

doing some kind of completely unobjectionable thing, namely making sure that Federal moneys that go to organizations that receive Federal moneys that go to organizations that receive Federal grants cannot use those funds for lobbying. That is already against the law; make no bones about that. But this hearing showed, I think, one of the many, many reasons why in fact this is a proposal that would grossly interfere with the free exercise of political expression, and free speech, and freedom of association, all profoundly important rights under the Constitution of the United States as protected in the first amendment.

Mr. Speaker, one of the more instructive witnesses yesterday was the director of political affairs for the YMCA of America, a lady named C.J. Van Pelt, and she gave a very, very interesting presentation about exactly how burdensome, intrusive, and chilling for the involvement of the YMCA, hardly a radical organization, in the political life of this country, and we should understand that we are not talking about lobbying Congress. This bill goes way beyond that to deal with any, quote, political advocacy activities of any individual or organization in this country that may happen to receive anything of benefit or any grant money from the Federal Government. The restriction on any such organization, in this case the YMCA, and I say to the gentleman, "Mr. MCINTOSH, I have only 5 minutes so I'm not going to have time to yield. I apologize."

Mr. Speaker, let me just take this moment. I would love it if perhaps the sponsors of this legislation would agree to a full hour of special orders sometime and we could really engage on this.

Mr. MCINTOSH. I think that would be beneficial.

Mr. SKAGGS. Terrific; I thank the gentleman.

Ms. Van Pelt made the following point: Under this proposed legislation the YMCA would be prohibited because it happens to engage in such things as provision of day care, dealing with prevention of crime, drug-aversion education, any number of other things for which it receives some Federal grant funding. Under this legislation it would be prohibited from spending more than 5 percent, probably significantly less than that in the case of the Y, more than 5 percent of its privately raised funds, on being involved in the political life of this country, appearing before a board of county commissioners to, for instance, argue with them about a drug-prevention program in their county or also appearing before Congress to talk about legislation that we may be considering.

But Ms. Van Pelt explained that under their proposal, in order for her, as she would be required or as the YMCA would be required to certify every year adherence to this 5-percent limit, the YMCA of America would have to make inquiry of 140,000 vendors

with which they do business around the country. Why in the world would they have to do that? Well, because one of the little known, but most perverse, aspects of this legislation would count anything that the YMCA spends with anybody else that happens to have exceeded another limit on political advocacy buried in this bill, and anything that the YMCA spends with anybody else that happens to have exceeded another limit on political advocacy buried in this bill, and anything they spent with somebody that violated this other limit would count against their 5-percent limit, and the only way they could certify that they complied was to find out from all 140,000 others with whom they do business to make sure that those 140,000 organizations and businesses had not exceeded their limit on political advocacy. My colleagues can imagine the kind of incredible paperwork burden, not to mention the intimidating and chilling effect on constitutionally protected speech in this country that comes out of just this small part of this ill-advised and perverse legislation.

The extent to which some who advocate this legislation are willing to go was also demonstrated at the hearing yesterday in which unfortunately it came to light that the staff of this committee had engaged in an act of forgery, of concocting what was going to be a poster that was put out on the press table that misrepresented on facsimile letterhead vital information about one of the organizations that was to testify, did it with official funds in violation of any standard of decency.

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

(Mr. HILLEARY addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my 5-minute special order be taken at this point out of order.

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

There was no objection.

ENDING WELFARE FOR LOBBYISTS

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

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Speaker, let me respond to some of the statements that were made by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS] prior to this and also amplify for my colleagues and the American people what our hearing yesterday discovered about welfare for lobbyists, the lobbying organizations who take and receive grants from the taxpayer in order to subsidize their efforts to lobbyists to spend more money.

One of the things we discovered was that it is unknown how many grants there are that are being given. The internal Revenue Service has a data base that says there are \$39 billion of grants, the one with the thermometer, that are given each year to different groups, many of whom turn around and lobby Congress. Well, yesterday we found out that in fact \$39 billion is much too low a number. It is really more like \$224 billion in Federal grants that go to groups who are eligible to turn around and lobby Congress. The taxpayer will not stand for that, but it has been one of the most well kept secrets here in Washington.

Now many of those groups, the YMCA and other groups, perform very important and legitimate charitable services, but even under our proposal that will limit welfare for lobbyists they can continue to speak out in the city councils and at their local community levels.

Mr. Speaker, we have a chart here that shows how much many of the important charities would be able to continue to spend on advocacy issues.

This chart shows exactly how much various groups would be able to spend. The American Red Cross could continue to spend 5 percent of its funds, or \$17 million. The YMCA that we were discussing earlier could spend \$1.2 million. Now Ms. Van Pelt told us that that actually is slightly more than what they are allowed to spend under current IRS regulations. So we have not asked any of the legitimate charities to silence their voice. What we have done is said, Restrict what you do so you don't become a federally subsidized lobbying organization, but continue to be a charity that helps build communities, offer programs for children, for elderly, for those people who need assistance. It is very critical in this debate that we not get lost in the rhetoric and focus on the fact that taxpayer dollars are being used to subsidize lobbying efforts here in Washington.

Just today one of the most heavily subsidized groups, the National Council on Senior Citizens, was in Washington lobbying against our efforts to balance the budget. Now they receive \$72 million a year from taxpayers; 95 percent of their entire budget is from the taxpayer. They are virtually an entity like a Federal agency. But they also have a political action committee. They also take out political ads on TV, and today they are lobbying Congress against the balanced budget initiative.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCINTOSH. I do not have time to yield at this point. The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS] has suggested an hour discussion, and I think that would be a great idea.

I think it is very important that the American taxpayers know that their funds are going to groups who then