

They wear a badge of courage, and they are now my additional warriors, who may not be in the 11th congressional district, but they are warriors nonetheless for that which is right. In the gallery, aside from State Senator Donzella James, who participated in the special session and who spoke out so eloquently against what happened, we also have State Senator Connie Stokes, who represents a portion of the 11th congressional district.

And I would like to take this moment to thank my own State Senator for her actions on behalf of preserving the 11th congressional district of Georgia. The members again of the Georgia Legislative Black Caucus worked day in and day out, and they only had one goal in mind. And that goal was to make sure that all of the folks of Georgia at the end of the day had an opportunity to cast a vote, a meaningful vote, for the representative of their choice.

And so while the venue has moved to a new place and a new time, the camaraderie, the loyalty, the love, the cohesion of the Georgia Legislative Black Caucus, and the way that I was able to interact with all of the members, I will never forget.

From that, I know, will come a new and stronger, more lasting relationship. And also a better relationship will come from the Democratic leadership of the State, that saw that under no circumstance were they able to break the glue that struck the members of the Georgia Legislative Black Caucus together. And that was their loyalty to the people of the State of Georgia.

In conclusion, I would just say that it is a pleasure for me to serve in the U.S. House of Representatives, and I have come to love, to truly love many of my colleagues with whom I interact daily. I appreciate all of them for their strong shows of support, for their kind words of support, and I want them to know that no matter how this fight ends, they have a friend in me.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Edwin Thomas, one of his secretaries.

GRANT REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EHLERS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. EHRlich] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. EHRlich. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to engage two freshmen colleagues personal friends and people I have high regard for, in a colloquy concerning grant reform. I want to take this opportunity to publicly thank the gentleman from Washington [Mr. TATE] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MCINTOSH], the chairman of the

subcommittee, for their wonderful leadership on this issue.

Let me begin the colloquy by making an observation. It seems as though there are a lot of people paying attention to what we have done in the House so far, with respect to grant reform, Mr. Speaker. Every major newspaper in the country has editorialized with respect to grant reform over the last few weeks, and we certainly hit a nerve with the American people.

Now I direct my first question to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MCINTOSH], the chairman of the committee and one of the leaders along with our friend, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ISTOOK], in our effort, and, of course, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. TATE], being one of the more recent victims of the opposition with regard to this issue.

□ 1615

My question to you, my friend, is a lot of people thought we would never get this far. And here we are. We had a resounding victory on the House floor. We are now in the Senate conference committee.

I see the gentleman from Washington [Mr. TATE] putting up a piece of demonstrative evidence we have used on this floor in the past. I know my chairman of the subcommittee wants to make a few remarks at the beginning here, and I will yield to him.

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for taking the lead in making the American people aware of what, quite frankly, has been a dirty little secret in this town, that Federal taxpayer money has been going to lobbying groups in the form of grants.

The chart that our colleague [Mr. TATE] has shown how this welfare for lobbyists works. The taxpayers paying \$39 billion, some people estimate it would be as many as four or five times that amount in grants to many special interests.

Now, some of them are very worthy charities who are doing the right things in their communities, but there are a lot of those groups who are really lobbying and political front groups who are taking taxpayer dollars and using them to engage in political tactics.

Now, let me say I think everyone has a right to speak out in this country, but they do not have a right to speak out with somebody else's money and to be funded by the taxpayer.

One of the things that our committee is committed to doing is holding a series of hearings on this, looking into these groups and finding out some answers to some basic questions. Those groups that are lobbyist groups, we want to know, is it true that you are segregating the grant money you are receiving from political activities? Is it true that you have safeguards in place to make sure that you do not violate the current law that prohibits that direct funding? And then we also want to know what plans that group has been

engaged in to encourage lobbying by other groups.

Mr. EHRlich. Of course, that is the problem. That is really the problem.

Mr. MCINTOSH. Exactly. And it is a continuous cycle that has led to huge deficit spending in this country.

Then there is another group who say, we are not lobbying groups, but we do not like this reform. And what I want to know from those groups is, what do they do to ensure that their donors have accurately been informed of what lobbying they do do?

There are some very highly regarded groups in this country. I am thinking of groups like the United Way, the Red Cross, the Girl Scouts, the Boy Scouts, who also receive Federal grants, and they engage in very worthy and noble activities. Some of them tell us they also want to be lobbyists, not extensively, but part-time. And I think we need to tell their donors, did you know that they also want to lobby with some of the money that you have given them? How much of that money is spent on lobbying? Is there a problem with the Washington groups lobbying, whereas the groups in the States and the communities do not do that but are, in fact, engaged in charitable activities?

We are going to try to develop a record in our committee on those issues.

Mr. EHRlich. If the gentleman would yield, really is that not the threshold fundamental problem here? It seems as though we have addressed this both here on the floor and at various times we have had to discuss this issue off the floor, and it seems for some reason, and the reason appears to be Federal money, to have developed over the years a distinction between acting as an advocate and fulfilling the mission of the particular organization.

I believe it is fair to characterize our piece of legislation as an attempt to return these groups. And we are not talking about, by the way, many groups out of thousands, tens of thousands of groups, only a few hundred who, in our view, have violated both the letter and the spirit of the law, by trying to get rid of that distinction, trying to limit that distinction to return these groups to their fundamental mission, which is to provide service for the less fortunate in our society.

Mr. MCINTOSH. The gentleman is exactly correct.

We heard testimony in one of our hearings in July from Mrs. Arianna Huffington who told us that there was a serious problem in the charitable community that, rather than doing good works, helping the elderly, helping clean up the environment, helping the young people, and you may remember she talked about Mrs. Hannah Hawkins here in Washington who had used her own money to set up a home for children after school in the inner city neighborhoods. They are moving away from those charitable missions into becoming lobbyists and advocates that