

The question: How many millions of dollars does it take to add up a trillion dollars? While you are thinking about it, bear in mind that it was the U.S. Congress that ran up the Federal debt that is \$27 billion away from \$5 trillion.

To be exact, as of the close of business yesterday, October 24, the total federal debt—down to the penny—stood at \$4,975,508,732,304.35. This figure is approximately \$27 billion away from \$5 trillion. Another depressing figure means that on a per capita basis, every man, woman, and child in America owes \$18,887.12.

Mr. President, back to our pop quiz, how many million in a trillion: There are a million million in a trillion.

TRIBUTE TO DON BROWN

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to Mr. Donald S. Brown, who throughout his exceptional career dedicated himself to public service. Mr. Brown has been a pioneer in the field of economic development. He worked tirelessly to help the poor around the world achieve a better way of life. He has also been instrumental in shaping the agenda of both bilateral and multilateral development institutions, encouraging them to focus closely on the needs of the people.

For the last 12 years, Don Brown has served as the vice president of the International Fund for Agricultural Development [IFAD], a specialized agency of the United Nations in Rome. As the most senior American in the organization, he has been an innovator of new and creative ideas that IFAD has implemented effectively on the ground. He has helped sharpen the focus of IFAD, which is the only international agency which devotes all of its resources to the rural poor. Most recently he has worked diligently, with other senior IFAD officials, to streamline IFAD, increase its efficiency, and reduce its administrative costs. Don Brown has labored unselfishly to promote development and reduce poverty and has been an inspiration to all of us working for a better world.

Mr. Brown also ably served in the U.S. Government for over 20 years. He willingly accepted very difficult assignments in various U.S. Agency for International Development [U.S. AID] posts throughout Africa and the Near East. During this time he held the position of mission director to Morocco and Zaire. In his last field assignment, Mr. Brown served as the director of the U.S. AID Mission to Cairo, Egypt, one of AID's largest missions. Mr. Brown also served at AID headquarters in Washington as the Deputy Assistant Administrator of AID to help formulate U.S. development policy. He also was the Executive Director of the Commission on Security and Economic Assistance, established by the Secretary of State.

Throughout his career, Don received numerous awards recognizing his outstanding achievements. His colleagues both within international organiza-

tions and the government found his sound advice and the many insights gained from his rich experience invaluable to their work. We and they will always remember him as someone who was ever willing to lend a helping hand or a word of comfort. Mr. Brown is a thoughtful, pragmatic, and dedicated individual who touched many of our lives and who made an enormous contribution to the lives of many poor people around the world. I ask my colleagues to join me in paying tribute to Don Brown and in wishing him well in his future endeavors.

THE ISTOOK-MCINTOSH AMENDMENT

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I rise to respond to the statement made yesterday by the distinguished Senator from Michigan, my old friend Senator CARL LEVIN. We came here to the Senate together. I have the greatest admiration and personal regard for him.

I trust that my colleagues will listen very carefully to what I have to say about this issue—the so-called "Istook-McIntosh" amendment which may be included in the Treasury-Postal appropriations conference report.

I ask for your close attention because I am certain that your offices are hearing about this language, just as the Senator from Michigan has been hearing about it. And, if the material coming across my desk is any guide at all, a clump of what you are hearing about it is plain hogwash, or more civilized, rubbish. I would surely include the commentary of the New York Times within that description.

I have been in the negotiations concerning the Istook-McIntosh language. I have been working side by side with my colleague from Idaho, Senator LARRY CRAIG. One could not ask for a better ally in this or any other cause. The Senator from Idaho brings many singular qualities to this work—a commitment to genuine reform, great realism about what it is possible to achieve in legislating, and unflagging consideration for the concerns of his colleagues—especially including me.

We know what this proposed amendment does, and what it does not do. And I can certainly assure my colleagues that much of the lobbying on this amendment has been hysterical at the worst, misleading at best. It is no wonder that my friend, the Senator from Michigan, is agitated about it, given the abjectly horrifying portrayal by those lobbying this issue.

It almost tempts me to coin a new aphorism—"hell hath no fury like an individual whose access to Federal bucks has been conditioned in any way." Because that is what this issue is about—access to the Federal Treasury. It is not about "free speech" or the first amendment, or anything of the sort. Those are merely the terms which are being applied during the argument by those who wish to continue to ensure themselves of continued delivery of Federal money.

Let me begin my description of this amendment by going back to first principles. I have a few views which might be termed eccentric or quaint or even naive in this era of behemoth government, and one of them is that there are "responsibilities" which follow from being a custodian of Federal money.

I know that is a strange and even bizarre thing in this day and age, to talk about "responsibility" instead purely of "rights," or purely of "victims." We are all experts on our own rights, but rarely do we acknowledge that these rights confer responsibilities. And that is what this issue is about—the responsibilities of those who receive Federal money.

The Senator from Michigan is justly concerned about the influence of lobbyists over the public policy process. This concern animates his sincere desire to pass lobbying reform legislation—and he is proceeding remarkably toward that end.

I agree with that concern, and I would add to it by saying that the American public knows that "something is wrong" with the process. They know that the process itself interferes with good policy. They know that the interests of the public at large are not served well when Washington has so contrived matters as to amplify the access and the influence of certain special interests, which comes effectively at the expense of the interests of the whole.

The average person on the street would be scandalized to find out that we, the Congress, have been blithely engaging for years in the practice of favoring political organizations with taxpayer-provided money.

I am not talking about simply the narrow practice of using Federal dollars to lobby. That is illegal already, as the Senator from Michigan has so ably pointed out.

But I think we need to agree that it is wrong to be giving Federal dollars to political organizations, whether or not we "mark" those bills they receive and then say that only those dollars can't be used for lobbying Congress.

Can you imagine the outcry, wailing and gnashing of teeth that would exist if the Federal Government were found to have channeled millions in grant money to the Christian Coalition? Or the Heritage foundation? It wouldn't matter whether that money was used to hold seminars or to buy stationery. The public would swiftly know that this was wrong, that Government should not be in the business of propping up the operations of political organizations.

And yet that is precisely what we in America have been doing. I found this year that the AARP received \$86 million in Federal grants—this, the largest and most powerful lobbying organization in the country—the King Kong of lobbying "gorillas."

At the time, I was criticized for "singling out" the AARP. I was told that

the only way "to be fair" was to deal with the problem as a whole, to put a stop to the practice across the board. That is what Congressmen ISTOOK, MCINTOSH, and EHRlich are attempting to do.

Let me repeat that I believe we should all agree on the basic premise from which we should be working; we should not be in the practice of funding political organizations with Federal money.

Thus, I have been working with my colleagues on the House side to try to develop a reasonable and balanced test for eligibility for public funds. Not to restrict anyone's rights of political expression—but rather, to specify minimum standards for the non-political, impartial distribution of public monies. I believe that our final product will try to set reasonable boundaries for the types of organizations which should be receiving Federal money.

Let me remind my colleagues that this is not a novel concept. Already in the law there are restrictions on the amount of lobbying which can be done by 501-C-3 organizations which take the 501-H election to identify themselves as charities. In return for the benefit of tax deductible contributions, these organizations agree to limit their lobbying expenses. They may spend 20 percent of their first \$500,000 on lobbying, 15 percent of their next \$500,000, 10 percent of their next \$500,000, and 5 percent after that, on up to a global cap of \$1 million on lobbying.

Let me repeat for my colleagues: This formula is already in the law. Now. It is accepted by all as a reasonable and balanced limit upon the political activities of such organizations. No one construes this as an abridgement of first amendment rights. It is a consequence of our consensus opinion that predominantly political organizations should not receive certain Government benefits.

I urge my colleagues to go out in the land and talk to various individuals about the 501-H spending formula. Not the ones "beating the drum" about this legislation. But most others would agree that the formula is extremely lenient, very generous—some would say it is so generous as not to constitute a significant restriction at all.

I have been working with my House colleagues to develop reforms of these boundaries to make certain that they work in practice in a way that they have not always worked before this time.

The Senator from Michigan highlighted one particular feature of the originally proposed Istook language, singling it out for criticism. This concerns the application of the spending formula to non-Federal money. I listened carefully to that commentary, and I wonder whether or not my old friend from Michigan and the rest of the Senate are aware of the way in which the law already works in this area.

I have been distressed to see the howls and shrieks of outrage from Gov-

ernment grantees when we suggest that they should no longer be able to "count" the amount of their Federal grants in computing their lobbying expenses under the formula which I just outlined. This has even been a rallying cry against the principles in the grant reform amendment—how outrageous, it is said, that there should be any restriction on the use of private funds.

Let me try to calm the heaving bosoms out there by asking my colleagues to think about this substantively for just a moment. First of all, the existing formula—already in the law—already applies to all 501-H groups even if they don't receive Federal money. So this supposed restriction on the use of private funds already exists.

Furthermore, consider the paradox that results if we continue to "count" the Federal money when computing allowed lobbying expenses. If you have two organizations—each with the same amount of private support—then, under current law, the one that pulls down a Government grant can spend more on lobbying than the one which doesn't. That is the very essence of taxpayer-subsidized lobbying, which we all agree is wrong. It only makes sense for an organization's lobbying expenses to be based on their degree of private support, not on the amount given to them in Federal money.

I expect that this debate will heat up still further, and I expect that hysteria and distortion will abound. I can see some of it already. I have read articles saying that somehow this legislation will stop organizations from being able to write editorials and to even make their opinions known. That is nonsense, unless somewhere in this country it costs you \$1 million to write a letter to the editor.

I personally will have my old bald dome battered because I have stated all along that I would seek to protect the "true" charities from the scope of any legislation—the 501-C-3 organizations which we all care so much about—and should.

Well, the amendment which hopefully will shortly be presented as an Istook-Simpson compromise will indeed protect them. We will protect them not by creating a blanket exemption for all charitable groups, but by leaving "in place" the spending restriction formulas that already apply to charitable organizations.

I have also heard various muted and sometimes raucous imputations that this amendment is somehow discriminatory, that it singles out a particular "type" of recipient for restriction. It has been implied—although not overtly stated—that somehow we are working to exclude for-profit lobbyists from this legislation, targeting the legislation only against "nonprofits."

That is simply untrue. The Istook-McIntosh-Ehrlich amendment does not distinguish between for-profit and non-profit entities. If a grant is given to a for-profit taxpaying organization, they are subject to the same lobbying caps.

The language does not exclude "contractors" in any general way, although the language does not apply specifically to "contracts." There is a very good reason for this, and this is the ambiguity as to what constitutes a "contract" with the Federal Government. The inclusion of "contracts" in this legislation would mean that every HMO around the country which contracts to provide services under Medicare would be covered. That and similar consequences are the reasons that "contracts" are not included; it is not some sinister conspiracy to exclude or target any particular group. If opponents of the legislation can figure out a way for us to responsibly include "contracts" in the scope of this legislation without creating serious ambiguities and contradictions, we would be most happy to work with those suggestions.

Mr. President, I will conclude my remarks, because there will be time to debate this later at length. But for the record today, I do not want to let the current characterization of this legislative language go unchallenged.

I want first and foremost to repeat my response to a central point made by the opposition. Somehow the Istook language is said to be sinister because it applies the spending formula to the nonfederal, private money.

Of course it does. Which money is the existing 501-H spending cap formula supposed to apply to? The Federal money? That is supposed to be illegal, to use Federal money for lobbying. No, it has always been understood that those restrictions applied to the private support; there is nothing novel or sinister of evil about that. The Proposed language would simply make this explicit.

We are still working with House negotiators to try to craft a package which we believe will be worthy of Senate support. I trust that my colleagues will study the details about the finished product rather than to listen to the characterizations that have been made by those who are lobbying against it.

This could be our best chance to effect true lobbying reform—and the best measure of that is the degree to which this has agitated those lobbyists suckling at the Federal breast. We should be equally vigilant about gifts from lobbyists, and gifts to lobbyists. This measure attempts to deal with the latter.

I thank my colleagues and I yield the floor.

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 12:19 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Ms. Goetz, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, without amendment:

S. 1322. An act to provide for the relocation of the United States Embassy in Israel to Jerusalem, and for other purposes.