unswerving commitment to achieving global nuclear nonproliferation goals. I call the attention of the Congress to the joint U.S.-EURATOM ''Declaration on Non-Proliferation Policy'' appended to the text of the agreement I am transmitting herewith.

The proposed new agreement provides for very stringent controls over certain fuel cycle activities, including enrichment, reprocessing, and alteration in form or content and storage of plutonium and other sensitive nuclear materials. The United States and EURATOM have accepted these controls on a reciprocal basis, not as a sign of either Party's distrust of the other, and not for the purpose of interfering with each other's fuel cycle choices, which are for each Party to determine for itself, but rather as a reflection of their common conviction that the provisions in question represent an important norm for peaceful nuclear commerce.

In view of the strong commitment of EURATOM and its member states to the international nonproliferation regime, the comprehensive nonproliferation commitments they have made, the advanced technological character of the EURATOM civil nuclear program, the long history of extensive transatlantic cooperation in the peaceful uses of nuclear energy without any risk of proliferation, and the fact that all member states are close allies or close friends of the United States, the proposed new agreement provides to EURATOM (and on a reciprocal basis, to the United States) advance, long-term approval for specified enrichment, retransfers, reprocessing, alteration in form or content, and storage of specified nuclear material, and for retransfers of nonnuclear material and equipment. The approval for reprocessing and alteration in form or content may be suspended if either activity ceases to meet the criteria set out in U.S. law, including criteria relating to safeguards and physical protection.

In providing advance, long-term approval for certain nuclear fuel cycle activities, the proposed agreement has features similar to those in several other agreements for cooperation that the United States has entered into subsequent to enactment of the NNPA. These include bilateral U.S. agreements with Japan, Finland, Norway and Sweden. (The U.S. agreements with Finland and Sweden will be automatically terminated upon entry into force of the new U.S.-EURATOM agreement, as Finland and Sweden joined the European Union on January 1, 1995.) Among the documents I am transmitting herewith to the Congress is an analysis by the Secretary of Energy of the advance, long-term approvals contained in the proposed U.S. agreement with EURATOM. The analysis concludes that the approvals meet all requirements of the Atomic Energy Act.

I believe that the proposed agreement for cooperation with EURATOM will make an important contribution to achieving our nonproliferation, trade and other significant foreign policy goals.

In particular, I am convinced that this agreement will strengthen the international nuclear nonproliferation regime, support of which is a fundamental objective of U.S. national security and foreign policy, by setting a high standard for rigorous nonproliferation conditions and controls.

It will substantially upgrade U.S. controls over nuclear items subject to the current U.S.-EURATOM agreement as well as over future cooperation.

I believe that the new agreement will also demonstrate the U.S. intention to be a reliable nuclear trading partner, and thus help ensure continuation and, I hope, growth of U.S. civil nuclear exports to EURATOM member states.

I have considered the views and recommendations of the interested agencies in reviewing the proposed agreement and have determined that its performance will promote, and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to, the common defense and security. Accordingly, I have approved the agreement and authorized its execution and urge that the Congress give it favorable consideration.

Because this agreement meets all applicable requirements of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, for agreements for peaceful nuclear cooperation, I am transmitting it to the Congress without exempting it from any requirement contained in section 123 a. of that Act. This transmission shall constitute a submittal for purposes of both sections 123 b. and 123 d. of the Atomic Energy Act. The Administration is prepared to begin immediately the consultations with the Senate Foreign Relations and House International Relations Committees as provided in section 123 b. Upon completion of the 30-day continuous session period provided for in section 123 b., the 60-day continuous session period provided for in section 123 d. shall commence.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *November 29, 1995.*

REQUEST FOR PERMISSION TO ADDRESS HOUSE FOR 5 MINUTES

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order for 5 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will not entertain that request at this point.

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.

□ 1032

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 Tuesday, November 28, 1995, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. WELLER] had been disposed of and the bill was open for amendment at any point.

Are there further amendments to the bill?

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I think the votes yesterday on this bill are very explicit. The committee has the steam and the power to turn back amendments.

Lobby disclosure, the field that I have been interested in for 5 years, our foreign interests, individuals from our Government and individuals who represent the interests of foreign entities, the law has been so vague and so weak that two out of every three agents representing foreign interests do not even bother to register.

Now, this bill addresses that to some degree, but there are still fines and penalties that are so huge it is like shooting a flea with a bazooka. As a result, the Department of Justice does not enforce it. We have many foreign interests lobbying the Congress of the United States. That basically goes unchecked, and when you try and change it, there is always a good reason why it should not be now.

I am not impugning the work of the fine chairman here, nor his intentions, but I would like to say this. Here is, in essence, what we are doing here in the Congress. To make a bill as good as it could be, maybe even make a bill great, that bill has no shot. If you want to pass it, send a mediocre bill to the other body who all of a sudden is the big decisionmaker on what our legislation should be.

Let me inform Congress that the first Senate was appointed by State legislatures to protect the interests of the States. The House of Representatives, the House of Commons, was to protect the people of the country. I think it is unbelievable to me that we would have these foreign agents running around, not even registering, and we have taken token steps to clamp down on that. I think it is time to change that.

In essence, I am taking a little bit of time away from the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK] to be here, and I am hoping somebody else is here to offer an amendment. I am not going to offer my amendment first unless there is nobody else and this committee rises.

If it is going to be defeated, then so be it, but here is what the Traficant

amendment says: You will have to register. If you do not register, you will be subject to fines, anywhere from $2,000 to $1 million. You could be prosecuted. You could be subpoenaed in. To register and to extend, you will do so January 31 and July 31. You will have known dates to do it. And we will know who you are. The American taxpayer should know who represents foreign interests.

Technically in the past, when this law was written, it dealt with Nazi Germany. We were interested in spies. Well, now we have foreign agents whose interest is trade. Commercial interests. I would submit that that is a greater problem in this country today than anything else we deal with, with a trade deficit of $170 billion.

Who represents China, folks? Who represents Japan? Who represents the European interests? Who represents any foreign interest that has an interest in the legislation today or an interest in the legislation dealing with Bosnia or dealing with appropriation matters of defense? That is what the issue is about.

I am hoping that the Members of Congress will take a look at this. I think the committee has brought enough Democrats together to carry the load, that in fact they will accept no amendments because if there are amendments, the Senate just is not going to accept it.

Well, as one Member of Congress, let me say this to the Senate. Quite frankly, Scarlett, I think the Congress should draft only the best legislation and that is the legislation to be signed into law.

With that, it is good to see the venerable chairman here. I do not question the intentions of former Chairman FRANK and Chairman CANADY. I think you have done a fine job. I hope the Members realize that there are foreign interests that lobby the Government, and we are dealing with lobby disclosure, and we are not doing the best job we can with foreign interests.

Maybe the Members might just decide to do something about it.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to the bill?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TRAFICANT

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TRAFICANT:

Page 37, line 11, strike ''AMENDMENT'' and insert ''AMENDMENTS'', in line 13 insert ''(a) REPORTS.—'' before ''Strike'' and insert after line 21 the following:

(b) DEFINITIONS.—

(1) AGENT OF A FOREIGN PRINCIPAL.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Section 1(c) of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended (22 U.S.C. 611(c)), is amended—

(i) by striking ''agent of a foreign principal'' each place it appears and inserting ''representative of a foreign principal'';

(ii) in paragraph (1)(iv), by striking ''and'' after the semicolon at the end;

(iii) in paragraph (2), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(iv) by adding at the end the following:

''(3) any person who engages in political activities for purposes of furthering commercial, industrial, or financial operations with a foreign principal.

For purposes of clause (1), a foreign principal shall be considered to control a person in major part if the foreign principal holds more than 50 percent equitable ownership in such person or, subject to rebuttal evidence, if the foreign principal holds at least 20 percent but not more than 50 percent equitable ownership in such person.''.

(B) FURTHER DEFINITION.—Section 1(d) of that Act (22 U.S.C. 611(d)) is amended to read as follows:

''(d) The term 'representative of a foreign principal' does not include—

''(1) any news or press service or association organized under the laws of the United States or of any State or other place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, or any newspaper, magazine, periodical, or other publication for which there is on file with the United States Postal Service information in compliance with section 3685 of title 39, United States Code, published in the United States, solely by virtue of any bona fide news or journalistic activities, including the solicitation or acceptance of advertisements, subscriptions, or other compensation therefor, so long as it is at least 80 percent beneficially owned by, and its officers and directors, if any, are citizens of the United States, and such news or press service or association, newspaper magazine, periodical, or other publication, is not owned, directed, supervised, controlled, subsidized, or financed, and none of its policies are determined by any foreign principal defined in subsection (b) of this section, or by any representative of a foreign principal required to register under this Act; or

''(2) any incorporated, nonprofit membership organization organized under the laws of the United States or of any State or other place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States that is registered under section 308 of the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act and has obtained tax-exempt status under section 501(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and whose activities are directly supervised, directed, controlled, financed, or subsidized in whole by citizens of the United States.''.

(2) POLITICAL PROMOTIONAL OR INFORMATIONAL MATERIALS.—Section 1(j) of that Act (22 U.S.C. 611(j)) is amended—

(A) in the matter preceding clause (1), by striking ''propaganda'' and inserting ''promotional or informational materials''; and

(B) in clause (1), by striking ''prevail upon, indoctrinate, convert, induce, or in any other way'' and inserting ''in any way''.

(3) POLITICAL ACTIVITIES.—Section 1(o) of that Act (22 U.S.C. 611(o)) is amended—

(A) by striking ''prevail upon, indoctrinate, convert, induce, persuade, or in any other way'' and inserting ''in any way''; and

(B) by striking ''or changing the domestic or foreign'' and inserting ''enforcing, or changing the domestic or foreign laws, regulations, or''.

(4) POLITICAL CONSULTANT.—Section 1(p) of that Act (22 U.S.C. 611(p)) is amended—

(A) by inserting ''(1)'' after ''any person''; and

(B) by inserting before the semicolon at the end the following: '', or (2) who distributes political promotional or informational materials to an officer or employee of the United States Government, in his or her capacity as such officer or employee''.

(5) SERVING PREDOMINANTLY A FOREIGN INTEREST.—Section 1(q) of that Act (22 U.S.C. 611(q)) is amended—

(A) by striking ''and'' at the end of clause (ii) of the proviso; and

(B) by inserting before the period at the end the following: '', and (iv) such activities do not involve the representation of the interests of the foreign principal before any agency or official of the Government of the United States other than providing information in response to requests by such agency or official or as a necessary part of a formal judicial or administrative proceeding, including the initiation of such a proceeding.''.

(c) SUPPLEMENTAL REGISTRATION.—Section 2(b) of that Act (22 U.S.C. 612(b)) is amended—

(1) in the first sentence by striking '', within thirty days'' and all that follows through ''preceding six months' period'' and inserting ''on January 31 and July 31 of each year file with the Attorney General a supplement thereto under oath, on a form prescribed by the Attorney General, which shall set forth regarding the six-month periods ending the previous December 31, and June 30, respectively, or, if a lesser period, the period since the initial filing,''; and

(2) by inserting after the first sentence the following new sentence: ''Any registrant using an accounting system with a fiscal year which is different from the calendar year may petition the Attorney General to permit the filing of supplemental statements at the close of the first and seventh month of each such fiscal year in lieu of the dates specified by the preceding sentence.''.

(d) REMOVAL OF EXEMPTION FOR CERTAIN COUNTRIES.—Section 3(f) of that Act (22 U.S.C. 613(f)) is repealed.

(e) LIMITING EXEMPTION FOR LEGAL REPRESENTATION.—Section 3(g) of that Act (22 U.S.C. 613(g)) is amended by striking ''or any agency of the Government of the United States'' and all that follows through ''informal'' and inserting ''or before the Patent and Trademark Office, including any written submission to that Office''.

(f) NOTIFICATION OF RELIANCE ON EXEMPTIONS.—Section 3 of that Act (22 U.S.C. 613) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''Any person who does not register under section 2(a) on account of any provision of subsections (a) through (g) of this section shall so notify the Attorney General in such form and manner as the Attorney General prescribes.''.

(g) CIVIL PENALTIES AND ENFORCEMENT PROVISIONS.—Section 8 of that Act (22 U.S.C. 618) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(i)(1) Any person who is determined, after notice and opportunity for an administrative hearing—

''(A) to have failed to file when such filing is required a registration statement under section 2(a) or a supplement thereto under section 2(b),

''(B) to have omitted a material fact required to be stated therein, or

''(C) to have made a false statement with respect to such a material fact,

shall be required to pay for each violation committed a civil penalty of not less than $2,000 and not more than $1,000,000. In determining the amount of the penalty, the Attorney General shall give due consideration to the nature and duration of the violation.

''(2)(A) Whenever the Attorney General has reason to believe that any person may be in possession, custody, or control of any documentary material relevant to an investigation regarding any violation of paragraph (1) of this subsection or of section 5, the Attorney General may, before bringing any civil or criminal proceeding thereon, issue in writing, and cause to be served upon such person, a civil investigative demand requiring such person to produce such material for examination.

''(B) Civil investigative demands issued under this paragraph shall be subject to the

applicable provisions of section 1968 of title 18, United States Code.''.

(h) CHANGE IN SHORT TITLE OF THE ACT.—Section 14 of that Act (22 U.S.C. 611 note) is amended by striking ''Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended'' and inserting ''Foreign Interests Representation Act''.

(i) REFERENCES TO AGENT OF A FOREIGN PRINCIPAL.—The Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended is amended—

(1) by striking ''agent of a foreign principal'' each place it appears and inserting ''representative of a foreign principal'';

(2) by striking ''agents of foreign principals'' each place it appears and inserting ''representatives of foreign principals'';

(3) by striking ''agent of such principal'' each place it appears and inserting ''representative of such principal''; and

(4) by striking ''such agent'' each place it appears and inserting ''such representative''.

(j) REFERENCES TO POLITICAL PROPAGANDA.—

(1) The paragraph preceding section 1 of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended is amended by striking ''propaganda'' and inserting ''political''.

(2) The Foreign Interests Representation Act (other than the paragraph amended by paragraph (1) of this subsection) is amended by striking ''propaganda'' each place it appears and inserting ''promotional or informational materials''.

(k) REFERENCES TO THE ACT.—

(1) Section 207(f)(2) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking ''Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended,'' and inserting ''Foreign Interests Representation Act''.

(2) Section 219 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in subsection (a) by striking ''agent of a foreign principal required to register under the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended,'' and inserting ''representative of a foreign principal required to register under the Foreign Interests Representation Act''; and

(B) in subsection (b)—

(i) by striking ''agent of a foreign principal'' and inserting ''representative of a foreign principal'';

(ii) by striking ''such agent'' and inserting ''such representative''; and

(iii) by striking ''Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended'' and inserting ''Foreign Interests Representation Act''.

(3) Section 5210(4) of the Competitiveness Policy Council Act (15 U.S.C. 4809(4)) is amended—

(A) by striking ''agent of a foreign principal'' and inserting ''representative of a foreign principal''; and

(B) by striking ''subsection (d) of the first section of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938 (22 U.S.C. 611)'' and inserting ''section 1(d) of the Foreign Interests Representation Act (22 U.S.C. 611(d)),''.

(4) Section 34(a) of the Trading With the Enemy Act (50 U.S.C. App. 34(a)) is amended by striking ''Act of June 8, 1934 (ch. 327, 52 Stat. 631), as amended'' and inserting ''Foreign Interests Representation Act''.

Mr. TRAFICANT (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of Thursday, November 16, 1995, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT] and a Member opposed each will be recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and claim the 15 minutes in opposition. I yield 7½ minutes of that time to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK] and ask unanimous consent that he may be permitted to yield blocks of time to other Members.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. CANADY] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK] each will be recognized for 7½ minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As I discussed, every year foreign interests spend hundreds of millions of dollars to influence our Government. They employ topnotch representatives. Many times they are former staff members of key committees, counsel to Ways and Means. Sometimes they are Members who chaired the most powerful committees in the Congress.

That evidently is a way of life, and the bill attempted to deal with that by banning for a lifetime U.S. Trade Representatives and Deputy Trade Representatives. We felt that did not go far enough.

But the bottom line is there are several General Accounting Office reports, and they basically say that only one out of every three, maybe only one out of every four agents who represent foreign interests take the time to register. The Traficant amendment deals with the registration of these agents dealing with foreign interests, and, in fact, penalties to stop such abuse.

Since that 1990 report was released by the General Accounting Office, the GAO wrote, neither the Justice Department nor Congress has adequately rectified this breach of security.

I submitted a bill dealing with the issue. The bottom line is with the end of the cold war, our whole dynamic on foreign interest lobbying has switched from sinister underground spy networks to trade and global competition. Many individuals and law firms who represent interests in these areas are exempt from registration under the act.

Now the bill deals with that, but not enough. The Traficant amendment would make them come in and submit in writing the reasons why they should qualify for an exemption.

In addition to that, the bill basically, and the focus, is changed from foreign agent representation act to foreign interest representation act, and that is where it should be.

Any person who engages in political activities for the purpose of furthering commercial, industrial or financial operations of a foreign interest would no longer be exempt. In addition, representatives of foreign interests will now be required to notify the Attorney General. Moreover, any person relying on an exemption under the act must notify the Justice Department of their intention to do so.

The amendment also establishes a test to determine what constitutes foreign control. Entities that are more than 50 percent foreign owned would be presumed to be foreign controlled, and be required to register. Entities with a 20 to 50 percent foreign ownership would also be considered foreign controlled.

But the timeliness of foreign agent registration now becomes an issue. Of the 28 registration statements reviewed in the GAO report, 70 percent had not even registered on time, for those who had registered.

Now one out of four is registering, and 70 percent of the one out of four is registering late. No one is really looking into them. We are talking about lobbying. We are worried about everybody lobbying Congress. I am talking about foreign interests that lobby the Congress of the United States. I could hear the talk. I have great respect for the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BRYANT] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK]. ''Yes, it's right, TRAFICANT, you're right, but not now.''

Beam me up here.

The penalties that are under law right now are so great the Justice Department shies away. The Traficant amendment puts reasonable penalties on. From a $2,000 civil fine up to $1 million with repeated abuse or significant facts.

The Justice Department would be given the authority to subpoena individuals for testimony and their records. The bottom line here is, even though I am preaching to the wind, we are now worried about Bosnia, with a $40 billion trade deficit with China.

Who represents China? We do not know. I guarantee you that. A $70-plus billion trade deficit with Japan. Whom all of those are, we do not know. We have gone from a $2 billion surplus with Mexico to a $20 billion deficit projected this year. Who represents the Government of Mexico? Who represents interests in Mexico?

□ 1045

Mr. Chairman, Canada, $16 billion surplus. Who represents all those interests? Here we are with North American free trade, Congress; we have a $36 billion deficit in our own hemisphere. We have chased our workers out of the country, chased our factories out, and we do not even require the people who represent those interests to register.

The Senate, the Senate said, ''If you add this on, it is gone, boy.'' Let me tell you what, any Senate that would reject this commonsense amendment is a Senate that the American people can do without.

I do not know how much time I have left, Mr. Chairman, but I want to retain some of my time to hear these illustrious rebuttals.

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

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I appreciate the interest of the gentleman from Ohio on this issue. I have offered to work with the gentleman from Ohio on his concerns.

I believe that the bill that is before the House addresses the concerns that the gentleman has in a very substantive way. I believe that the bill takes a big step forward in improving the information that will be available concerning foreign agents as well as persons representing foreign business interests.

As I have said before on the floor, I believe that this whole issue of the representation of foreign interests is something that we need to look into with greater detail. I am committed to doing that in a comprehensive way early next year in the Subcommittee on the Constitution.

I am concerned that, in some ways, the gentleman's amendment would actually weaken what we have in the bill. I think that that is a point that needs to be made and understood by the Members.

But I want to work with the gentleman from Ohio. I would urge the gentleman from Ohio to withdraw his amendment so that we can move forward with this important legislation, put this legislation on the President's desk, and break the 40-year gridlock. I understand what the gentleman has said, and I respect his perspective on this.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANADY of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Would the gentleman articulate where the Traficant amendment weakens his bill?

Mr. CANADY of Florida. I will, Mr. Chairman. For instance, H.R. 2564, the bill before the House now, eliminates the domestic subsidiary exemption which is currently in the law for foreign corporations. Your amendment would restore that exemption. Now, I think that is a weakening of the bill.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Notification would allow it. We have to know the reasons, sir. Let us be honest about that. Right now that exemption goes without notice.

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Reclaiming my time, I urge the Members of the House to focus on the issue here. We debated this at great length yesterday or earlier and at some length yesterday. The point here is that we have a bill dealing with lobby disclosure reform. This is an issue that has been tied up in the House and the Senate for more than 40 years. We have seen 40 years of gridlock.

We have a historic opportunity today to send a bill to the President to sign that will ensure that the public has access to information concerning lobbying activities here in Washington. I think it is time we do that.

There is bipartisan consensus that that is what we should do. There is bipartisan support for this bill that passed the Senate 98 to zero.

I do not claim that this is a perfect bill. But I do know that if history repeats itself, we will not get anything done on this issue, and I think the American people want something done and they are tired of excuses. They are tired of delay. They are tired of games that are played, and it is time that we ended that.

So I would urge opposition to the amendment, the well-intended amendment, offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

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

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BRYANT], a major sponsor of this legislation on our side.

(Mr. BRYANT of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BRYANT of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say first to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT] that what you are asking for in this amendment is, in my opinion, the right thing, as were several of the amendments asked for last night, and I think I can speak with more credibility perhaps than many of the Members of the House about this because of the fact that over the last years I have introduced and on occasion passed legislation to require disclosure of foreign ownership, sponsored and voted for legislation to force disclosure of the lobbying connections between our former Cabinet members and their clients after they leave and to prohibit them from being able to lobby for or advise foreign nationals or foreign companies. I agree with you.

It is not the amendment that you have here today that is the problem. It is the fact that any amendment in this setting is a problem.

As you know, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK] and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CANADY] are going to introduce legislation which I intend to cosponsor that will take these amendments and put them into law. We will get to vote on this again.

The Senate has not said that if you put the Traficant amendment on we will kill this bill or if you put the Istook amendment on we will kill this bill; they have not said they are going to kill the bill at all.

What we know, though, is if this bill goes to conference, as opposed to being passed and going to the President, it is going to be tied up and killed as it has been every time it has been attempted for 40 years.

Here we have a historic opportunity to pass this bill and see it signed into law and watch a major bipartisan accomplishment improve this process. Any amendment offered today, no matter how good it is, standing alone, is going to endanger this process.

For that reason I ask Members to vote ''no'' and then to cosponsor the Canady-Frank bill that will come after it.

I want to say the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CANADY] has played this straight from the beginning. He played it straight last year when we were in the majority, and I was chairman of the Committee of jurisdiction, and he has played it straight this year as subcommittee chairman. I accept his commitment to do just what he said; that is, to have hearings and move this bill out of here that contains many of the things we would like to see done.

For the time being, please vote ''no'' on the amendment today so we can pass the bill.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me say the gentleman from Ohio has brought this to our attention before. I agree with most of his amendment.

This is a complex issue, and as the gentleman from Florida pointed out, there is one point the gentleman from Ohio acknowledges, and I appreciate it, that the legislation here would strengthen regulation of foreign agents. He makes the point that we can strengthen it further. We agree with him.

But there are two points that are relevant. First, and I think what happened was he quite sensibly drafted his amendment to the existing law. This bill, as it came to us, changed the existing law. So, while his amendment does, in fact, strengthen the regulation of foreign interests in most instances, there is one instance, because of the kind of problem that happens with drafting, where he drafted to the original law and then the bill about came in after that, and there is one provision here, domestic subsidiaries of foreign interests, which now have an exemption in the law, and the bill, as presented, would abolish that exemption. Domestic subsidiaries would have no exemption. What they have now is a too generous exemption.

The gentleman from Ohio understandably tightens up the exemption. What he could not have known when he was drafting his bill was this legislation would do away with the exemption altogether. So, through no fault of anyone's, in fact, in this one case his bill weakens the scheme. In general, it strengthens it. His amendment, in general, strengthens it. In this one instance, it weakens it because it modifies an exemption we abolished altogether.

I would note I mentioned yesterday we have, and I am holding a bill here that includes as cosponsors myself, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BRYANT], I hope the gentleman from Ohio [Mr.

TRAFICANT], the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS] on the other side, and others. Not the chairman of the subcommittee, because he quite understandably wants to preserve his ability to look at the whole thing. But he promised us yesterday—and I have worked with him for years and he is a man who has kept every promise he has ever made to other Members—there would be a hearing and markup of legislation that would focus specifically on tightening foreign agents' registration.

Here is our problem. As my friend from Texas said, it is not anyone in the Senate has said if you change it we will kill the bill. It is worse than that. If we had such a public threat, then the gentleman would be correct, the gentleman from Ohio, and political pressure could be brought against them. But as the gentleman from Ohio understands as well as anyone here, this bill has a lot of enemies who do not want to admit they are its enemies. If we were dealing with someone who stood up and said, amend it and I will kill it, we could deal with that.

This bill is not likely to be shot head on. It is likely to be nibbled at from all sides. It will disappear. There will be quicksand here. There will be a bend in the road. We have a crowded legislative calendar.

It took a lot of energy to get this bill up even today. If it has to go to conference with everything else going on, with Bosnia, with the budget, with all the other major items, there is a strong likelihood of it being held up.

The problem is not if you go to conference and someone stands up and says, ''I hate this bill,'' but people who want to kill it say, ''I like this bill better than you do. I want to do it this way. I want to do it that way.'' We have no way to resolve it.

So we believe, and we appreciate the gentleman acknowledging this, we have a bill that improves the scheme of regulation of foreign interests. We agree it does not go far enough. Our hope is that we would get this bill passed, which we can do. If we get by this amendment without it being adopted, this bill goes to the President's desk, in my opinion, and we then immediately thereafter begin to tighten it. We tighten it in ways where I think we have a consensus.

The only change we would want to make in the gentleman's bill, I want to make, would be one I think he would agree with, we would want to continue to wipe out that exemption rather than to restore it.

With that, I hope the gentleman from Ohio would understand we say this in a cooperative spirit and want to get this bill to the President's desk.

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Under the bill, section 8, lobbying contact, under exceptions, B, the term ''lobbying contact'' does not include a communication that is made on behalf of a government of a foreign country or foreign political party and disclosed. I have heard all of this talk about how it is so much stronger.

Let us talk about what your bill does not do here, folks. Your bill does not empower the opportunity of the Justice Department to subpoena foreign agents to appear, testify, or produce records at administrative hearings concerning their violation of registration. Your bill does not impose administrative fines for minor violations against those who, after being directly informed of their obligation to report, still fail to do so. So, as a result, the General Accounting Office says this is meaningless. The Department of Justice is not going to go after these gnats with an MX missile.

Now, if there is some delineation and clarification of exemption, I would submit I would have to see in writing where the strength of your language is that much stronger. But, given that, given that, when is it that there are minor matters that deal in these issues that cannot be rectified in the conference with the U.S. Senate? Have we started to become subservient to the House of Lords or what?

Let me say, I do not have that much time. You guys are going to defeat the amendment. I want to say this to you: We have allowed foreign interests to run around this country lobbying our Government, and if not this bill today, then, damn it, when? That is what this bill is about. You are telling me you are going to bring another bill back. It is going to go to the other body. They are going to like it then, and the President is going to sign it.

What I am hearing today is: If it is great legislation, it has no shot; if it is mediocre, send it over, boys.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the remainder of my time.

I am disappointed in my friend. We are trying to work this out. You want to posture and wave your arms, fine.

You asked me where is your bill weaker. We, in our bill here, page 26, line 13, letter D, striking subsection (q), subsection (q) of the law is an exemption granted to domestic subsidiaries of foreign agents. We abolish that exemption. Your bill merely amends it.

Yes, your bill tightens this in some ways. But here is the specific case, page 26, line 13.

Second, we are not being subservient to the Senate. We are recognizing what you yourself understand. There are enemies of this bill who, if it goes back into the parliamentary thicket, will make it less likely it emerges.

☐ 1100

That is why we want to get this thing done, and then move beyond that. But I will say at this point, there is a very specific area, page 26, line 13, where we strike an exemption for domestic subsidiaries of foreign interests, a pretty significant one, and you leave it in there and modify it. That is the difference.

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, under my amendment, and listen to the language, ''Any person who engages in political activities for the purpose of furthering the commercial or financial operations of a foreign interest would no longer be exempt. In addition, representatives of foreign interests will now be required to notify the Attorney General'' if they would even seek any technicality to have such an exemption.

The only thing that I do is, I ban it too, but I make sure that at least those have an intention of trying to get around the registration have to show their hand here. I think that that speaks well of it. If there could be any more clarifying language, I would be glad to accept it.

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

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The gentleman had just said, first of all, he abolishes the exemption; but, second, he makes you tell the Attorney General if you are going to get it. That is like saying, ''I didn't take the bicycle, and it was fixed when I gave it back to you, but it was broken when I took it.''

The fact is that the gentleman, inadvertently perhaps, restores an exemption that this bill repeals, and saying that the Attorney General has to tell us does not change the facts. That is why this would benefit from being able to be worked on, as we will do in January or February.

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

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, we are so close. We are about this close from passing real lobby reform legislation, the length of the pen that the President of the United States can use to sign this into law. We have done it in a very contentious Congress, on a bipartisan basis, with people who said ''Yes, let us have a gift ban, and a strong gift ban,'' and who now, after almost 50 years, five decades, are this close, the length of a pen, to signing this into law and to make it the law of the land that we are reforming this Congress and regulating the lobby.

Yes, I am very concerned about the lack of registration of foreign agents. There are some that are not registered. But for every one of them, there are dozens or hundreds of people that are domestic agents that are not registered under our laws today. I am concerned about the loss of jobs to other countries, but I am also concerned about the loss of the public interest from this Capitol building. Let us do what is

right today: Defeat these amendments, place this on the President's desk, sign it into law this year, and then move on to reform our campaign finance laws, on a bipartisan basis also.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from western Pennsylvania [Mr. ENGLISH], replacing the big shoes of Tom Ridge, and he has done a fine job.

Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time, and for his handsome comments.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman's amendment, I think, provides fundamental reform of the registration of foreign agents. I think it is timely and necessary, given that this aspect of the law has not been modified for many decades and is demanding of reform. It is an obscenity right now that most representatives of foreign interests do not register. They are not in the public domain. The public is not protected from them and is not provided with the information that they need about the level of foreign interest representation.

Mr. Chairman, let me say, there is no controversy here. The managers of this bill have conceded, despite some technical arguments, that generally this amendment would strengthen this bill. That clearly is not in question here. I think the managers of this bill have made one real argument against this amendment, that somehow it impedes the progress of the legislation. However, I would repeat my earlier argument on previous amendments, like the English-Traficant amendment that was defeated last night by a very narrow margin, that we need to do our business.

It has been conceded here that this bill, this underlying bill, should be stronger. I would submit that we will feed public cynicism if we do not go forward and produce, here and now, the strongest possible bill, and have the discipline to follow through and get a conference passed by both houses. I do not think we can jump start this by simply passing the Senate version which, as has been conceded, does not go far enough in some particulars.

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS].

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, this has been one of the few issues that has been bipartisan in the extraordinary leadership of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CANADY] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK], Republican and Democrat coming together for the first time in 49 years to pass meaningful lobby disclosure.

The Senate wants the bill of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT] to pass. They want this bill to be sent back to the Senate. Some do not like the Simpson amendment in it; some do not like for the first time the fact that Senators will have to disclose their blind trusts, the full amount. They want it to come back to them so in conference they can take out the parts they do not want. Others want to send the President a bill that he will veto, to embarrass the President.

Mr. Chairman, we have the opportunity to have for the first time since 1946 meaningful lobby disclosure pass this Congress and be signed by the President. When they passed meaningful lobby disclosure in 1946 it was gutted by the Supreme Court in 1954. We have a meaningless law right now on the books. It is the reason that only 6,000 people register as lobbyists, when it is estimated that 60,000 to 80,000 people actually lobby Congress and lobby the executive branch. We have an opportunity to have these individuals lobby, and to disclose that they lobby, to disclose who pays them, to learn how much they are paid and to learn what they do.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT] has a good concept. I believe that will pass. I believe that we can bring out a bill on its own, combined with a few others that have come forward in the course of this debate, but I urge my colleagues to recognize we are so close. We have the opportunity to defeat this amendment, maybe defeat one more, and then send it to the President and have it become law.

I would just conclude by congratulating the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CANADY] and congratulating the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK], and to tell them that it is refreshing to participate, and to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BRYANT] and others, to participate in a bipartisan effort to get true lobby disclosure.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, No. 1, I do not want any of my comments taken to in any way cast any shadow of competency and/or address to duty on behalf of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK], one of the most intelligent Members of this body, who has shepherded a lot of these bills in the past, and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CANADY], his effort, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS], both of them extremely well qualified and do an excellent job. They have worked with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK] and we probably have the best brain trust involved in the bill. When you talk about the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BRYANT], we talk about one of our more solid Members who understands the Constitution and can interpret law.

Saying that, Mr. Chairman, I agree with everything the gentleman said. I have some concerns with loopholes in your language. In section 3 under definitions, the definition of lobbying contact calls for, in subsection B, under subsection 8, the term ''lobbying contact'' does not include a communication that is made on behalf of a government of a foreign country or a foreign political entity.

Mr. Chairman, there is some real technical language in here that people can run with. Everybody says no, that does not apply, the other section applies. A court of law is a funny place. The only thing I would like to say is this: that the Traficant amendment gives reasonable fines for reasonable offenses. It provides a date certain when individual agents representing foreign agents must register, and they have no more than a 30-day grace period, January 30–July 30.

The point I am making is, I listen to these arguments but here is what troubles me. We all agree that this is strengthening. If there is one question on the exemption language which, quite frankly, I believe the intent of my legislation prohibits any exemptions for commercial trade issues and, in fact, further makes notice that anybody who misreads that section must notify the Attorney General that they think they may have an exemption, make sure there is a process, before they could even consider having an exemption. My bill specifically in fact denies any exemption. I will read it: ''Any person who engages in political activities for the purpose of furthering commercial or financial operations of foreign interests would no longer be exempt.''

Yes, the trouble that we have is most people do not know the law. There is no notification, which the Traficant bill provides. There is no reasonableness in the fines. As a result, there is no enforcement. There are no subpoena powers. It is like saying we are going to enforce the law, but we cannot subpoena your records.

I have been here for a number of years and, quite frankly, I am absolutely sickened by foreign interests who rip us off. Let me say this: We might be concerned about the Senate's blind trust today, but I am concerned about foreign interests' blindsiding of the American economy. I think that is a hell of a lot more.

However, I am going to do this. I am asking the chairman, because I have a commitment by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK], will he include the Traficant language with that one minor clarification, in another piece of legislation, and does that have a shot to come out of this Congress?

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Chairman, as I have told the gentleman before, I want to work with the gentleman on this issue. We are going to consider the specific language that he has proposed here today, any changes he wants to make on it, any other suggestions he has on this general subject. I want to move forward with as strong a piece of legislation on this subject on this legislation as we possibly can.

Mr. TRAFICANT. I would ask the gentleman, Mr. Chairman, is that a yes?

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Yes.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TRAFICANT. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I can guarantee to the gentleman, knowing the way this place functions, that we will have a new bill come out, his language will be in it in some form, and if he does not like that form, we will have a vote on the floor on his language, because we need a vote on this and other issues, and I can guarantee he can have a vote on this floor and I will be supporting it.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TRAFICANT. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out, there are a number of others of us who would like to speak in favor of such effort.

Mr. TRAFICANT. With that, Mr. Chairman, I think we have at least made our case. The blind trusts of the Senate are important, but there is the blindsiding of our economy by individuals trying to operate and get around it. I agree, the gentleman's intentions are honorable.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment, which in text and in substance will be included in further legislation, from what I have heard, now be withdrawn and there be no labor of a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased that today, the House of Representatives is considering H.R. 2564, legislation that will make long-overdue lobbying reforms. By approving this measure, the House will make real changes in the lobbying process, and take an important step toward restoring the American people's faith in their government.

Too often in the past, Congress has failed to effectively address the problems plaguing the lobbying process. Last year, for example, the House worked in a bipartisan manner to approve meaningful lobbying reform legislation, only to see the maneuvers of a few Republicans in the Senate block its enactment.

Throughout this year, Democrats have called upon the Republican majority to move forward with similarly meaningful lobbying reform legislation. By bringing H.R. 2564 to the floor, the Republicans have at last heard and answered this call. This bill would require professional lobbyists to identify their clients and disclose how much they are paid for their efforts. It would also guarantee the American people full access to this information.

Earlier this month, the Judiciary Committee, of which I am a member, recognized the importance of real lobbying reform and unanimously approved H.R. 2564. This impressive, bipartisan support offers great promise for today's debate on the measure.

Two weeks ago, the House demonstrated its commitment to reform by approving tough, new gift rules. Today, the House can take another step on the path toward needed reform and restored public faith in Government. I urge my colleagues to choose this path by passing real lobbying reform. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2564.

Mr. QUINN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 2564, the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995. This historic legislation imposes new disclosure requirements for lobbyists who contact legislative and executive branch officials and their staffs.

Lobbying reform legislation is long overdue. In fact, Congress has failed to agree to comprehensive legislation on this issue for 49 years. I have served in this body for almost 3 years and I am relieved to finally have the opportunity to vote for genuine lobbying reform.

Today, when the House adopts a rule to ban lobbyists from giving, and Members from receiving, unnecessary gifts, such as meals and vacations, it will be amending the 1946 Federal Regulation and Lobbying Act.

The 1946 act is seen as having broad deficiencies: among other weaknesses, it does not cover executive branch lobbying, grassroots lobbying, or the lobbying of congressional staff. These deficiencies have diminished the public's trust in Congress and its actions.

This issue should concern all Americans, because it indicates where the sympathies of their own Representatives lie, with them and their neighbors or with special interest groups based in Washington.

Polls clearly show that citizens continue to believe that special interests control the outcome of legislative debate. It is time for the House of Representatives and all of its Members to answer to the public's demand for lobbying reform.

The Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 reforms the way special interest groups and lobbyists unduly influence legislation on Capitol Hill. The legislation holds lobbyists responsible and if they break the law, they will be punished with tens of thousands of dollars in fines. I urge all my colleagues to support H.R. 2564.

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2564, the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995. Unfortunately, current lobbying disclosure requirements are riddled with loopholes, which may lead public officials to enact policies that benefit special interests, rather than the public good. Building on Republican efforts to end business as usual in Washington, H.R. 2564 would impose strict registration and disclosure requirements for lobbyists who contact legislative and executive branch officials or their staffs. The bill would impose civil penalties on lobbyists who fail to file or who report false information, prohibit former U.S. trade officials from representing foreign entities, and expand financial disclosure requirements for Members of Congress.

In order to ensure that individuals who petition their congressional and Government representatives are not unfairly burdened with disclosure laws, H.R. 2564 defines a lobbyist as any individual who is employed or retained for compensation for services that include more than one lobbying contact, other than an individual whose lobbying activities constitute less than 20 percent of the time engaged in the services provided by such individual to that client over a 6-month period.

There is strong bipartisan support for this legislation. In fact, the Senate passed an identical version of this legislation—S. 1060—on July 25, 1995, by a vote of 98 to 0.

Justifiable concerns were raised that if the Senate-version of this legislation were amended, the bill would become mired in a House-Senate conference, and the possibility of enacting any significant lobbying reform legislation would be substantially reduced. Therefore, although I find merit in many of the amendments which are being offered during floor consideration of H.R. 2564, I am voting against all changes to the underlying bill to avoid sending the legislation into a protracted House-Senate conference. This scenario would result in delay and disagreement between the two Chambers, which has in fact undermined previous attempts at lobbying reform.

Mr. Chairman, improvements in our outdated lobbying registration and disclosure requirements are long overdue. By promptly passing H.R. 2564 without amendment, we can send this important measure to the President's desk for signature into law. I am hopeful that the House will consider separate legislation relating to the issues raised through the amendment process in the coming months.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to approve this legislation in the same form as passed by the Senate. H.R. 2564 is an important reform bill which is worthy of strong bipartisan support.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to the bill?

If not, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ALLARD) having assumed the chair, Mr. KOLBE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2564) to provide for the disclosure of lobbying activities to influence the Federal Government, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 269, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 421, nays 0, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 828]

YEAS—421

Abercrombie	Andrews	Bachus
Ackerman	Archer	Baesler
Allard	Armey	Baker (CA)

Baker (LA)
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bryant (TX)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chapman
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Coleman
Collins (GA)
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cooley
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Danner
Davis
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
DeLay
Dellums
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Dornan
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Durbin
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Ensign
Eshoo
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fawell
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Fields (TX)
Filner
Flanagan
Foglietta
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fowler
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Frost
Funderburk
Furse
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Green
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jackson-Lee
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Johnston
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
King
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaFalce
LaHood
Lantos
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Lincoln
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Longley
Lowey
Lucas
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Martini
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McDermott
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Metcalf
Meyers
Mfume
Mica
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Murtha
Myers
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Paxon
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Reed
Regula
Richardson
Rivers
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Sabo
Salmon
Sanders
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Stockman
Stokes
Studds
Stump
Stupak
Talent
Tanner
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas
Thompson
Thornberry
Thornton
Thurman
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Torres
Torricelli
Traficant
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Ward
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—11

Cox
Crane
de la Garza
Fattah
Flake
Hefner
Riggs
Roth
Towns
Tucker
Waters

□ 1134

Mrs. LINCOLN and Mr. OWENS changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. COX of California. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 828, I was necessarily detained due to official business. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea.''

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 828, I was unavoidably detained on other legislative business and was not able to cast my vote within the allotted time. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea.''

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 2564, the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 269, I call up the Senate bill (S. 1060) to provide for the disclosure of lobbying activities to influence the Federal Government, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The text of the Senate bill is as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds that—

(1) responsible representative Government requires public awareness of the efforts of paid lobbyists to influence the public decisionmaking process in both the legislative and executive branches of the Federal Government;

(2) existing lobbying disclosure statutes have been ineffective because of unclear statutory language, weak administrative and enforcement provisions, and an absence of clear guidance as to who is required to register and what they are required to disclose; and

(3) the effective public disclosure of the identity and extent of the efforts of paid lobbyists to influence Federal officials in the conduct of Government actions will increase public confidence in the integrity of Government.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

As used in this Act:

(1) AGENCY.—The term ''agency'' has the meaning given that term in section 551(1) of title 5, United States Code.

(2) CLIENT.—The term ''client'' means any person or entity that employs or retains another person for financial or other compensation to conduct lobbying activities on behalf of that person or entity. A person or entity whose employees act as lobbyists on its own behalf is both a client and an employer of such employees. In the case of a coalition or association that employs or retains other persons to conduct lobbying activities, the client is the coalition or association and not its individual members.

(3) COVERED EXECUTIVE BRANCH OFFICIAL.—The term ''covered executive branch official'' means—

(A) the President;

(B) the Vice President;

(C) any officer or employee, or any other individual functioning in the capacity of such an officer or employee, in the Executive Office of the President;

(D) any officer or employee serving in a position in level I, II, III, IV, or V of the Executive Schedule, as designated by statute or Executive order;

(E) any member of the uniformed services whose pay grade is at or above O–7 under section 201 of title 37, United States Code; and

(F) any officer or employee serving in a position of a confidential, policy-determining, policy-making, or policy-advocating character described in section 7511(b)(2) of title 5, United States Code.

(4) COVERED LEGISLATIVE BRANCH OFFICIAL.—The term ''covered legislative branch official'' means—

(A) a Member of Congress;

(B) an elected officer of either House of Congress;

(C) any employee of, or any other individual functioning in the capacity of an employee of—

(i) a Member of Congress;

(ii) a committee of either House of Congress;

(iii) the leadership staff of the House of Representatives or the leadership staff of the Senate;