

their political agenda. It is almost as big an offense to me to see groups coming and defending this kind of activity.

Now, I will be the first to admit that the legislation that is being advanced may not be perfect, but it is hard for me to imagine anybody saying that there is not a serious problem. This is a serious problem.

This is probably only the tip of the iceberg. As the gentleman indicated, we are talking about \$39 billion that is being disbursed. Much of it is being funneled back into political activity. This may only be the tip of the iceberg. I think the taxpayers of the United States would be outraged if they knew this was going on.

I appreciate the fact that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MCINTOSH] has had the courage to bring this bill forward with the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. EHRLICH] and the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ISTOOK]. As I say, I think this is something that has been simmering beneath the surface for too long, and I am glad we brought it forward.

Mr. MCINTOSH. I thank the gentleman for his comments. One of the things we found out in our hearing yesterday is that many of the groups like the Red Cross and the United Way and the YMCA who were testifying before us yesterday, would, in fact, not be affected in the amount of advocacy that they could engage in. Because we have a 5-percent de minimis rule, they do not spend that much in lobbying.

My point essentially is that these groups would not be affected in their political advocacy because they are not big lobbying groups. But it is somewhat surprising that they are opposing this. I asked the YMCA do they disclose to their donors that they do a lot of advocacy and that they want to protect the ability of charitable groups to be lobbyists, and they did not really tell me how much they disclose that to their donors. They said they do a lot of mailings, but it was not quite clear when they asked them to give a donation if they tell somebody, "You know, we might spend up to 5 percent of that to be a lobbying group." I think some people would want to know that when they are giving money to these groups.

#### LAWS GOVERNING NONPROFIT LOBBYING ADEQUATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EVERETT). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. SLAUGHTER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, persons who are watching this afternoon, I have to tell you, if you are really going to find out what happened at that subcommittee meeting yesterday, I am afraid we are going to have to send you copies of the committee transcript. Because, frankly, you would have to be like Alice in Wonderland, who can believe six impossible things before

breakfast, if you believe what has been said here.

It was made clear by the witnesses yesterday that the law that is already on the books that governs nonprofit agencies is more than adequate. If there is any problem anywhere, if there is some kind of enforcement problem, deal with it.

The truth of the matter is, there has been no complaint to the IRS at any time that these laws have been on the books that any nonprofit agency in America broke that law. There is simply no indication of that at all.

What we have here is a bill that is intended to punish people who do not agree with the other side. They have made it clear. They have beaten up on the National Council of Senior Citizens as though they were the scourge of the earth and were going to bring down the country. We yesterday went through listening to people who headed up agencies, and we have had letters from people like the Girl Scouts, Catholic Charities, the YMCA, that this bill implies they are an enormous threat to the United States because of the grants they get.

Let me just tell you what it means to be a nonprofit agency and what you have to do under current law with Federal money. For example, you may not have any communication with the public and direct communication with legislators in an attempt to influence the introduction, enactment, modification or defeat of new or pending legislation in Congress or State legislatures. That does not apply to universities. We will get to them a little bit later.

You are prohibited from legislative liaison activities, including attending the hearings, gathering information, analyzing effects of such activities that support lobbying or are in knowing preparation for it.

You may not electioneer, directly or indirectly. This covers both attempting to (a) influence a Federal, State or local election, referendum, initiative, or similar procedure and, (b) to establish, support or administer a political campaign party, political action committee, or other organizations.

It's another matter what they do with their own money. It is not the Federal money. They have done nothing wrong with their Federal money. There is no indication anywhere that they did anything wrong with the Federal money that they got.

In addition, there is about a 5-page questionnaire which really smacks of McCarthyism frankly. I just learned today when a similar thing came up in the Justice Committee, that several Republicans took great umbrage at the questionnaire, things that had been asked of citizens of the United States.

For example, this questionnaire wants to know of every nonprofit agency, who do you associate with? Is that any of their business, who you associate with? Second, they have to contact every vendor with which they do business and get from them a written

statement on how much they in their private business spend for any lobbying activities.

In the case of the YMCA, the director told us yesterday that she does business with 148,000 vendors. She said that the onerous restrictions in this bill would obviously meet the purpose, which is to not allow nonprofits like the Boy Scouts and Girl Scouts and others who have always been perfect citizens, who are really always encouraging the community, to not let them have any say in this Federal Government—to give them an awful choice, to give up their citizenship or what little Federal money they get.

Now, how much do they get in a grant? Well, the first thing we need to know is the State and local governments in the United States get 90 percent of all the Federal grants. Do we ask them how they spend it? No. If they suddenly build something that does not go well, or a train that does not run, or a bridge that collapses, do we say how shameful this is to do this? No. We ask nothing in the world about them. The only restriction that we put on Federal grant money to a State and local government is to not let them charge their membership dues to an organization.

Contrast that to what I just read for you about what a nonprofit organization in this country has to do. Now, if you are a university, you are not even prohibited from paying your membership. Indeed, you can do that.

But when it comes to the misuse of Federal money that goes into the contracts, Mr. Speaker, since I have been in this House, and I am starting my ninth year, the misuse of Federal money that has been talked about most has come in two groups. First, the military contractors—which you all know the stories about the coffee pots, the toilet seats and the hammers; and universities who spent a lot of their research money or grant money for remodeling the university, for the President's salary, for putting dogs in kennels, or whatever other things they have done.

□ 1630

Did we call them before Congress and jump all over them and take the money away? No. We merely said we wished they would not do that.

Mr. Speaker, we have reached a new low. I want to tell everyone what Washington's dirty little secret is.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EVERETT). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

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