association president, a longtime Democrat. "They don't have to prostitute themselves. They are ideologically in sync" with the corporate PACs. "Every politician dreams of being able to meet your conscience and raise money at the same time."

Yet money is also the source of increasing tension among House Republicans that could ultimately weaken them, if not tear them apart. The conflict, in essence, is between ideology and populist reform. One wing wants to collect as much corporate money as possible to sustain and expand the revolution. Another wing fears that this will disillusion voters who brought the Republicans to power to change the traditional ways of doing business in Washington. Gingrich stands in the middle aware, people around him say, that his tenure could depend in part on his ability to resolve the conflict.

Gingrich, DeLay and their comrades have set in motion a historic shift in campaign giving. As recently as 1993 the National Republican Congressional Committee, the main vehicle for fundraising for House GOP candidates, was millions of dollars in debt. But by soliciting contributions from the corporate world through a combination of tenacity, cheerleading and intimidation—"playing offense" all the time, as DeLay describes it—the revolution has established a formidable money machine. The turnaround has been dramatic. House Republicans received 58 percent of the money from the top 400 PACs during the first six months this year and their numbers are rising every month. Last year two of every three PAC dollars went to the ruling Democrats. The trend is evident in all industries, including those with traditional Democratic ties.

The Transportation Political Education League, for example, gave only 3 percent to the Republicans last year but 42 percent this year. The No. 1 corporate contributor to the GOP in 1995, United Parcel Service, which worked closely with DeLay and the leadership in fighting federal workplace safety regulations, also made a decisive partisan transformation, its contributions going from 53 percent Democratic to 71 percent Republican in one year.

The once-threadbare NRCC raised a record \$18.7 million from January through June, four times as much as its Democratic counterpart. Its two elite organizations, which offer private sessions with House leaders at the Capitol Hill Club, are suddenly fat and happy: 225 corporations and political action committees have joined the House Council at \$5,000 apiece, and 150 are enrolled in the Con-

gressional Forum for \$15,000 to \$20,000 each. Rep. Bill Paxon of New York, the NRCC's chairman, estimates that he has met privately with "200 to 300" chief executive officers of Fortune 500 companies to make his pitch.

"If you believe in the revolution and what's happening, then it's time to follow common sense," Paxon tells them. "Why do you support the enemy? Why do you give money to people who are out there consciously every day trying to undermine what's good for you?" He often leaves, Paxon says, with a financial pledge.

Another \$20 million, double the Democratic number, has come to the party in unrestricted contributions known as soft money, used for party rebuilding efforts, voter drives and policy initiatives. Leading the way in the soft money realm this year have been tobacco companies that, concerned about regulation by the Food and Drug Administration, gave a record \$1.5 million to the Republicans during the first six months, tenfold what they gave two years ago.

Gingrich, DeLay, Majority Leader Dick Armye of Texas and Republican Conference Chairman John Boehner of Ohio all have established separate PACs this year with goals of raising millions of dollars more. Gingrich's new PAC, dubbed "Monday Morning" in honor of a refrain from his swearing-in speech, has already raised more than \$330,000, with pledges of an additional \$60,000 since its inception a few months ago.

Advised by kitchen cabinets of industry lobbyists, these leadership fund-raising operations will distribute money to Republican congressional candidates, strengthening the bond between the revolution and industry while reinforcing the loyalty of House colleagues to Gingrich and his lieutenants.

The freshman class, 73 Republican newcomers who consider themselves the vanguard of the revolution, has proved as ambitious in the fund-raising realm as elsewhere. They have bumped up the average price of a fund-raising ticket fourfold from the previous term to \$1,000, hired professional consultants to run their events and solicit contributions, and formed steering committees of lobbyists to advise them. Almost all have liquidated their campaign debts in the first 10 months of their first term, and more than half belong to the NRCC's \$100,000 Club, having at least that much cash ready for next year. The average Republican freshman raised \$123,000 in the first six months, nearly double the amount of their Democratic colleagues.

Even reform-minded freshmen who oppose PACs have pursued them aggressively. Sam Brownback of Kansas solicited Washington lobbyists to contribute to a fund-raising event for him soon after he had returned from Ross Perot's United We Stand convention in August. There he had given a speech denouncing the Washington lobbying scene as "a domestication process where you bring in new, fresh legislators and then you start to try to tame them and assist them with gifts and meals and trips almost like you would a horse with a sugar cube." Several lobbyists who received Brownback's fund-raising invitation angrily turned him down.

A few days after the House Republicans took power last January, DeLay turned to one of his most trusted allies in the lobbying community, David Rehr of the National Beer Wholesalers Association, and said, "I want you to do something with the freshmen just to get them on the right course." Rehr was a member of a small group of Washington lobbyists who had remained loyal to the Republicans throughout the long period of Democratic control. His informal duties now included serving as a PAC adviser to both DeLay and the NRCC.

Rehr set up a seminar at NRCC headquarters entitled "Seven Steps in Liquidating Your Debt and Building for the Future," and more than a quarter of the freshman class attended. Rehr instructed them to set up steering committees of PAC supporters to be their "eyes and ears" in the Washington community. He suggested that they contact the NRCC and House committee chairmen for a list of PACs relevant to their committee assignments.

Make contacts personally, Rehr, whose own PAC contributed \$144,492 to the House Republicans in the first six months this year, advised the freshmen. If a PAC opposed them during the campaign, they should not take it personally. Those PACs, he said, should now be considered "additional prospects."

Rehr is among a new breed of Capitol Hill operators on the rise, fortyish, ideological and fervently committed to the House revolution and its two primary bankers, DeLay and Paxon. The lobbyists span the corporate world, commanding networks of business allies along with large PACs of their own organizations. Dan Mattoon of BellSouth, another lecturer at the NRCC seminar, is the leadership's main link to local telephone companies. Bob Rusbuldt, a top insurance lobbyist, taps the financial resources of the related fields of mortgage banking and real estate. Jim Boland of Philip Morris draws from the tobacco industry and its food subsidiaries. Freelance lobbyists such as former Bush White House aide Gary Andres bring lists of diverse clients and the ability to penetrate new fund-raising channels.

The Republican takeover has been a time for "cashing in," as a PAC director close to Gingrich put it, and also a time for "getting right." Lobbyists whose PACs or clients once gave heavily to Democrats have been eager to show they found religion, leading to such scenes as the one late one recent night at one of the steak and cigar restaurants fashionable along Pennsylvania Avenue.

"Man," said a lobbyist approaching a GOP leadership aide and pleading to be restored to good graces, "just want to tell you, we've given like 70 percent to you guys now."

DeLay, for his part, has launched what has come to be known as the "K Street Strategy," named for the downtown Washington avenue lined with lobbying headquarters, law firms and trade associations. The strategy is to pressure those firms to remove Democrats from top jobs and replace them with Republicans.

Headhunters now call DeLay's office in search of recommendations. When one corporation lobbyist sought a meeting with the whip, DeLay telephoned the firm's CEO and complained that his agent in Washington was "a hard-core liberal." If the company wanted to get in to see him, DeLay added, "you need to hire a Republican." The hard-core liberal lobbyist was soon transferred to London.

One drug company hired a Democrat to head its office, but after he was unmasked at a DeLay fund-raiser, he called the whip's office the next day to plead that his firm not be scorned by the House Republicans. His position was only temporary, he said, and he would soon be replaced by someone more aligned with the revolution.

"There are just a lot of people down on K Street who gained their prominence by being Democrat and supporting the Democrat cause, and they can't regain their prominence unless they get us out of here," said DeLay. "We're just following the old adage of punish your enemies and reward your friends. We don't like to deal with people who are trying to kill the revolution. We know who they are. The word is out."

At times, Republican leaders have had to choose between friends, and money may have

been a factor. When the Commerce Committee voted on a sweeping telecommunications deregulation bill in May, for example, its legislation appeared to favor AT&T and other long-distance firms over the regional Bell companies. A last-minute amendment by Chairman Thomas Bliley would have complicated entry of the seven regional Bells into the long-distance market. AT&T has a plant in Bliley's Richmond district and a new PAC profile: reversing a past preference for Democrats, it has given 58 percent to GOP lawmakers this year.

But the baby Bells, with combined PAC donations double those of AT&T and with influential lobbyists such as Mattoon, appealed the decision. Help came from Paxon and deputy whip Denny Hastert of Illinois, both Commerce Committee members who had voted for the Bliley provision as part of the May bill. But after hearing from Bell lobbyists, they argued for change at a Speaker's Advisory Group meeting in early July, contending that the Bells would be prevented from competing, a participant said. Gingrich directed Bliley to "rescrub" the bill, and by mid-July the Bliley provision was deleted. Two weeks before the new bill passed the House, Pacific Telesis Group's chief executive hosted a fund-raiser for Gingrich at his San Francisco home, raising \$20,000.

Paxon said he was guided by his "driving passion" for deregulation, not fund-raising calculations, in siding with the Bells. "I haven't sat down with a legislative calendar," he said, "and said this is the time to go after this industry group."

But some fund-raising efforts have been less than subtle. Ways and Means Committee Chairman Bill Archer lectured corporate leaders not to give to Democrats. In an Oct. 23 letter, signed by the Oklahoma GOP delegation, corporate lobbyists were told that they were expected to support freshman Tom Coburn in his tough reelection race.

"As you are courted by others to get involved in this race, we want to make our position clear," the letter read. "We strongly support our good friend and colleague, Tom Coburn, and we will be unified as we work on his behalf. We trust you will join us in our effort and certainly not oppose us."

That letter was mild compared with a similar dispatch earlier in the year from DeLay, a no-nonsense missive that helped establish his reputation as "the Hammer." Days before freshman Randy Tate of Washington state was to hold a fund-raiser in Washington, DeLay sent out a letter listing the exact sum each PAC had given to the losing cause of Tate's Democratic opponent in 1994, Mike Kreidler.

While he was "surprised to see you opposed Randy Tate," DeLay wrote, "you now have the opportunity to work toward a positive future relationship." The note got more demanding—"your immediate support for Randy Tate is personally important to me and the House Republican leadership team"—before closing with an offer of redemption: "I hope I can count on you being on the winning team."

The aftermath of that letter captures DeLay's unapologetic mode of operation. A reporter received a copy of it and called DeLay's PAC director, Karl Gallant. Gallant asked the reporter how he obtained the letter. When he was told it came from a lobbyist, Gallant responded, "That tells me it's effective. They want you to write a negative story so we'll back off. You just made my day."

DeLay agreed, distributing the article to his colleagues. "It had great impact," DeLay said later. "It raised him (Tate) a bunch of money. We know who we sent the letters to and who we got checks from."

One other result: Kreidler recently decided not to challenge Tate in 1996, citing as one factor his difficulty in raising PAC money.

For Gingrich, learning the value of fund-raising has been a gradual process. Staffers at the NRCC in the 1970s and early 1980s would roll their eyes when the small-college history professor with mutton-chop sideburns strolled through the door, knowing they were in for a long day of lectures on the Ming dynasty and a barrage of expensive ideas for promoting his conservative opportunity society. "In those early days Newt was very naive about money," said Steve Stockmeyer, then the executive director of the NRCC. "He was always coming up with ideas on how to spend it, not raise it."

But despite his early naivete about the ways of money, Gingrich, more than DeLay or any other figure, was most responsible for turning the revolution into a money machine.

Two years ago the financial situation for the Republicans seemed bleak. They were "walking in the valley of the shadow of death," as Paxon, installed by Gingrich as chairman of the NRCC, put it.

They were the minority party in the House and Senate and without the White House. Their fund-raising relied largely on a direct-mail list that had become utterly obsolete. Of the more than 1 million names on it, only one in 10 had given to the party in recent years. Many were in nursing homes or dead. But by April 1994 Gingrich had become convinced that the Republicans would seize control of the House that year. He went over to the NRCC and wrote personal appeals for funds claiming that the Republicans would soon be in the majority.

"Gingrich was for my purposes the whole ballgame when we wanted to raise money," said Grace Wieggers, then director of fund-raising for the NRCC and now the head of Gingrich's leadership PAC, Monday Morning.

In August and September he met individually with more than 150 Republican members, assigning fund-raising tasks and goals to each. Incumbents from safe seats were asked to raise \$50,000 for Republican challengers or vulnerable colleagues. Ranking minority members of House committees made pledges to Gingrich to raise even larger amounts traveling for other candidates on the road.

When the revolution arrived, Gingrich had a system already in place for maintaining and expanding the money operation. DeLay would be his hammer. Paxon would serve as cheerleader. Majority Leader Armer would position himself as ideological arbiter, attacking corporations for funding nonprofit agencies that opposed the revolution. Conference Chairman Boehner would nourish business coalitions, bringing them in for regular Thursday sessions to plan how the corporate world could advance conservative policy. Committee chairmen Bliley of Commerce, Archer of Ways and Means and Bud Shuster of Transportation would cultivate industries in their turfs.

The lines between elected revolutionaries and their business cohorts occasionally blurred. Lobbyists helped DeLay write his regulatory moratorium bill. Shuster raised money for the revolution with the assistance of his former political aide, Ann Eppard, a lobbyist whose clients included Amtrak, Conrail, Federal Express and the Pennsylvania Turnpike Authority, all of whom had issues pending before Shuster's committee.

Eppard maintains a close relationship with her old boss. At the same time that she was soliciting money from industry for the "Bud Shuster Portrait Committee" which commissioned a painting of the chairman in his committee room, she was also sending out fundraising letters for Republican candidates. One to industry colleagues on behalf of a Virginia candidate ended with the bold-faced assertion: "This dinner is of personal importance to Chairman Shuster."

Given the place Gingrich assigned to fundraising, his handshake agreement with President Clinton in June to form a bipartisan commission on campaign finance reform took his allies by surprise. More than any other act, it revealed the tensions within his revolution.

At the next meeting of the House leadership, the tone, said one participant, was, "Why the hell did you go and do that?"

Arney, responsible for scheduling the revolution's legislative agenda, worried about how he would be able to fit the issue into an already packed calendar. DeLay, and to a lesser degree Paxon, questioned whether the timing was right and whether the Republicans should cede anything to Clinton and the Democrats now that the revolution's money machine was operating so effectively. Gingrich's response was that the handshake "buys us time." He needed to think the issue through, he said.

Another wing of Gingrich's House, represented by populist freshmen Brownback and Linda Smith of Washington, along with veteran moderate Christopher Shays of Connecticut, was pushing Gingrich from the other side. If the Republicans did not clean up Washington and prove that they were not continuing business as usual, they said, the revolution would collapse from a fatal flaw of political hubris. If reform did not happen on the Republican watch, said Shays, it would become "our Achilles' heel." While Shays and Brownback took Gingrich's handshake with Clinton as a sign that he supported reform, Smith was skeptical. She said she thought he was just stalling.

Gingrich found himself in a familiar position: on both sides of a debate and looking for another way entirely. He understood the call for reform and had a lingering resentment toward PACs for funding the Democrats when they controlled Congress. But he also, he and his aides say, felt equally strongly that the revolutionaries should not unilaterally disarm themselves while they were engaged in a more profound struggle of what he called the "Information Age."

The real fight, Gingrich told his aides, was not over money but information and how it is disseminated. Money was one weapon in that struggle and important to the movement as a way to counter the American mass media, which the speaker considered largely hostile to the revolution.

Gingrich said as little as possible about the issue after the handshake, promising that at some point he would deliver a white paper on the subject. As months went by, the reformers grew increasingly agitated. At Shays's request, Gingrich met with the reformers in his office late on the afternoon of Sept. 29 just before the Columbus Day break. While Shays hoped to discuss another reform issue involving a gift ban, the meeting devolved into a tense confrontation over campaign finance reform between Gingrich and Smith, who had just planted a story with conservative columnist Robert Novak in which she said that the leadership was not telling the truth about their intentions on reform.

"He got so mad. He kicked the staff out and yelled at them, he was so unhappy," Smith recalled. The session was "testy and pointed," according to Brownback. Gingrich was overwhelmed by other concerns that day, including Medicare and Bosnia. He was late for a meeting at the White House, and freshman Smith kept jabbing at him.

Noting that Smith was working with Common Cause and United We Stand in pushing campaign reform, Gingrich told her that she had to decide whether she wanted to be an outsider or work with the House leadership. "Whatever you decide is okay with me," he said. "We just have to know."

Smith wanted to know why Gingrich needed a time-consuming commission, why he

could not just support legislation eliminating PACs, as he had when he was in the minority. She told the speaker that he tried to carry too much of the burden himself and that he should let others take the load on this issue.

Then, according to Smith's recollection of the scene, corroborated by others in the room, "Newt looked at me and said, Nobody can do it but me! I have the most experience. I'm the only one who can do this. I'll just have to take some time this week and write a paper on it."

Shortly after that meeting the leadership announced that the Oversight Committee would hold hearings on campaign finance reform starting Nov. 2 and that Gingrich would be the first to testify. One aide took memos from a group of informal advisers, including Stockmeyer, the former NRCC director who now ran the National Association of Business PACs. PACs were invented as a reform in the 1970s, he noted, and another round of reforms doing away with them would probably create a system that was worse.

Sen. Mitch McConnell of Kentucky sent a letter over to the House noting that the Republicans had killed campaign finance reform before the 1994 elections—"proof positive that this issue is not a hindrance to us at the polls." In a handwritten P.S., McConnell added: "We'd be foolish to throw away our ability to compete."

Another Gingrich aide began piecing together his speech. He plunged into a long assigned reading list and followed up on the speaker's request to compare the amount of money spent in political campaigns with what is spent in advertising products. Companies spent \$100 million selling two stomach acid pills recently, he discovered, one-sixth of the total amount spent on all congressional campaigns last year. One of the great myths of American politics, Gingrich concluded, was that campaigns are too expensive. He believed that most of the criticism of the campaign system came from "nonsensical socialist analysis based on hatred of the free enterprise system."

Smith was sitting one row behind Gingrich and off to his right when he delivered those conclusions at the hearing. She wanted to watch his eyes and his facial expressions as a means of gauging his earnestness, she said, but as he continued to attack the reformers, including some of the groups she had been working with, she became increasingly distraught.

"His anger at the media drove what he said," she concluded. She retreated to her office, where she reached a final decision on Gingrich's earlier ultimatum to her. She would work from the outside.

Gingrich's lieutenants expressed satisfaction with his speech. If reform is inevitable, they say, it will not involve the elimination of PACs and it will not diminish the role of money in the revolution. DeLay said he would work the system until PACs gave an appropriate amount to the Republicans. "Ninety percent would be about right," he declared. DeLay has a running competition with Gingrich over who can raise more money. There are scores of revolutionaries doing the same thing, but he is not worried that they might trip over each other.

"It's a big country," said the Hammer.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, under the rules of the House, this is a proposal to change the rules, when a provision says the Speaker may promulgate regulations, under the rules of the House, will there or will there not be a vote of approval of those promulgated regulations by the Speaker on the definition of educational functions?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The Chair will read this.

Mr. SNYDER. You're a great reader, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The degree to which the pending proposal changes the status quo is a matter for the House to debate. It is not the function of the Chair to interpret a legislative proposal while it is under debate.

Mr. SNYDER. I am sorry, when the Speaker promulgates regulations, regardless of a minor change or a major change, my inquiry is: Does that or does that not require a vote of the body?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. I will stand by what I said. The terms of the resolution must speak for themselves.

Mr. SNYDER. I will stand with you, Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to close this debate by saying again that we do have a problem that exists, and we are committed to bringing about major institutional reform. Increasing the level of transparency and disclosure is a high priority. We have seen guilty pleas from lobbyists who have done things that are absolutely reprehensible, and we want to do everything that we can, in a bipartisan way, to ensure that those things never happen again.

Every American has the right to petition their government. Every single American has the right to petition their government. We do not believe that anyone should have an unfair advantage over any other American when it comes to that. That is why what we are doing here today is the right thing to do. Former Members of Congress who are registered lobbyists should not be on the House floor when the House of Representatives is doing its business.

Today, we begin the work of the Second Session of the 109th Congress, and it is very apparent that we will be able to enjoy strong bipartisan support for this first step on the road to reform. There are many other things that need to be addressed. The Speaker of the House has been working on this. I have been working with him on this issue, and he is committed to getting input from Members on both sides of the aisle and to work in a bicameral way with our colleagues who serve in the other body.

I have had countless meetings with Democrats and Republicans. I have been listening to proposals, and I believe that we are going to have an opportunity to address those understandable concerns so that the American people will once again be able to hold this institution in high regard. It is a challenge. This is the greatest deliberative body known to man, but I believe that it is our responsibility to do what it is that we are going to do here today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 648, Mr.

DREIER's provision to eliminate floor privileges and access to Member exercise facilities for registered lobbyists who are former Members or officers of the House.

Since the founding of our country, interest groups, or "factions," as Madison called them in 1787, were seen as both a boon and a bane to giving the American people fair representation. Fully 90 years before votes were finally given to African Americans and former slaves, and 150 years before universal suffrage, our Founding Fathers understood the dangers of interest groups and the biased effect they can have on policy and law.

Unfortunately, in 2006, the interest groups now have the higher hand at the expense of our citizens and constituents. The pockets of powerful Members of Congress, and the unequal access former Members of Congress have, supercede their responsibility to their constituents. This is unequal access to democracy.

Reforms are desperately needed, and for once, we have bipartisan agreement. The difficulty now, is determining where reform is needed urgently and unequivocally, and seeing it through to established law.

As a co-sponsor for the Honest Leadership and Open Government Act of 2006, which we will all be considering soon enough, I can say that today's bill should be the beginning of many reforms.

The Honest Leadership and Open Government Act of 2006:

Limits gifts and travel: Bans gifts, including meals, tickets, entertainment and travel, from lobbyists and non-governmental organizations that retain or employ lobbyists, prohibits lobbyists from funding, arranging, planning or participating in congressional travel.

Regulates Member travel on private jets: Requires Members to pay full charter costs when using corporate jets for official travel and to disclose relevant information in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, including the owner or lessee of the aircraft and the other passengers on the flight.

Shuts down the K Street Project: Makes it a criminal offense and a violation of the House Rules for Members to take or withhold official action, or threaten to do so, with the intent to influence private employment decisions.

Slows the revolving door: Prohibits former Members, executive branch officials and senior staff from lobbying their former colleagues for 2 years; eliminates floor and gym privileges for former Members and officers who are lobbyists; and requires Members and senior staff to disclose outside job negotiations.

Ends the practice of adding special interest provisions in the dead of the night: Prohibits consideration of conference reports and other legislation not available in printed form and on the Internet for at least 24 hours; requires full and open debate in conference and a vote by the conferees on the final version of the legislation; prohibits consideration of a conference report that contains matters different from what the conferees voted on.

Toughens public disclosure of lobbying activities: Requires lobbyists to file quarterly reports with more information, including campaign contributions, fundraisers and other events that honor Members, and the name of each Member contacted. Report must be in electronic format, searchable on the Internet; increases civil and criminal penalties for lobbyists who violate the rules.

The most obvious place to begin these reforms is here, where we conduct business every day. It is unconscionable that we would allow this access to special interest groups in a place where citizens of this country are not allowed to step. The House has played favorites, against the people we took an oath to protect and serve.

Lobbyists should not be allowed on the floor, or in exercise rooms maintained for the well-being and personal use of congressional Members, staff, and employees.

I am ashamed that we have to urge my Republican colleagues to adopt more effective measures. It should be a no-brainer. Let's start with this simple reform and keep it going until we succeed in delivering the government "of the people, by the people, and for the people," back to the people.

It is for these reasons that I vigorously support drawing a clear ethical line at that door and preventing unjust and unethical influence in our place of business. I urge my colleagues to also extend their support for H. Res. 648 and renew our dedication to our constituencies and ethical principles.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, anyone who doubts that symbols often take priority over substance in Washington only needs to consider that among our first items of business the House of Representatives is considering this year is a measure banning from the House gym former members of Congress who are now lobbyists. This bill is being rushed to the floor in order to assure the American people that Congress is "cracking down" on lobbying practices in response to recent scandals.

This measure does nothing to address the root cause of the scandals—the ever-growing size and power of the Federal Government. As long as the Federal Government continues to regulate, tax, and subsidize the American people, there will be attempts to influence those who write the laws and regulations under which the people must live. Human nature being what it is, there will also be those lobbyists and policymakers who will manipulate the power of the regulatory state to enrich themselves. As I have said before, and I fear I will have plenty of opportunity to say again, the only way to get special interest money and influence out of politics is to get the money and power out of Washington. Instead of passing new regulations and laws regulating the people's right to petition their government, my colleagues should refuse to vote for any legislation that violates the constitutional limits on Federal power or enriches a special interest at the expense of American taxpayers. Returning to constitutional government is the only way to ensure that our republican institutions will not be corrupted by powerful interests seeking special privileges.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 648.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

RELATING TO CONSIDERATION OF S. 1932, DEFICIT REDUCTION ACT OF 2005

Mr. PUTNAM. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 653 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 653

Resolved, That the House hereby concurs in the Senate amendment to the House amendment to the bill (S. 1932) to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 202(a) of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2006 (H. Con. Res. 95).

UNFUNDED MANDATE POINT OF ORDER

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to section 426 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, I make a point of order against consideration of this rule, H. Res. 653. Section 425 of that same act states that a point of order lies against legislation which imposes an unfunded mandate in excess of specified amounts against State or local governments. Section 426 of the Budget Act specifically states that a rule may not waive the application of section 425.

H. Res. 653 states that the House hereby concurs in the Senate amendment to the bill S. 1932 to provide for reconciliation. This self-executing rule effectively waives the application of section 425 to provisions in the underlying bill on child support enforcement which the Congressional Budget Office informs us impose an intergovernmental mandate as defined by the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act.

Therefore, I make a point of order that the rule may not be considered pursuant to section 426.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Washington makes a point of order that the resolution violates section 426(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

In accordance with section 426(b)(2) of that Act, the gentleman has met the threshold burden to identify the specific language in the resolution on which the point of order is predicated.

Under section 426(b)(4) of the Act, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. PUTNAM) each will control 10 minutes of debate on the question of consideration.

Pursuant to section 426(b)(3) of the Act, after that debate, the Chair will put the question of consideration, to wit: Will the House now consider the resolution?

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT) for 10 minutes.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.