doing some kind of completely unobjectionable thing, namely making sure that Federal moneys that go to organizations that receive Federal moneys that go to organizations that receive Federal grants cannot use those funds for lobbying. That is already against the law; make no bones about that. But this hearing showed, I think, one of the many, many reasons why in fact this is a proposal that would grossly interfere with the free exercise of political expression, and free speech, and freedom of association, all profoundly important rights under the Constitution of the United States as protected in the first amendment.

Mr. Speaker, one of the more instructive witnesses yesterday was the director of political affairs for the YMCA of America, a lady named C.J. Van Pelt, and she gave a very, very interesting presentation about exactly how burdensome, intrusive, and chilling for the involvement of the YMCA, hardly a radical organization, in the political life of this country, and we should understand that we are not talking about lobbying Congress. This bill goes way beyond that to deal with any, quote, political advocacy activities of any individual or organization in this country that may happen to receive anything of benefit or any grant money from the Federal Government. The restriction on any such organization, in this case the YMCA, and I say to the gentleman, ''Mr. MCINTOSH, I have only 5 minutes so I'm not going to have time to yield. I apologize.''

Mr. Speaker, let me just take this moment. I would love it if perhaps the sponsors of this legislation would agree to a full hour of special orders sometime and we could really engage on this.

Mr. MCINTOSH. I think that would be beneficial.

Mr. SKAGGS. Terrific; I thank the gentleman.

Ms. Van Pelt made the following point: Under this proposed legislation the YMCA would be prohibited because it happens to engage in such things as provision of day care, dealing with prevention of crime, drug-aversion education, any number of other things for which it receives some Federal grant funding. Under this legislation it would be prohibited from spending more than 5 percent, probably significantly less than that in the case of the Y, more than 5 percent of its privately raised funds, on being involved in the political life of this country, appearing before a board of county commissioners to, for instance, argue with them about a drug-prevention program in their county or also appearing before Congress to talk about legislation that we may be considering.

But Ms. Van Pelt explained that under their proposal, in order for her, as she would be required or as the YMCA would be required to certify every year adherence to this 5-percent limit, the YMCA of America would have to make inquiry of 140,000 vendors with which they do business around the country. Why in the world would they have to do that? Well, because one of the little known, but most perverse, aspects of this legislation would count anything that the YMCA spends with anybody else that happens to have exceeded another limit on political advocacy buried in this bill, and anything that the YMCA spends with anybody else that happens to have exceeded another limit on political advocacy buried in this bill, and anything they spent with somebody that violated this other limit would count against their 5-percent limit, and the only way they could certify that they complied was to find out from all 140,000 others with whom they do business to make sure that those 140,000 organizations and businesses had not exceeded their limit on political advocacy. My colleagues can imagine the kind of incredible paperwork burden, not to mention the intimidating and chilling effect on constitutionally protected speech in this country that comes out of just this small part of this ill-advised and perverse legislation.

The extent to which some who advocate this legislation are willing to go was also demonstrated at the hearing yesterday in which unfortunately it came to light that the staff of this committee had engaged in an act of forgery, of concocting what was going to be a poster that was put out on the press table that misrepresented on facsimile letterhead vital information about one of the organizations that was to testify, did it with official funds in violation of any standard of decency.

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

(Mr. HILLEARY addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my 5-minute special order be taken at this point out of order.

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

There was no objection.

ENDING WELFARE FOR LOBBYISTS

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

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Speaker, let me respond to some of the statements that were made by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS] prior to this and also amplify for my colleagues and the American people what our hearing yesterday discovered about welfare for lobbyists, the lobbying organizations who take and receive grants from the taxpayer in order to subsidize their efforts to lobbyists to spend more money.

One of the things we discovered was that it is unknown how many grants there are that are being given. The internal Revenue Service has a data base that says there are $39 billion of grants, the one with the thermometer, that are given each year to different groups, many of whom turn around and lobby Congress. Well, yesterday we found out that in fact $39 billion is much too low a number. It is really more like $224 billion in Federal grants that go to groups who are eligible to turn around and lobby Congress. The taxpayer will not stand for that, but it has been one of the most well kept secrets here in Washington.

Now many of those groups, the YMCA and other groups, perform very important and legitimate charitable services, but even under our proposal that will limit welfare for lobbyists they can continue to speak out in the city councils and at their local community levels.

Mr. Speaker, we have a chart here that shows how much many of the important charities would be able to continue to spend on advocacy issues.

This chart shows exactly how much various groups would be able to spend. The American Red Cross could continue to spend 5 percent of its funds, or $17 million. The YMCA that we were discussing earlier could spend $1.2 million. Now Ms. Van Pelt told us that that actually is slightly more than what they are allowed to spend under current IRS regulations. So we have not asked any of the legitimate charities to silence their voice. What we have done is said, Restrict what you do so you don't become a federally subsidized lobbying organization, but continue to be a charity that helps build communities, offer programs for children, for elderly, for those people who need assistance. It is very critical in this debate that we not get lost in the rhetoric and focus on the fact that taxpayer dollars are being used to subsidize lobbying efforts here in Washington.

Just today one of the most heavily subsidized groups, the National Council on Senior Citizens, was in Washington lobbying against our efforts to balance the budget. Now they receive $72 million a year from taxpayers; 95 percent of their entire budget is from the taxpayer. They are virtually an entity like a Federal agency. But they also have a political action committee. They also take out political ads on TV, and today they are lobbying Congress against the balanced budget initiative.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCINTOSH. I do not have time to yield at this point. The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS] has suggested an hour discussion, and I think that would be a great idea.

I think it is very important that the American taxpayers know that their funds are going to groups who then

turn around and use other moneys to lobby Congress. But we all know that money is fungible and that one of the things that our subcommittee is going to do is track down how that money, in the case of the National Council on Senior Citizens, 95 percent of their funds is actually spent. Does any of it spill over, and is it used for lobbying activities? Does it indirectly subsidize those lobbying activities? Is there an inherent conflict of interest when somebody lobbies for spending, that they turn around and apply to receive as a grant recipient? I think the taxpayer has a right to know, and our committee is committed to getting to the bottom of this issue, making sure that we get through all of the distractions and red herrings and honestly tell the American taxpayers the truth about welfare for lobbyists so that we can put an end to that in this Congress, and we are committed to not doing business as usual, but doing the taxpayers' work and ending welfare for lobbyists once and for all.

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

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

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to reclaim my 5-minute special order scheduled for this evening.

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

There was no objection.

PLO COMPLIANCE WITH MEPFA

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my colleagues for allowing me to reclaim my time.

Mr. Speaker, in light of yesterday's signing ceremony at the White House I felt compelled to come to the floor today to comment on an aspect of the Middle East peace process that has troubled me for some time. That subject is the failure of the Palestine Liberation Organization to live up to the solemn commitments to which it agreed when it signed the Declaration of Principles, the DOP with Israel on the White House lawn on January 13, 1993.

It has now been over 2 years since that historic day, a day on which the PLO and its leader, Yasser Arafat, agreed to be held accountable for its actions by the international community in exchange for territorial and administrative concessions by the Government of Israel.

□ 1600

As witness to the accord, the United States pledged its political, financial, and moral support to the peace effort, making clear that it expected the PLO to transform itself from a terrorist organization to a lawful administrative entity to be known as the Palestinian Authority [PA]. The United States pledged the sum of $500 million over 5 years to the PLO to assist the Palestinians living in areas controlled by the PA with their development efforts.

What we have seen over the last 2 years has been a grave disappointment, as the PLO has blatantly violated its commitments under the DOP.

The PLO has failed to prevent terrorism emanating from the territory it controls and has shown little inclination to prosecute known terrorists or to extradite those individuals allegedly responsible for criminal acts inside Israel.

As recent video tapes of Yasser Arafat demonstrate, he continues to exhort his people to violence against Israel and advocates a Jihad—or holy war—to regain Jerusalem. Even as we speak, Arafat is building up a paramilitary force in Gaza nearly three times what was permitted under the DOP, replete with automatic weapons and a modern security apparatus.

Just last week, the Palestinian Ministry of Information issued a statement condemning the Senate's attempt on the fiscal year 1996 Foreign Operations Appropriations Act to institute a small degree of oversight over funds going to the PLO, calling Congress ''racist'' and its action a demonstration of ''hatred towards the Palestinian people, its leadership and its national rights.

As a representative of the American people and a strong supporter of Israel, I am outraged that the PLO would essentially say ''Forget you and your money'' when we ask them simply to live up to their word. I'm afraid I cannot sit by and hope that the PLO will suddenly decide to abide by the commitments it made 2 years ago. I feel it is my duty to cry foul when I believe the American people are being had and our national interest is at stake.

The administration has mounted a full court press to persuade Congress and the world community that the PLO remains committed to the peace agreement even when their violations are numerous. As a result, the PLO has learned that there are no sanctions for violating their agreements.

That is why I have agreed to cosponsor H.R. 1960, the Middle East Peace Compliance Act of 1995, introduced by my distinguished colleague, MICHAEL FORBES.

In essence, the bill says that should the PLO demonstrate ''substantial, material and timely'' compliance with its commitments under the DOP as well as with certain requirements under U.S. law, then the President is authorized to transfer funds to Palestinian institutions and activities directly, and not through the PLO or the PA. Only in this way can we ensure that the funds reach the people for whom it is intended.

Further, the PLO would be required to assist U.S. law enforcement agencies in the apprehension and prosecution of any member of that organization responsible for the killing of an American citizen. The bill also requires that U.S. assistance only be used for humanitarian purposes and economic development—no military activities.

Unfortunately, much of the language attached to the Senate foreign operations bill is unenforceable and weak. Yesterday I agreed to an extension of current law for 30 days, with the understanding that the chairman of the House Foreign Operations Subcommittee, other interested colleagues, and I will work together to craft language that will bring real oversight and accountability into the process.

Let there be no mistake about my position. I support peace as fervently as any man or woman in this Chamber. What I object to is the process for obtaining peace which requires that we turn our backs on our core national values and our responsibility as guardians of the public purse.

Only the people of Israel have the right to determine the course of their own future. It is our job to see to it that when the history of this extraordinary period is written, we, the people of the United States, have not set aside our values, or standards, or our requirements under law to support a myth, not a fact.

CONGRESS SHOULD STAY AND FINISH ITS WORK

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EVERETT). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I was sorry that two people back did not yield, because I wanted to ask a few questions. I think it is very interesting that some folks are so exercised about the Boy Scouts and the Girl Scouts and senior citizens and other people, and called them paid lobbyists and all of this. Yet, when I offered an amendment to try and do the same thing vis-a-vis defense contractor lobbyists and others who were getting 100 percent of their money from the Federal Government, the same folks voted against that. Somehow the Boy Scouts you have to watch every minute, but the defense lobbyists, hey, they are cool, they are our guys. If you think the Boy Scouts and senior citizens have PAC's, you should see what the defense contractors have. You think that the Girl Scouts have clout, you should see what defense contractors have.

In fact, we just saw today a bill rolled out of here $7 billion over the President's budget, loaded with all sorts of hardware they wanted and golden parachutes and every other such thing. It seems to me if we are going to be really sincere about this, we ought to treat everybody the same, and especially those who are doing it for profit.