

seminal element in the development of this city and the Capitol complex. He deserves the commendation this resolution provides.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate concurrent resolution was concurred in. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the legislation just considered.

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

There was no objection.

PROVIDING ADDITIONAL DEBATE TIME ON AMENDMENTS ON WHICH VOTE WAS POSTPONED ON H.R. 2564, LOBBYING DISCLOSURE ACT OF 1995

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2564, in the Committee of the Whole, prior to the votes on the four amendments which were considered on November 16 upon which further proceedings were postponed, that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLINGER], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ENGLISH], and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. WELLER], each be recognized for 2½ minutes in support of their amendment, and that I be recognized for 2½ minutes in opposition to each amendment.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1815

LOBBYING DISCLOSURE ACT OF 1995

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 269 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2564.

□ 1815

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2564) to provide for the disclosure of lobbying activities to influence the Federal Government, and for other purposes, with Mr. KOLBE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Thursday, November 16, 1995, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. WELLER] had failed by voice vote and a request for a recorded vote had been postponed.

Pursuant to the order of the House of today, there will be a period of further debate on the following amendments on which further proceedings were postponed on Thursday, November 16, 1995:

No. 1, the amendment by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX].

Second, the amendment by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLINGER].

Third, the amendment by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ENGLISH].

Fourth, the amendment by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. WELLER].

Further debate on each amendment will be limited to 5 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CANADY]. Such further debate shall occur at the point of the debate.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FOX OF PENNSYLVANIA

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to debate the subject matter of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX].

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX] will be recognized for 2½ minutes, and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CANADY] will be recognized for 2½ minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX].

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

My colleagues, we have a very important mission tonight to look at some important amendments. I regard the first rule of safety in any matter as self-defense, and my amendment provides that security in a bipartisan fashion.

We passed a rule not long ago which requires that we not take gifts from lobbyists. My amendment makes sure lobbyists do not give us gifts so that we are not caught in a catch-22, being guilty of receiving gifts, not knowing about it, not disclosing it, having an ethics violation, when in fact it should not exist.

Now, there have been some erroneous arguments presented by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CANADY], my good friend, and I would like to explain why they are not correct. My amendment will not derail this important legislation, it will strengthen it so that we can finally attain lobby reform in a strong and logical way, and this will make sure we have true gift reform as well.

It is necessary because a ban of lobbyists presenting gifts to Members of Congress will protect Members of Congress from an unintentional failure to reject gifts. It is consistent with the Gift Reform Act that we passed under

House Resolution 250. My amendment will provide reform without risk, and any differences there can be clarified within the conference committee.

It is fair because it makes lobbyists and Members equally responsible, and it makes sure that in fact they will be protected. As representatives of the people, we need to give the kind of reforms not only for lobbyists but for ourselves which the public wants.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK].

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CANADY] for yielding me this time and for his contributions on this important issue.

The issue here is whether or not we are going to have a lobbying bill. We have a history here of legislation getting killed because it gets caught up in House-Senate fights. I have filed a bill today, along with the gentleman from Texas and the gentleman from Connecticut, it is bipartisan, leaders in this fight, that take many of the amendments that will be offered that have a lot of merit and make them into a separate bill. Because if we amend this bill, the certainty is that it goes to the Senate; and the likelihood then is that no bill emerges and it becomes a way to kill it.

Mr. Chairman, the preferable way is to send this first very good step to the President and have him sign it and then for us to deal with this amendment and others in a vehicle that will soon follow.

I would ask the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CANADY], the chairman of the subcommittee, who has done such a good leadership job in this, if he would agree, as he has told me, that we would have such a vehicle.

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentleman that I am committed to moving forward with other aspects of this reform issue early next year, and I will certainly work with the gentleman from Massachusetts and other Members who are concerned about strengthening this bill at the right time and the right place.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. WELLER].

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, very often we have good bills that come to the floor and the chairman and the ranking members and many others have worked well to come forward with a bill that is a good bill. We have an amendment here which improves the bill, and frankly, my colleagues of the House, this is an amendment to protect Members of the House.