

Menendez	Reed	Stark
Metcalf	Richardson	Stokes
Meyers	Riggs	Studds
Mica	Rivers	Stupak
Miller (CA)	Roberts	Talent
Miller (FL)	Roemer	Tate
Minge	Roukema	Taylor (MS)
Mink	Roybal-Allard	Thornton
Moakley	Royce	Thurman
Molinari	Rush	Tiahrt
Mollohan	Sabo	Torkildsen
Morella	Salmon	Torres
Myrick	Sanders	Torricelli
Nadler	Sanford	Upton
Neal	Sawyer	Velazquez
Neumann	Schiff	Vento
Nussle	Schroeder	Visclosky
Oberstar	Schumer	Waldholtz
Obey	Scott	Walker
Olver	Seastrand	Walsh
Orton	Sensenbrenner	Wamp
Pallone	Serrano	Ward
Paxon	Shadegg	Waters
Pelosi	Shaw	Waxman
Peterson (FL)	Shays	Weldon (FL)
Peterson (MN)	Sisisky	Weldon (PA)
Petri	Skaggs	Weller
Pickett	Skelton	White
Pomeroy	Slaughter	Wise
Porter	Smith (MI)	Wolf
Portman	Smith (NJ)	Woolsey
Poshard	Smith (TX)	Wyden
Pryce	Smith (WA)	Wynn
Quinn	Solomon	Yates
Rahall	Souder	Young (FL)
Ramstad	Spratt	Zimmer

## NOT VOTING—2

Fields (LA) Tucker

□ 1719

Messrs. LONGLEY, WHITE, NEUMANN, HALL of Texas, WYNN, BUYER, Ms. HARMAN, and Messrs. METCALF, RAHALL, SERRANO, GILCHREST, CONDIT, SISISKY, and CHRYSLER changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. OWENS, Ms. DANNER, and Messrs. WATTS of Oklahoma, NETHERCUTT, and ALLARD changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

(Mr. GEPHARDT asked and was given permission to speak out of order and address the House for 1 minute.)

## LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask for this time to inquire about the schedule for today and the rest of the week.

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

Mr. GEPHARDT. I yield to the distinguished majority leader and ask about the schedule for the rest of the day and the week.

Mr. ARMEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, of course, the Members are very concerned about what will be our schedule, and we have worked very hard to come to a point where now I can give a pretty good outline of what the rest of the week and the early part of next week will look like.

If the gentleman will continue to yield, it is our hope to finish the Gift Reform Act and the Lobby Disclosure

Act this evening, Mr. Speaker. Tomorrow we plan to consider the conference report on the Balanced Budget Act of 1995 and also to consider H.R. 260, legislation regarding American troops in Bosnia.

On Saturday, the House will be in session and voting, beginning about 12 noon.

The House will not be in session on Sunday, but will be in session on Monday and Tuesday.

Given the circumstances, I cannot divine further than next Tuesday, although we will inform Members early next week about the balance of the week, and I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. GEPHARDT. I would like to ask the gentleman if he has a good estimate on when Members might expect to be able to leave here on Saturday afternoon or evening.

Mr. ARMEY. I thank the gentleman for his inquiry. I can only regret that it was not directed to someone else.

But my best estimate is that our work would be completed around 6 on Saturday.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Could the gentleman further inform us what might be on the schedule for Saturday and what time Members might be expected to be here on Monday?

Mr. ARMEY. The most certain thing we would have under consideration on Saturday would be further consideration of the Balanced Budget Act of 1995, upon action of the other body, and then, of course, we have some very important conference reports we would hope to get to on Saturday as well.

Mr. GEPHARDT. On Monday, what time would the gentleman think we might come in?

Mr. ARMEY. I am pleased to announce to my colleagues that we expect no votes before 2 on Monday.

Mr. GEPHARDT. And finally, could the gentleman answer about what would be the estimated time of the first vote on Saturday?

Mr. ARMEY. Saturday, I should think that we would probably have the first vote between 12:30 and 1 o'clock.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from yielding.

I wonder if we could learn about the activities later this evening. My understanding is that there are some 20 amendments that have been listed as possible amendments to the lobby reform bill which will follow the gift rule. Does the gentleman have a time certain tonight that we would terminate our activities, or do we just go through the evening into the morning hours dealing with the amendments, many of which have been heard but some of which are new?

Mr. ARMEY. I appreciate the gentleman's concern. Let me just say, first of all, of course, it is an open rule, and as

is often the case in an open rule with a great many amendments, the managers of the bill can often work things out with the Members with amendments, and that is always the best way to come to an arrangement on time.

What I would propose doing is watching to see how well that progress can go and then perhaps making a decision about completing the bill or perhaps, in fact, giving it further consideration.

It is our hope and our desire to complete the bill tonight, and I am placing a great deal of confidence in the collegiality of the bill managers and the Members with amendments.

Mr. GEPHARDT. One more point or question. With respect, I would just urge the distinguished majority leader to perhaps look at the idea of coming in Saturday a littler earlier so that Members would have a chance, if they were going to go back to their districts on Saturday night, to be able to accomplish that.

Mr. ARMEY. It appears that the gentleman's point is well taken, and I will take it under consideration.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Let me say to the distinguished majority leader that I would hope that it might be possible, and I know the President made statements today, and the Speaker and the Senate majority leader, about trying to figure our way through this business of a continuing appropriation.

If something could be arrived at on Saturday, I assume that if that can be accomplished for a period of time that would get us past Thanksgiving, that we might be able to avoid a session on Monday and Tuesday. I know that is a very tough thing to get done and will take some time. But if that could be done, does the gentleman think we might be able to avoid Monday and Tuesday?

Mr. ARMEY. I believe that it could be possible should an accord be reached on a continuing appropriation, but at this point I have to say we have a very clear and a very important schedule before us that we would intend to work on.

Mr. FAZIO of California. If the gentleman would yield further, I have had some Members suggest that perhaps we could work on Sunday, if it would be possible to be out of here next week; in other words, keep working until we have completed our work. Is there any possibility that that could be entertained?

Mr. ARMEY. At this point, we have no plans to work on Sunday.

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

Mr. GEPHARDT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. Could the gentleman tell us what the plans are for Wednesday and Thursday for next week? Could the distinguished gentleman from Texas tell us what the plans of the leadership are for Wednesday and Thursday of next week?

Mr. ARMEY. I thank the gentleman for his inquiry.

If I may, if the gentleman would yield further, Mr. Speaker, I hope it is in order for me to make the observation that Sunday is a Sabbath and we try to respect that. In addition, of course, the gentleman, and you are a tough crowd, and, if I may say to the Members, we are, of course, very much cognizant of Thursday, Thanksgiving Day. We are also acutely aware of the fact of the difficulties of traveling on Wednesday prior to Thursday, and we will make every effort we can to find a place where we can close business in order to enable Members to be back in their districts with their families Thanksgiving Day. I will assure the gentleman from Michigan this is a very big priority with us.

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

Mr. GEPHARDT. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the majority leader, I understand, of course, Saturday is the Sabbath, Sunday is the day of rest for many, as well, and for religious services. But, Mr. Leader, you are well aware that we have now shut down the Government for the longest period of time in history as a result of an impasse between the Congress and the President. Waiting until Monday or Tuesday to try to resolve this will not only put many, many people in the public and private sectors in great distress and trauma, but it also will incur substantially additional costs.

□ 1730

If we could resolve this by the end of the weekend so that the Federal Government could undertake operations on Monday, that would be beneficial for every American and would be in the fiscal best interests of our country, which, of course, are some of the things we have been discussing.

Toward that end, I would hope we would very seriously consider trying to resolve this impasse before the beginning of next week.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and the gentleman's expression of concern I think is very much a genuine expression and one that can only invoke the most empathic response. The gentleman did, in fact, just last night vote for a continuing resolution that would enable us to resolve the dilemma. We are moving that along as fast as we can to the White House. We are hopeful the President will sign it, in which case we will be exactly where the gentleman wants to go.

Mr. HOYER. In the event though, Mr. Leader, we are not there, what I am urging is that we continue to work with consideration for religious services for all the Members, but in that context, to continue to work straight through, so that we could try to resolve this impasse.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. SALMON].

Mr. SALMON. Mr. Speaker, just an alternative thought on the schedule. I know the President and others on the other side have been critical of our not getting out the appropriations bills. Maybe we should just keep going right on up to Thanksgiving to get those appropriations bills out.

Mr. GEPHARDT. I would say to the gentleman, since we do not have our applause meter out here, we cannot decipher that.

Mr. ARMEY. If the gentleman will yield further, may I assure my colleagues, the hourly schedules and daily schedules we have outlined here for the floor, I believe, accommodate quite nicely to everything I can at this time forecast we could have available to bring to the floor within the day's outline. If other opportunities present themselves, we will certainly revisit the schedule and inform Members.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, there will not be another vote for another 30 minutes or so, so if some of the Members want to leave, they are welcome to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SOLOMON

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, as the designee of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH], I offer an amendment printed in part 2 of House Report 104-341.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina). The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SOLOMON: Page 2, line 3, strike "(1)" and strike lines 6 through 15.

Page 7, strike lines 1 through 5, and page 9, strike lines 15 through 16 and redesignate paragraphs (13) through (22) as paragraphs (12) through (21).

Page 10, line 9, insert a period after "individual" and strike "if others" and all that follows through line 12.

Page 13, beginning in line 24 strike "3 days exclusive of travel time within the United States" and insert "4 days within the United States".

Page 14, insert a period after "employee" in line 17 and strike "subject to" and all that follows through line 23.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] will be recognized for 15 minutes, and a Member opposed will be recognized for 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON].

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

Mr. Speaker, as the chairman of the Rules Committee, I am obliged to support the position of the committee which was to favorably report House Resolution 250 and urge its adoption. It is a good resolution and one which we can all be proud of.

At the same time, I have an obligation as a Member to support amendments that will help to improve and strengthen this resolution, and the amendment of our distinguished Speaker is such an amendment.

During our hearings on House Resolution 250, I agreed with those House

Members and public witnesses who urged us to report to the House the resolution as passed by the Senate. We used that as our guidelines in reporting House Resolution 250 to the House by unanimous voice vote, with only a few technical amendments.

At the same time, I was deeply troubled by the prospect that the \$10 exemption for gifts that would count toward the \$50 and \$100 limits would inadvertently trip up some Members and land them in the Ethics Committee on a frivolous or malicious complaint filed with that committee.

At first we considered raising the exempt threshold to those gifts under \$20 which was the exempt limit in last year's bill passed by the House and Senate.

But we did not do that, because too many people would charge that we were weakening the resolution. I therefore came to conclude that the best way to avoid getting into trouble was to adopt the total gift ban recommended by the Speaker.

It retains most of the exceptions contained in the existing resolution including exemptions for gifts from close personal friends and relatives, gifts of personal hospitality, and reimbursements from private sources for travel, in connection with our official duties, such as speech making, factfinding, and substantial participation events.

The two exceptions from the gift rule that are dropped in the Gingrich-Solomon amendment are gifts of home State products made to Members, and their offices, and gifts of nominal value such as t-shirts, baseball caps, coffee mugs, etc. Members can still accept such things as commemorative plaques for their service as Members.

But I think most Members will be much more comfortable with the zero-gift rule proposed by the Speaker, because it does establish that bright line between what is acceptable and what is not acceptable.

There is no need for recordkeeping or disclosure for gifts from persons who are not close personal friends or relatives. You just cannot accept them. Period?

No meals, no free tickets, no bottles of wine, or baskets of fruit or birthday cakes—no matter what their value. What could be more simple than just saying no—in a polite way of course.

I know many Members now have such a policy in their own offices including me and to a person they indicate that it is the easiest policy in the world to live with, because there are no gray areas. If a gift comes into your office from someone who is not a friend, you just refuse to accept it.

I urge support for the Gingrich-Solomon amendment that simply says accept no gifts.

Mr. Speaker, the Gingrich-Solomon amendment also makes another important change in this resolution, and that is to delete the requirement that for a spouse or child to accompany you on a privately reimbursable trip for official

business, you must determine and certify that they are, and I quote "appropriate to assist in the representation of the House."

Mr. Speaker, that is demeaning, insulting, and unnecessary language. It is contrary to our family friendly policy that we established this year in this House. One Member of this House put it very bluntly but appropriately when she said: "I don't take my husband with me to represent the House. I take him with me to keep our marriage together."

Mr. Speaker, we don't make speeches to groups and associations for the fun of it. We do so because part of our representational function here is to help educate the public as to what we are doing in this Congress. We can not depend on the media or on people staying glued to C-SPAN for them to know what the Congress is doing.

We have an obligation to keep the people informed as to what legislation we are considering, what our agenda is, and what we have accomplished.

My wife is gracious enough to accompany me on the few trips I do take when I am invited to address associations that represent my constituents.

I do not and will not make it a condition for her accompanying me on those rare occasions that she must somehow prove that she is representing the House to justify her being with me. I want her to be with me because she is my wife and not because she is an ambassador for the House, as important as this institution is.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, the Gingrich-Solomon amendment is simple; it is easy to understand; and it is that bright line that is easy to comply with. It says to our Members and to this House that we do not depend on, we do not need, or we certainly do not want any kind of gifts from persons who are not friends or relatives.

It says to our constituents what they expect of us in the first place, and that is that we are willing to adopt, to comply with, and to enforce the strictest of ethical standards.

It says to the American people that there is no question that we are somehow beholden to the gifts of those who may even indirectly try to influence our behavior or voting in this House.

We are here because we believe that this Government is and should be of the people, by the people, and for the people, and, as the people's House, we are here as servants of the people for 2 short years before we must take our records and conduct, back to the people for renewal.

I urge the adoption of the amendment.

□ 1745

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

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I will manage the time, as I know of no Member who intends to rise in opposition to this amendment on our side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE].

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding me time, and I thank him for his leadership, along with my good friend, the gentleman from Texas, JOHN BRYANT.

I appreciate the words of the distinguished gentleman from New York and rise to support the Speaker's amendment on this issue because there are just two simple propositions that we need to pay attention to.

This amendment would result in a ban of all underlying gifts, and it would even include, though I come from the great State of Texas and they have some good barbecue, any gifts that come in as home-State products. Simply a fairness issue.

I think it is time now for the U.S. Congress to go right to the line, to go straight to the point. And the point is to ban all gifts. It bans Members from accepting free travel to events that are substantially recreational in nature. Nothing less, nothing more. Simple fairness.

Coming on this House floor on January 4, 1995, as a freshman, that was the first statement I made, a willingness to ban gifts so that we could get on with the people's business. Now we have come to this point on November 16, 1995. I join in supporting what really we should be doing, cleaning the people's House; standing up for what Americans say we should be doing, and that is doing their work. Ban all gifts. It is a good amendment.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Sanibel, FL, PORTER GOSS, one of the very distinguished Members of this body. He is not only a member of our Committee on Rules but he is a long-standing member of the Ethics Committee.

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, this amendment makes three major changes to the base text of House Resolution 250, leaving the rest of its provisions intact. These changes have the effect of: First, providing a general ban on all gifts—including meals. This proposal does away with the idea of dollar value thresholds—in other words, regardless of the value of a gift or meal, Members and staff would simply not be permitted to accept it. In terms of defining what constitutes a gift, this amendment retains 21 of the 23 exceptions that are in House Resolution 250—most of them commonsense mentions that provide Members with some sense of confidence that they can live normal lives; second, providing a reasonable assurance that Members can make their own decisions about when it is appropriate for them to be accom-

panied by their spouse or child at an event or on a trip; and third, conforming the domestic travel limit to current House rules of 4 days.

These changes make a lot of sense to me. For Members who are concerned that the dollar thresholds and triggers in House Resolution 250 could entrap Members even as they try to do the right thing. By banning all gifts the bright lines should be very clear. Having had such a policy in my office for 7 years—in fact a policy that goes beyond this proposal, because we accept no travel—I can assure my colleagues that a clear ban is workable. I urge my colleagues to support this approach—it is fair and it will go a long way in helping to restore the public's faith in this body.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan [Ms. RIVERS].

Ms. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, before I was elected last November, I took the common cause pledge to not accept gifts in my office, and I have adhered to that pledge throughout the time that I have been here. I introduced a bill that would do exactly what this amendment would do, it would say that in Congress we do not take gifts.

Throughout my district, I have talked about the need for Congress to operate in a bipartisan way and for Congress to clean up its House in terms of ethics, and I am pleased to support this effort today, which is both, bipartisan and reflective of our need to put ethics first.

Mr. Speaker, this is really the deimperialization of Congress. We are saying to our Nation that we will not take gifts, we will pay for our own food, we will pay for our own travel, we will pay for our own recreation. This is not revolutionary, it is not unreasonable, it is not unduly burdensome, it is simply the right thing to do. I urge a "yes" vote.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. BROWNBACK], one of the outstanding new Members of this body, one who has led the fight for reform since he arrived here about 11 months ago.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the chairman for his kind words.

Briefly stated, this is a very important reform on trying to reestablish some public trust in elective office. I say this not to impugn anything or anybody at this institution or body, but simply that people do not trust the system. We have to change the system.

I think until we ban gifts completely, they will not trust the system. Indeed, half steps forward may actually take us backward in the public's perception of this body and trust. And that is what this is all about, about public trust.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this amendment, to just say "no" to gifts, to ban them, and to start to reestablish that public trust in this body.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOEKSTRA].

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague on the other side of the aisle for yielding me time, and I also want to compliment the distinguished gentleman, the chairman of the Committee on Rules, for structuring a fair rule, and also for being a partner during the last 3 weeks as we have tried to put together this reform to the gift policy in the House.

It has been a fun time, it has been a learning time, but, most importantly, I think tonight, as we complete this process, we can demonstrate that we have gone through a process of listening to the American people, we have spent a tremendous amount of time listening to Members, Members of both sides of the aisle, and recognize that they have all approached this issue with a lot of emotion, a lot of good will, and a lot of genuine interest in doing the right thing.

Mr. Speaker, I think tonight we will have the opportunity to do the right thing. We will have an opportunity to set a clear, new standard on the gifts that House Members can accept. This does not preclude us from interacting in an effective and efficient way with our constituents, with those that are here to educate us on the issues, this just moves a whole set of concerns, issues that have been associated with how constituents and other individuals may interact with Congress.

We are going to set a new standard. I applaud the Speaker for bringing this idea and this concept to the floor, and I think we have a real opportunity to say the new standard is we will accept no gifts. Our interaction with our constituents, our interaction with those that are here to educate us on the issues will deal purely with the substance of the various issues.

Mr. Speaker, I think this is a good opportunity to set a standard, to set a standard which perhaps the other body will also follow.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Connecticut, Mr. CHRIS SHAYS, one of the true leaders of reform in this House.

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

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Gingrich amendment to House Resolution 250 and commend the gentleman from Georgia on his valuable contribution to this debate.

A total gift ban, as proposed in the Gingrich amendment, makes sense. It's simple, straightforward and strong.

The American people want gift reform and this amendment goes even further than the Senate-passed rule many of us have been advocating. I thank Speaker GINGRICH for coming forward with this bold proposal, and urge its adoption.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. JOHN FOX, another out-

standing new Member of this body, another leader in reform since he arrived here 11 months ago.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, no one runs for this office to receive gifts from lobbyists. No one runs for reelection for that purpose. There is a public expectation we should not receive gifts, trips or entertainment. Our citizens do not. We need to help restore the confidence in the House by passing the Gingrich-Solomon amendment. No gifts mean no recordkeeping. The concept is overdue. Please vote for the amendment.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the time remaining on each side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST] has 10½ minutes remaining and the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] has 3½ minutes remaining.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN].

□ 1800

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, it was good fortune in life as a college student to go to work for U.S. Senator Paul Douglas of Illinois, a man who literally wrote the book on ethics and government.

He had a gift policy in the early 1960's, where he would not accept a gift of value more than \$2.50. He ended up retuning almost everything. Sometimes it created embarrassment and a stir, but it was a standard that he lived by and people respected him for that.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to support this bipartisan effort. It holds Members of Congress to a higher standard, and we should be held to that standard. I have personally established a gift ban in my office and it has been in place for quite some time. This disclosure and the gift-ban provisions here are consistent with that, and I think a good measure for this House to follow. I am sorry it has taken us this long to bring this matter before us.

Mr. Speaker, having said that, now that we have established ourselves a higher standard for Members of Congress, let me suggest that we are in the midst of a governmental crisis where we are holding Members of Congress to a lower standard. I make reference to the bill I introduced, H.R. 1221, "No budget, no pay."

We sent home 800,000 Federal employees without pay while Members of Congress still receive their paychecks. We have said to those widows and dependents of veterans, "You may not get a check December 1, but your Congressman will." We have said to our staff people, "You may not get a check for your services, but your Congressman will."

Frankly, I think this is an outrage. Members of Congress have basically created a political crisis which could be solved in a heartbeat. I frankly think if we turned off the TV cameras and the machines printing congressional checks, this crisis would be over in 15 minutes.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GILCHREST].

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Speaker, if I understand this correctly, there are three schools of thought driving the gift ban. The first is that some believe Members of Congress regularly, or even occasionally, sell their vote for a dinner or a golf game. If anyone seriously believes this, instead of bringing a bill to the floor, they should bring a complaint to the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct. I do not think anyone who knows this institution or its Members could believe that this is the case.

The second theory maintains that the problem is not reality; the problem is perception. They think that the people believe that we are easily bribed and we need to prohibit these bribes in order to placate the populace. In other words, they say that on a day when the Government is shut down over budget problems and we are on the brink of entering a conflict in Bosnia, the American people want us to go through this self-flagellation to restore the appearance of integrity. I am not sure that is what we ought to be spending our time on.

The third school of thought maintains that our constituents will reelect us as long as we make a grand show of how terrible this institution or its Members are. If we make it clear to everyone that we are trying to clean this place up and that we are trying to somehow play the integrity guardian of this place, then they will never consider us politicians.

Mr. Speaker, in the Bible it says that hypocrites stand on the street corner and pray out loud. Well, I think we ought to restore the confidence of the public by doing the public good.

Mr. Speaker, I do not go to dinner with lobbyists. I have no interest in gifts. I do not play golf. I do not like to travel. More importantly, I do not take any PAC money. I do not take any money outside the district. I find it ridiculous that the suggestion here is that if Members take a \$25 dinner from a lobbyist, they might be bribed, but if they accept \$5,000 from a PAC, they will not be bribed.

The only gift, for example, that would interest me right now is that we get our work done, and we can all go home. But, Mr. Speaker, I will vote for this legislation.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOKE].

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, I want to speak in favor of this amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I want to share with the House my own experience in business, because we went through this same challenge in the companies that I founded and ran, and we finally decided that we could tinker around with different ways of trying to deal with the problem, if there is such a problem, of purchasing influence by suppliers through entertainment and gifts.

Mr. Speaker, if, in fact, my colleagues believe that there is an ethical vulnerability, and obviously that is what we are saying because we do have rules in this area already, then the way to really solve it, the way to really end it once and for all, is to create a zero-tolerance standard, because what that does with a zero-tolerance standard is that it draws the brightest of bright lines. It makes it crystal clear on a daily basis. There is absolutely no question in anybody's mind and everyone knows what the standard is.

Mr. Speaker, we are talking about a standard of no gift, zero tolerance, no question. It is crystal clear. It is very simple. So long as Members take on the yoke of representation in this House, Members will know without any question, without any doubt, exactly what their responsibility in this area is with respect to the acceptance of gifts.

Mr. Speaker, that is why I support the amendment. I urge my colleagues to do the same thing, and I hope it passes.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM].

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, it is good to be working on something that we can agree on today and really improve the quality of Government. It is not about whether Members can be bought. That is not the issue here. I respect the Members of this body. Nobody is going to be bought because they go to dinner.

Mr. Speaker, if Members have a propensity to being bought, they can get bought no matter what rules we have. That is not the issue. The issue is to make this body more businesslike and reflect the value system that the American public wants us to adopt.

Mr. Speaker, I came from South Carolina, the legislature there, where we had several people unfortunately go to jail because they did get bought. We had a lot of rules, but they still got bought. We looked at the situation in South Carolina and we said, "Let us adopt bright-line rules and make people feel better about this institution." In South Carolina, legislators cannot take anything from a registered lobbyist.

Mr. Speaker, let me tell my colleagues this: Government still works. Lobbyists do not need to give me anything to tell me about their business interest, to tell me what they would like to happen with their Government. We can sit down and we can talk and I will listen and I will do what I think is best for my district. We do not need money to change hands; we do not need gifts to change hands.

Military officers, and I was one for 6½ years, cannot take anything from the contractors that they deal with.

Mr. Speaker, what we are trying to do is run this place in a more businesslike fashion and restore public trust. The issue is not about being bought. The issue is changing Congress to make sure that we live in a system

that is very similar to the average, everyday American.

The gift situation needs to be changed, and I congratulate the Speaker for putting in a zero-tolerance level as the standard. I congratulate the Democratic Party for helping us to get there to restore faith in our Congress. This is a small step forward, but it is a good step forward.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina). The gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST] has 4 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] has 3½ minutes remaining.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, do I understand that the gentleman from New York only has one speaker who will close?

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, that is correct.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BRYANT].

(Mr. BRYANT of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BRYANT of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am glad we are at this point, finally, after all these years of effort on the part of many people on both sides of the aisle, and we are about to prohibit the acceptance of gifts. Mr. Speaker, I think it is right that we do so.

I can only observe that we spent a good part of that 2½ years trying to hammer out a compromise between those who were opposed to doing anything and those of us who wanted a complete ban, and the compromise that we came up with it what is in the bill that is known as the Waldholtz bill before the House today.

Had we known the Speaker was going to come forward with an amendment to take it down to zero, we would have embraced that in the first place. I am glad he has done it. I would point out that his bill, like the underlying bill, has many, many exceptions to it, including gifts from relatives and gifts based on personal friendship, and attendance at lobby-attended events and so forth, which are good exceptions. I support them.

Mr. Speaker, I notice in the gentleman's provisions that he specifically left out of the list of exceptions, items of little intrinsic value, such as baseball caps and greeting cards. I am curious to know, and this is an actual question, not a rhetorical question, if that was intentional. If it was not intentional, I wonder is it would not be a good idea to fix it while we have a chance.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, I would say to the gentleman, it was not intentional and we would accept a unanimous consent to remove it.

MODIFICATION OFFERED BY MR. BRYANT OF TEXAS TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SOLOMON

Mr. BRYANT of Texas. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, if that is appro-

priate at this time, I ask unanimous consent to do that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYANT of Texas. Mr. Speaker, finally, I would say to the Members of the House it is not only that Lord that works in mysterious ways; it is the U.S. Congress. However we got here, I am glad we are here. We ought to vote for it and be proud of it as a bipartisan product and move on to other business.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. So the Chair can be clear about the impact of that unanimous consent request, the gentleman from New York will suspend one moment so we can make certain of the import of that.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BRYANT] I do not know if he has the bill there, but on page 9, lines 21 and 22, there is a section that says, an item of nominal value such as a greeting card, baseball cap, or T-shirt.

Mr. BRYANT of Texas. Yes.

Mr. SOLOMON. And that was the one the gentleman was talking about?

Mr. BRYANT of Texas. That is the one I was referring to.

Mr. SOLOMON. The other item was on page 7, which was donations of products from the State that the Member represents that are intended primarily for promotional purposes, such as display or free distribution, and are of minimal value to any other recipient.

Mr. BRYANT of Texas. I would like to include that in the unanimous consent request, although I did not before.

Mr. SOLOMON. The others were taken out for the same reason, unintentionally. If the gentleman from Texas wants to include that, we would accept it.

Mr. BRYANT of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would do so and if it is not necessary to rearticulate that, I will leave it that way.

Mr. SOLOMON. So that the Speaker and the Clerk understand, on page 7, we are removing lines 7 through 11, and on page 9 we are removing lines 21 and 22. That is the Byrant unanimous consent request.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands this to be the unanimous consent request. The Clerk will read what the Chair understands to be the modification that is being requested.

The Clerk read as follows:

Modification offered by Mr. BRYANT of Texas to the amendment offered by Mr. SOLOMON.

In the second paragraph of the amendment offered by Mr. SOLOMON of New York, strike out Instructions. On page 9, strike lines 21 through 22.

Mr. SOLOMON. And page 7, lines 7 through 11.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, I have a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, is this being made available in writing to the Members?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk is attempting to report the modification proposed by the unanimous-consent request.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman reserves the right to object and the gentleman's point of order is noted.

If the gentleman will suspend for a moment while the Chair verifies the unanimous-consent request.

Mr. SOLOMON. I just sent it to the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will now rereport the modification that is the subject of the unanimous-consent request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BRYANT], realizing that there is a reservation of objection by the gentleman from Hawaii.

The Clerk read as follows:

Modification offered by Mr. BRYANT of Texas to the amendment offered by Mr. SOLOMON:

Strike out the second paragraph of the instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the modification offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BRYANT]?

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, could we have it explained once more? Perhaps the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BRYANT] or the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] would explain at this juncture precisely what it is that will be allowed or disallowed, whichever makes the most sense in terms of an explanation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to either the gentleman from Texas or the gentleman from New York.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Hawaii will suspend. The gentleman from Hawaii has the floor and may yield to whomever he may wish.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BRYANT] or the gentleman from New York, if he feels he can contribute to the explanation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. There is an explanation forthcoming about an important unanimous-consent request.

□ 1815

The gentleman from Hawaii has yielded to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BRYANT].

Mr. BRYANT of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the amendment to the bill simply says that there will be no gifts accepted by any Member unless they fall under specific exemptions. Those exemptions are the same exemptions that are in the Senate rules, that are in the underlying rule which the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH] has amended, with two omissions that were inadvertent, one of those is home State prod-

ucts of minimal value for display or distribution, and the other is items of little intrinsic value such as baseball caps or greeting cards. Those were accidentally omitted from the list of exceptions and, accordingly, I made a unanimous consent request that they be added back into the list of exceptions thereby permitting Members to accept those without worrying about any problems.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, continuing my reservation of objection, what concerns me here is, the reason I raised the question, the reason that I am doing this is that I am concerned that we are now arriving at a point where we are listing what is proscribed, or are we listing what is included in that which is accepted? If it is not specifically named in this legislation, does that mean then that we run the risk of having it considered something which is forbidden?

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, the answer is yes.

Mr. BRYANT of Texas. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, I am not sure what the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] answered yes to. I want to make it very clear.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I am exactly clear as to what the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] just said. Mr. SOLOMON just said that in regard to what you just named—greeting cards and baseball caps—that will now be allowed. Presumably, had that not been included at this point, or the attempt made to include it at this point, you could get greeting cards which would be illegal. You could get baseball caps which would be illegal. The question I asked, and why I am reserving the right to object is, I am trying to find out—excuse me, not I—but if we do not list everything that is allowed, does that mean that that which does not appear in this specific list of exemptions may very well at some point be considered as being illegal and will we have to find that out as we go along?

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

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, if I could even go one step further than that, I think the beauty of this amendment, prior to this unanimous-consent request, was that it is a clear signal to the lobbyists, do not send anything. Then we do not have to decide. Then there is not a problem.

Now we are saying that baseball caps and other items, other items of minimal value, now it becomes a judgment call not only on the giver but also the receiver as to what else may be included, which goes to the gentleman's point, but also to what is of minimal value.

The beauty of this amendment, which was a gift ban, which exempted

out the family and everything else, was that it not only was a suggestion to us but it was a clear signal to those who might want to give. I think that was the beauty of it. I would hope that the gentleman would continue to object.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, I have not objected yet.

Mr. NUSSLE. If the gentleman does not, I might.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the editorial clarity, but I am trying to find out here from the chairman of the Committee on Rules, who is now being advised on all sides, Mr. Speaker, I thank you for your patience in this, but I do think it is crucial to the understanding of the bill before us.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina). So that Members may have clarity of thought, the gentleman from Hawaii still controls the floor under a reservation of objection.

Mr. BRYANT of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Further reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BRYANT of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the specific item which was inadvertently left out of the Gingrich amendment said, and it said this for several years in its text, items of little intrinsic value, such as baseball caps and greeting cards. Items of little intrinsic value, we want to leave that in there so there is no problem for any Member. That is all we are trying to do here. My unanimous-consent request, which has been approved by the other side, is simply to leave it in there.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, we are exchanging these words verbally right now. I am looking at the amendment to House Resolution 250, gift reform. The amendment retains exceptions for, and then it lists quite a number of items. If I understand it correctly, there is now a unanimous-consent request that language be added to that list of exemptions; am I correct?

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, yes, the gentleman is correct.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, could the gentleman repeat the language at this time, please.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I would be glad to. If the gentleman has the underlying legislation, the proposal before him, on page 7, lines 7 through 11, they are allowed under the underlying legislation. And the Gingrich amendment would prohibit them. This is what the underlying legislation allows.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Reclaiming my time, is the gentleman referring to, on page 7, "donations of products from the State."—

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, that is correct.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. "That a Member represents that are intended primarily for promotional purposes, such

as display or free distribution, and are of minimal value to any individual recipient'?

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, exactly. And then flip the page to page 9. Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Page 9?

Mr. SOLOMON. Yes, lines 21 and 22.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. An item of nominal value such as greeting cards, baseball cap or T shirt.

Mr. SOLOMON. Keep in mind "such as."

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Yes. Now, is it the case that by inadvertence this was left out of the bill?

Mr. SOLOMON. The underlying legislation, it was specifically left in. In other words, as an allowed gift. Under the Gingrich legislation, it was inadvertently prohibited.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, in the Gingrich legislation that is now before us, it was inadvertently left out; is that correct?

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, that is correct.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. So if this is accepted, the unanimous consent request is accepted, those two elements that appeared in the underlying bill would now appear in the Gingrich legislation?

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, that is correct.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, continuing my reservation of objection, it occurs to me that the "such as" may be illustrative, but is it supposed to be illustrative of the amount of money, when we say intrinsic value, are we talking about, is it your understanding, Mr. SOLOMON, that that has a dollar value, when the phrase intrinsic value is utilized to describe—

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, minimal, nominal value, yes.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH] our Speaker, has to leave in about 3 minutes. There are 3½ minutes remaining in the debate.

Mr. BRYANT of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my unanimous-consent request for the time being.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's request is withdrawn for the time being.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, on opening day the Speaker of this House directed the Republican Members of this House to reform this Congress. We put through profound changes, such as shrinking the number of committees, subcommittees, eliminating proxy voting and opening up sunshine for these committees. He also directed us to continue the reforms of this House. This is one of them.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH], the great Speaker of this House. Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST] for the way he handled this this afternoon and enabled Members to participate in a bipartisan manner.

I want to thank the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BRYANT], because the truth is when we first drafted this we did not intend to drop out the T shirt part in particular. Members who go and they try to help with charities and a lot of other things. I appreciate his bringing it to our attention. I hope when I am done he can actually finish working that out with the gentleman from Hawaii and really make that unanimous-consent request a second time.

I also thought, however, that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GILCHREST] had a very important point. I want to mention here to the House the testimony I made a few days ago to the House Committee on Government Reform and Oversight about establishing a bipartisan commission to look at the entire fabric of power in the information age, from lobbying to gifts to campaign financing to party financing to independent expenditures, because the truth is, we can ban gifts and then we end up with a PAC giving \$5,000. We can outlaw PAC's and then we end up with an independent expenditure of \$500,000. There are all sorts of things that go on in the information age that we do not record very well, we do not understand very well. And we are not going to have any one or two reforms that automatically improve it.

I do believe that I had an obligation to offer this amendment. Let me explain why. I think that the Speaker has an obligation to try to protect all the Members of the House. I was told by several members of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct and several former members of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct that the rules adopted by the Senate were clearly unenforceable and would in the end end up with Members by the most innocent of just forgetting things over the course of an entire year traveling back and forth to home, the kind of schedules we keep, inadvertently ending up in the kind of violations that would for the first time cause real problems and lead Members to innocently end up either being entrapped or finding themselves in trouble they had no notion of.

The gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN], who had been for many years our ranking member, made the point that we have never actually had an ethics case involving a gift. So at one level one can say, why are we changing it? But if we are going to change it in the direction that the Senate chose, then I think frankly we have an obligation to change it decisively and clearly.

I just think that we have to recognize that there is bipartisan support for trying to figure out how should we operate. We win an election. We are here for 2 years. We serve the people. What should the standards be?

My conclusion was that the simplest, the cleanest and the clearest standard was to say, no gifts. That may well mean what the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] was saying a while ago, we may literally have to set

up a repository that anonymous gifts end up at go to a charity or to go somewhere because people literally will drop things off. But the rule ought to be, no gifts. Personal friends, yes, Members have every right to have a personal life. Family, yes, we hope Members have a family life. We want you to, despite the recent schedule.

But the fact is that there is a clear line and rather than have all sorts of little nuances and regulations and red tape, I would urge my colleagues to vote for this amendment to end accepting gifts from lobbyists and others who give them the gift because they are a Member of Congress. There is no way around it. They did not get the gift before they were elected, they are not going to get the gift after they leave. That is different from personal friends and it is different from family, and I think it is the right thing, to just end it and take this as step one.

Then I hope the House will join me before the year is out in voting for a bipartisan commission to look at the totality of what we have to do to clean up this system and make it fair for the average American.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would advise Members, at this point the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] has one-half minute remaining, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST] has 2 minutes remaining.

The Chair will now entertain the unanimous-consent request.

MODIFICATION OFFERED BY MR. BRYANT OF TEXAS TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SOLOMON

Mr. BRYANT of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the language found at page 7, lines 1 through 5, and page 9, lines 15 and 16, be reintroduced as exceptions.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is on the introduced bill and not on the bill before us. The gentleman should be on the Gingrich amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the proposed modification.

Modification offered by Mr. BRYANT of Texas to the Amendment offered by Mr. SOLOMON: Strike out the second paragraph of the amendment.

□ 1830

Mr. BRYANT of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that we do what the Clerk just read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.



Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, is there any way, under the rule reported out, that the House could amend the pending amendment short of a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. SOLOMON. Not short of a unanimous-consent request.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. So that no amendment would be allowed?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Only by unanimous consent.

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

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. I would like to know, Mr. Speaker, whether with the objection the possibility of the two items mentioned by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] in response to the request from the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BRYANT] are now out of the Gingrich amendment with respect to that which appears in the underlying bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is not at liberty to interpret the modification that was suggested.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker, and the reason I am asking is that it may determine how I will vote and, perhaps, others will vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would advise the gentleman from Hawaii that the modification was not agreed to by unanimous consent.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Does that mean, any further parliamentary inquiry because I want to understand the meaning of it, and I think I am entitled to that before I vote, I am entitled to understand it. If everybody else in the room understands it, that is fine; I intend to have a full understanding before I vote.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend the time by 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would like to make sure all heard the unanimous-consent request. Will the gentleman restate it?

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. It is to extend the time of debate another 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. To be controlled by? Equally divided?

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. By me.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

Mr. SOLOMON. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, we would not object to the time being extended for the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST] or for myself, but we could not do it for the gentleman from Hawaii.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, I think I need to get a clear understanding. I will do it under the parliamentary inquiry, but I thought it might be more in order if there was an oppor-

tunity for members to maybe, perhaps, discuss it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Then the gentleman from Hawaii has a parliamentary inquiry that is being entertained by the Chair?

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, I will stay with the parliamentary inquiry, and I withdraw my unanimous-consent request.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman withdraws his unanimous-consent request.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. The parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker, is that if I, or anybody else on the floor, wishes to vote for a bill which contains the two elements as enunciated by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BRYANT], would I then vote against the Gingrich proposal as presently before the body and then vote, should that fail, for the underlying legislation? If I wanted to vote for a bill which contained all of the exemptions listed in the underlying bill, minus those two, which I believe would have been added had there not been objection to the unanimous-consent request made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BRYANT]—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would advise the gentleman, given a request for regular order, that the gentleman is not stating a proper parliamentary inquiry, but the Chair understands his dilemma. The Chair cannot advise the Member as to the import of this amendment. The Chair can only say it is a modification by unanimous consent.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, I cannot hear you.

Mr. Speaker, I am doing my best to make a parliamentary inquiry within the boundaries of the rules.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A parliamentary inquiry is being made by the gentleman from Hawaii. The Chair will entertain that first, and then will take up any others.

The Chair would advise the gentleman from Hawaii that the Chair is not at liberty to interpret the import of any amendments currently pending. The Chair will simply say that a modification was proposed by unanimous-consent request, objection was heard, so the underlying amendment remains the same as it was debated now on the floor.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] has one-half minute remaining. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST] has yielded back.

It may answer the gentleman from Hawaii's parliamentary inquiry to have the gentleman from New York use that one-half minute.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, maybe I did not state it correctly, and I will make a further parliamentary inquiry then. There are obviously Members who want to vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will indulge the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. ABERCROMBIE] for one more inquiry.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, I understand that there are Members who are now prepared to vote. I am glad they have all received wisdom. I do not pretend to have it.

My parliamentary inquiry is:

Should the Gingrich proposal as presently before us be defeated, would we then be voting on the underlying legislation which would contain the two elements which do not now exist, as I understand it, in the Gingrich proposal because the unanimous-consent was objected to?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Clerk will report the pending Solomon amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SOLOMON: Page 2, line 3, strike "(1)" and strike lines 6 through 15.

Page 7, strike lines 1 through 5, and page 9, strike lines 15 through 16 and redesignate paragraphs (13) through (22) as paragraphs (12) through (21).

Page 10, line 9, insert a period after "individual" and strike "if others" and all that follows through line 12.

Page 13, beginning in line 24 strike "3 days exclusive of travel time within the United States" and insert "4 days within the United States".

Page 14, insert a period after "employee" in line 17 and strike "subject to" and all that follows through line 23.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the reading). The Chair would advise the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. ABERCROMBIE] that the Clerk is reading the pending amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] as the designee of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH].

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. SOLOMON. I ask the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. ABERCROMBIE] to listen to my parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. Speaker, is it not a fact that in the Waldholtz legislation pending before us there is an exception which allows Members to accept nominal values such as greeting cards, baseball caps, and T-shirts? The answer is yes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is not at liberty to interpret the underlying amendment, but the gentleman is the offeror of the amendment.

Mr. SOLOMON. Well then, Mr. Speaker, is it not a fact that in the Gingrich amendment it strikes the exception which allows the gentleman from Hawaii to accept a T-shirt?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is not stating a proper parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under the new regime have we now debated T-shirts more than we have debated the defense budget today?



The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has not stated a proper parliamentary inquiry.

The Chair at this point would advise Members that the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] has one-half minute remaining in the debate and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST] has yielded back the balance of his time.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to conclude.

Mr. Speaker, the amendment before us is the Gingrich amendment which does strike the exception which allows Members to accept T-shirts, greeting cards. If the Gingrich amendment passes, it will ban all gifts except those exceptions allowed in the underlying legislation. I would urge Members to vote for the Gingrich amendment.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the previous question is ordered on the amendment.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON].

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

## RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 422, noes 8, not voting 2, as follows:

[Roll No. 808]

## AYES—422

Abercrombie	Bryant (TN)	Davis
Ackerman	Bryant (TX)	de la Garza
Allard	Bunn	Deal
Andrews	Bunning	DeFazio
Archer	Burr	DeLauro
Armey	Burton	DeLay
Bachus	Buyer	Dellums
Baesler	Callahan	Deutsch
Baker (CA)	Calvert	Diaz-Balart
Baker (LA)	Camp	Dickey
Baldacci	Canady	Dicks
Ballenger	Cardin	Dingell
Barcia	Castle	Dixon
Barr	Chabot	Doggett
Barrett (NE)	Chambliss	Dooley
Barrett (WI)	Chapman	Doolittle
Bartlett	Chenoweth	Dornan
Barton	Christensen	Doyle
Bass	Chrysler	Dreier
Bateman	Clay	Duncan
Becerra	Clayton	Dunn
Beilenson	Clement	Durbin
Bentsen	Clinger	Edwards
Bereuter	Clyburn	Ehlers
Berman	Coble	Ehrlich
Bevill	Coburn	Emerson
Bilbray	Coleman	Engel
Bilirakis	Collins (GA)	English
Bishop	Collins (IL)	Ensign
Bliley	Collins (MI)	Eshoo
Blute	Combust	Evans
Boehlert	Condit	Everett
Boehner	Conyers	Ewing
Bonilla	Cooley	Farr
Bonior	Costello	Fawell
Bono	Cox	Fazio
Borski	Coyne	Fields (TX)
Boucher	Cramer	Filner
Brewster	Crane	Flake
Browder	Crapo	Flanagan
Brown (CA)	Cremeans	Foglietta
Brown (FL)	Cubin	Foley
Brown (OH)	Cunningham	Forbes
Brownback	Danner	Ford

Fowler	Lewis (KY)	Ros-Lehtinen
Fox	Lightfoot	Rose
Frank (MA)	Lincoln	Roth
Franks (CT)	Linder	Roukema
Franks (NJ)	Lipinski	Roybal-Allard
Frelinghuysen	Livingston	Royce
Frisa	LoBiondo	Rush
Frost	Lofgren	Sabo
Funderburk	Longley	Salmon
Furse	Lowey	Sanders
Gallegly	Lucas	Sanford
Ganske	Luther	Sawyer
Gedjenson	Maloney	Saxton
Gekas	Manton	Scarborough
Gephardt	Manzullo	Schaefer
Geren	Markey	Schiff
Gibbons	Martinez	Schroeder
Gilchrest	Martini	Schumer
Gillmor	Mascara	Scott
Gilman	Matsui	Seastrand
Gonzalez	McCarthy	Sensenbrenner
Goodlatte	McCollum	Serrano
Goodling	McCrery	Shadegg
Gordon	McDade	Shaw
Goss	McDermott	Shays
Graham	McHale	Shuster
Green	McHugh	Sisisky
Greenwood	McInnis	Skaggs
Gunderson	McIntosh	Skeen
Gutierrez	McKeon	Skelton
Gutknecht	McKinney	Slaughter
Hall (OH)	McNulty	Smith (MI)
Hall (TX)	Meehan	Smith (NJ)
Hamilton	Meek	Smith (TX)
Hancock	Menendez	Smith (WA)
Hansen	Metcalfe	Solomon
Harman	Meyers	Souder
Hastert	Mfume	Spence
Hastings (WA)	Mica	Spratt
Hayes	Miller (CA)	Stark
Hayworth	Miller (FL)	Stearns
Hefley	Minge	Stenholm
Hefner	Mink	Stockman
Heineman	Moakley	Stokes
Herger	Molinar	Studds
Hilleary	Mollohan	Stump
Hilliard	Montgomery	Stupak
Hinchey	Moorhead	Talent
Hobson	Moran	Tanner
Hoekstra	Morella	Tate
Hoke	Myrick	Tauzin
Holden	Nadler	Taylor (MS)
Horn	Neal	Taylor (NC)
Hostettler	Nethercutt	Tejeda
Houghton	Neumann	Thomas
Hoyer	Ney	Thompson
Hunter	Norwood	Thornberry
Hutchinson	Nussle	Thornnton
Hyde	Oberstar	Thurman
Inglis	Obey	Tiahrt
Istook	Olver	Torkildsen
Jackson-Lee	Ortiz	Torres
Jacobs	Orton	Torricelli
Jefferson	Owens	Traficant
Johnson (CT)	Oxley	Upton
Johnson (SD)	Packard	Velazquez
Johnson, E.B.	Pallone	Vento
Johnson, Sam	Parker	Visclosky
Johnston	Pastor	Volkmer
Jones	Paxon	Vucanovich
Kanjorski	Payne (NJ)	Waldholtz
Kaptur	Payne (VA)	Walker
Kasich	Pelosi	Walsh
Kelly	Peterson (FL)	Wamp
Kennedy (MA)	Peterson (MN)	Ward
Kennedy (RI)	Petri	Waters
Kennelly	Pickett	Watt (NC)
Kildee	Pombo	Watts (OK)
Kim	Pomeroy	Waxman
Kingston	Porter	Weldon (FL)
Klecicka	Portman	Weldon (PA)
Klink	Poshard	Weller
Klug	Pryce	White
Knollenberg	Quillen	Whitfield
Kolbe	Quinn	Wicker
LaFalce	Radanovich	Wilson
LaHood	Ramstad	Wise
Lantos	Rangel	Wolf
Largent	Reed	Woolsey
Latham	Regula	Wyden
LaTourette	Richardson	Wynn
Laughlin	Riggs	Yates
Lazio	Rivers	Young (AK)
Leach	Roberts	Young (FL)
Levin	Roemer	Zeliff
Lewis (CA)	Rogers	Zimmer
Lewis (GA)	Rohrabacher	

## NOES—8

Fattah	Murtha	Towns
Hastings (FL)	Myers	Williams
King	Rahall	

## NOT VOTING—2

Fields (LA)	Tucker
-------------	--------

## □ 1900

Mr. RAHALL and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. SMITH of Michigan, SANFORD, and LAFALCE changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina). Pursuant to House Resolution 268, the previous question is ordered on the resolution, as amended.

The question is on the resolution, as amended.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

## RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 422, noes 6, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 809]

## AYES—422

Abercrombie	Calvert	Dornan
Ackerman	Camp	Doyle
Allard	Canady	Dreier
Andrews	Cardin	Duncan
Archer	Castle	Dunn
Armey	Chabot	Durbin
Bachus	Chambliss	Edwards
Baesler	Chapman	Ehlers
Baker (CA)	Chenoweth	Ehrlich
Baker (LA)	Christensen	Emerson
Baldacci	Chrysler	Engel
Ballenger	Clay	English
Barcia	Clayton	Ensign
Barr	Clement	Eshoo
Barrett (NE)	Clinger	Evans
Barrett (WI)	Clyburn	Everett
Bartlett	Coble	Ewing
Barton	Coburn	Farr
Bass	Coleman	Fawell
Bateman	Collins (GA)	Fazio
Becerra	Collins (IL)	Fields (TX)
Beilenson	Collins (MI)	Filner
Bentsen	Combust	Flake
Bereuter	Condit	Flanagan
Berman	Conyers	Foglietta
Bevill	Cooley	Foley
Bilbray	Costello	Forbes
Bilirakis	Cox	Ford
Bishop	Coyne	Fowler
Bliley	Cramer	Fox
Blute	Crane	Frank (MA)
Boehlert	Crapo	Franks (CT)
Boehner	Cremeans	Franks (NJ)
Bonilla	Cubin	Frelinghuysen
Bonior	Cunningham	Frisa
Bono	Danner	Frost
Borski	Davis	Funderburk
Boucher	de la Garza	Furse
Brewster	Deal	Gallegly
Browder	DeFazio	Ganske
Brown (CA)	DeLauro	Gedjenson
Brown (FL)	DeLay	Gekas
Brown (OH)	Dellums	Gephardt
Brownback	Deutsch	Geren
Bryant (TN)	Diaz-Balart	Gibbons
Bryant (TX)	Dickey	Gilchrest
Bunn	Dicks	Gillmor
Bunning	Dingell	Gilman
Burr	Dixon	Gonzalez
Burton	Doggett	Goodlatte
Buyer	Dooley	Gordon
Callahan	Doolittle	Goss

Graham	Martinez	Salmon
Green	Martini	Sanders
Greenwood	Mascara	Sanford
Gunderson	Matsui	Sawyer
Gutierrez	McCarthy	Saxton
Gutknecht	McCollum	Scarborough
Hall (OH)	McCrery	Schaefer
Hall (TX)	McDade	Schiff
Hamilton	McDermott	Schroeder
Hancock	McHale	Schumer
Hansen	McHugh	Scott
Harman	McInnis	Seastrand
Hastert	McIntosh	Sensenbrenner
Hastings (FL)	McKeon	Serrano
Hastings (WA)	McKinney	Shadegg
Hayes	McNulty	Shaw
Hayworth	Meehan	Shays
Hefley	Meek	Shuster
Hefner	Menendez	Sisisky
Heineman	Metcalf	Skaggs
Herger	Meyers	Skeen
Hilleary	Mfume	Skelton
Hilliard	Mica	Slaughter
Hinchey	Miller (CA)	Smith (MI)
Hobson	Miller (FL)	Smith (NJ)
Hoekstra	Minge	Smith (TX)
Hoke	Mink	Smith (WA)
Holden	Moakley	Solomon
Horn	Molinari	Souder
Hostettler	Mollohan	Spence
Houghton	Montgomery	Spratt
Hoyer	Moorhead	Stark
Hunter	Moran	Stearns
Hutchinson	Morella	Stenholm
Hyde	Myrick	Stockman
Inglis	Nadler	Stokes
Istook	Neal	Studds
Jackson-Lee	Nethercutt	Stump
Jacobs	Neumann	Stupak
Jefferson	Ney	Talent
Johnson (CT)	Norwood	Tanner
Johnson (SD)	Nussle	Tate
Johnson, E. B.	Oberstar	Tauzin
Johnson, Sam	Obey	Taylor (MS)
Johnston	Oliver	Taylor (NC)
Jones	Ortiz	Tejeda
Kanjorski	Orton	Thomas
Kaptur	Owens	Thompson
Kasich	Oxley	Thornberry
Kelly	Packard	Thornton
Kennedy (MA)	Pallone	Thurman
Kennedy (RI)	Parker	Tiahrt
Kennelly	Pastor	Torkildsen
Kildee	Paxon	Torres
Kim	Payne (NJ)	Torricelli
Kingston	Payne (VA)	Traficant
Klecza	Pelosi	Upton
Klink	Peterson (FL)	Velazquez
Klug	Peterson (MN)	Vento
Knollenberg	Petri	Visclosky
Kolbe	Pickett	Volkmer
LaFalce	Pombo	Vucanovich
LaHood	Pomeroy	Waldholtz
Lantos	Porter	Walker
Largent	Portman	Walsh
Latham	Poshard	Wamp
LaTourette	Pryce	Ward
Laughlin	Quillen	Waters
Lazio	Quinn	Watt (NC)
Leach	Radanovich	Watts (OK)
Levin	Rahall	Waxman
Lewis (CA)	Ramstad	Weldon (FL)
Lewis (GA)	Rangel	Weldon (PA)
Lewis (KY)	Reed	Weller
Lightfoot	Regula	White
Lincoln	Richardson	Whitfield
Linder	Riggs	Wicker
Lipinski	Rivers	Wilson
Livingston	Roberts	Wise
LoBiondo	Roemer	Wolf
Lofgren	Rogers	Woolsey
Longley	Rohrabacher	Wyden
Lowey	Ros-Lehtinen	Wynn
Lucas	Rose	Yates
Luther	Roth	Young (AK)
Maloney	Roukema	Young (FL)
Manton	Roybal-Allard	Zeliff
Manzullo	Royce	Zimmer
Markey	Rush	

## NOES—6

Fattah	King	Towns
Goodling	Myers	Williams

## NOT VOTING—4

Fields (LA)	Sabo
Murtha	Tucker

□ 1919

So, the resolution, as amended was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

# PROVIDING FOR THE CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2564, LOBBYING DISCLOSURE ACT OF 1995

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 269 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

## H. RES. 269

*Resolved*, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2564) to provide for the disclosure of lobbying activities to influence the Federal Government, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. Points of order against consideration of the bill of failure to comply with clause 2(l)(6) of rule XI are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed two hours equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five minute rule. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against any amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except on motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. If H.R. 2564 is passed by the House in a form that is identical to S. 1060, as passed by the Senate, then at any time thereafter it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider the Senate bill in the House. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the Senate bill to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time is yielded for the purpose of debate only.

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the resolution (H. Res. 269) providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2564) to provide for the disclosure of lobbying activities to influence the Federal

Government, and for other purposes, and that I may include extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, with this rule, the House begins important discussions of reform that will, I hope, assist in restoring the public confidence in this institution and its practices. With this rule we embark on the first of the triumvirate of issues that concern Americans most about the mechanics of how this democracy functions: Lobby reform, gift reform and campaign finance reform. Beginning now with lobby reform, we will work to rewrite an outdated, inadequate and exceedingly vague series of rules pertaining to registered lobbyists and, specifically, public disclosure of their activities.

I am generally an ardent supporter of open rules, and today I bring to the House an open rule for consideration of this lobby reform bill—a rule that should have the support of all members. I should note, however, that in this special case, I have some reservations about what will happen if amendments are adopted to this bill. The reason for my concern is that this issue—lobby reform—has been bottled up in the Congress for years. This year, we have a real chance to break the logjam and send a good bill to the President for signature. The other body has already passed the identical measure we begin with today—and if the House passes the same bill without amendment, the measure could head straight to the White House without further delay. In my view, that would be the optimal result. Although I believe very strongly in the merit of several of the amendments members will hear today—most notably a proposal to restrict lobbying with taxpayer funds by executive branch officials and a proposal to restrict lobbying by organizations that are taxpayer-funded through grants—I intend to vote against all amendments to this bill because of my overriding belief that we've got to get the essence of lobby reform passed and signed into law now. I have learned from past efforts on this and other difficult subjects that, if you load up these bills with new ideas, late in the process, you become spoilers of the good in pursuit of the perfect. I hope my colleagues will consider that as they cast their votes today.

Mr. Speaker, that being said, Members should know that this is a wide open rule, providing that any Member may offer an amendment to H.R. 2564 if that amendment conforms to the standing rules of the House. The rule provides two hours of general debate, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking member of the Judiciary Committee. The rule waives clause 2(l)(6) of rule XI—the 3-day lay-over rule—against consideration of the bill and it waives all points of order