

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.

The message also announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 117. An act to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937 to prevent persons having drug or alcohol use problems from occupying dwellings units in public housings designated for occupancy by elderly families, and for other purposes.

H.R. 782. An act to amend title 18 of the United States Code to allow members of employee associations to represent their views before the United States Government.

H.R. 1114. An act to authorize minors who are under the child labor provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 and who are under 18 years of age to load materials into balers and compacters that meet appropriate American National Standards Institute design safety standards.

The message further announced that the House agrees to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 716) to amend the Fishermen's Protective Act.

The message also announced that the Speaker appoints Mr. CUNNINGHAM as an additional conferee in the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 4) to restore the American family, reduce illegitimacy, control welfare spending and reduce welfare dependence.

The message further announced that the House disagrees to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 1617) to consolidate and reform work force development and literacy programs, and for other purposes, and agrees to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon; and appoints Mr. GOODLING, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. RIGGS, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. CLAY, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. SAWYER, and Mr. GREEN as the managers of the conference on the part of the House.

The message also announced that the House disagrees to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 1058) to reform Federal securities litigation, and for other purposes, and asks a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon; and appoints the following Members as managers on the conference on the part of the House:

From the Committee on Commerce, for consideration of the House bill and the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Mr. BLILEY, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. FIELDS of Texas, Mr. COX of California, Mr. WHITE, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BRYANT of Texas, and Ms. ESHOO.

As additional conferees from the Committee on the Judiciary, for consideration of the House bill and the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Mr. HYDE, Mr. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. CONYERS.

At 3:21 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Hays, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Sen-

ate to the bill (H.R. 2002) making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and second times by unanimous consent and referred as indicated:

H.R. 117. An act to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937 to prevent persons having drug or alcohol use problems from occupying dwellings units in public housings designated for occupancy by elderly families, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 782. An act to amend title 18 of the United States Code to allow members of employee associations to represent their views before the United States Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1114. An act to authorize minors who are under the child labor provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 and who are under 18 years of age to load materials into balers and compacters that meet appropriate American National Standards Institute design safety standards; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second time by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. INOUE:

S. 1361. A bill to provide for the repurchase of land acquired by the United States from Native American organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. HOLLINGS:

S. 1362. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to issue a certificate of documentation with appropriate endorsement for employment in the coastwise trade for the vessel *Focus*; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. ABRAHAM:

S. 1363. A bill to terminate the agricultural price support and production adjustment programs for sugar on the date the President certifies to Congress that a General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade has been entered into that prohibits all export subsidies for sugar, price support and production adjustment programs for sugar, and tariffs and other trade barriers on the importation of sugar, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. INOUE:

S. 1361. A bill to provide for the repurchase of land acquired by the United States from Native American organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

SURPLUS REAL PROPERTY LEGISLATION

• Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I introduce a measure that would authorize the repurchase of surplus real property by native American trust organizations.

This measure is unusual in that it not only serves the objective of restor-

ing to such organizations—real property that was acquired by the United States should such property be deemed to be surplus to the need of the federal government—but also provides for the repurchase of the property at today's fair market value, which will enable the United States to recapture the original value of the property, as well as any associated appreciation in value which has accrued since the time of acquisition.

Mr. President, this measure also authorizes the establishment of a trust fund in the United States Treasury, in which would be deposited that amount which represents the appreciated value of the reacquired property. For each property so repurchased by a Native American Trust Organization—the amount associated with the appreciated value of such property—would be added to the corpus of the trust. In turn, the income accruing on the investment of the trust corpus funds would be expended for the purposes of health and education authorized under existing federal law. •

By Mr. HOLLINGS:

S. 1362. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to issue a certificate of documentation with appropriate endorsement for employment in the coastwise trade for the vessel *Focus*; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

TRADING PRIVILEGES LEGISLATION

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I am introducing a bill today to direct that the vessel *Focus*, U.S. Official Number 909293, be accorded coastwise trading privileges and be issued a certificate of documentation under section 12103 of title 46, U.S. Code.

The *Focus* was constructed in Kowloon, Hong Kong, in 1983 and is a sailing vessel presently used for recreational purposes. It is 47.8 feet in length, 15.8 feet in breadth, has a depth of 6.5 feet, and is self-propelled.

The vessel is owned by John Passaloukas of Hilton Head Island, South Carolina. Mr. Passaloukas would like to utilize his vessel in the coastwise trade and fisheries of the United States. However, because the vessel was built in a foreign shipyard, it does not meet the requirements for coastwise license endorsement in the United States. The present owner purchased the *Focus* in a state of disrepair, after the vessel had been neglected for ten years, and has totally refurbished the vessel in U.S. shipyards. Coastwise documentation is mandatory to enable the owner to use the vessel for its intended purpose.

The owner of the *Focus* is seeking a waiver of the existing law because he wishes to use the vessel for recreational and ecotourism charters. His desired intentions for the vessel's use will not adversely affect the coastwise trade in U.S. waters. If he is granted this waiver, it is his intention to comply fully with U.S. documentation and