

New York ad firms O'Leary Clarke & Partners and FCB/Leber Katz Partners Inc. were second and third respectively, making slightly over \$5 million each from the Cayman Islands (O'Leary) and Jamaica and the British Virgin Islands (FCB).

Washington law/lobbying firms also fared well. Patton Boggs, home of super lobbyist and name-partner Hale "Tommy" Boggs, pulled in more than \$3.5 million from such clients as Oman, Qatar, the Philippines and Pakistan. Other Patton Boggs clients who did not pay them during the six month time period include Hong Kong, Italy, the United Arab Emirates, France, Germany and Taiwan.

Other law/lobby/PR firms grossing over \$1 million with numerous active foreign clients were Fleishman-Hillard (including clients from Canada, France, Angola, Turkey, Northern Ireland and Japan), Cassidy & Associates (France, Australia, Japan, Saudi Arabia and Taiwan), the Bozell Sawyer Miller Group (Canada, the Bahamas, Bolivia, Japan and Indonesia), Arnold & Porter (Canada, Israel, Panama, Turkey and Venezuela), Burson-Marsteller (Hong Kong, Great Britain, Indonesia, Mexico, Pakistan, Turkey and Portugal), Washington & Christian (Antigua & Barbuda, Gabon, Guinea and Nigeria) and Hogan & Hartson (Canada, France, Panama, Russia, the Bahamas, Haiti, Japan, Great Britain and Taiwan).

Registerable activities include engaging in lobbying, "political activities," or public relations in the United States. A foreign agent must also register if he or she "solicits, collects, disburses or dispenses contributions, loans, money or other things of value . . ." This includes the promotion of trade and tourism.

Furthermore, ostensibly domestic entities don't have to register with the Department of Justice.

USBICEF's Tonelson noted that many domestic companies have become almost proxy foreign agents. "The China trade debate is a perfect example . . ." said Tonelson.

He added that, "the positions that they're lobbying for hard have become almost indistinguishable from the Chinese government, and in fact they've become the most effective voice for the Chinese government."

So, for example, while the Chinese Embassy paid a paltry \$18,750 to the law and lobbying firm of Jones, Day, Reavis & Pogue for keeping up on issues like Most-Favored-Nation (MFN) trade status, groups like the U.S.-China Business Council and large multinational corporations lobby the U.S. government in favor of the MFN renewal.

As of June 30, 1996, 595 active registrants (totaling 2,825 individuals) were registered to represent 871 foreign principals.

Lobbying, law and P.R. firms grossing over \$1 million from foreign clients

DDB Needham Worldwide ..	\$18,343,333
O'Leary & Clarke & Partners ..	5,139,405
FCB/Leber Katz Partners ..	5,131,928
International Registries Inc ..	4,709,640
Merkley Newman Harty ..	3,670,489
Patton Boggs ..	3,574,939
Fleishman-Hillard Inc ..	2,619,152
Cassidy & Associates ..	2,060,465
Bozell Sawyer Miller Group ..	1,786,831
Arnold & Porter ..	1,614,937

Foreign governments spending over \$1 million

Japan ..	\$17,840,878.31
Bahamas ..	8,722,043.54
Cayman Islands ..	8,212,662.99
Ireland ..	5,546,970.00
Marshall Islands ..	4,376,538.87
Mexico ..	3,576,368.31

Foreign governments spending over \$1 million—Continued

Canada ..	2,716,742.50
Hong Kong ..	2,569,187.99
Bermuda ..	2,473,473.71
India ..	2,273,449.09

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

CHAOS IN MAJORITY AFFECTS FLOOR SCHEDULE

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I would simply like to take this time to correct the impression left by the previous speaker, the gentleman from New York, about what happened on the House floor tonight.

The fact is, the votes on suspensions which occurred tonight, to which the gentleman from New York objected, occurred at the insistence of the majority party, not at our insistence. In fact, we suggested five different propositions which would have enabled the Republican leadership of this House to close debate on measures in an orderly manner and at a reasonable hour tonight, and all five of those suggestions were rejected by the majority party leadership.

We, in fact, specifically asked and our party leadership specifically asked that the majority party consider not having the votes on suspension until tomorrow, and that was also turned down by the majority party leadership.

So lest the gentleman from New York be under the impression that this protracted session tonight occurred at the wish of the minority party in the House, that is specifically not the case. My staff tried. The staff of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT] tried. The staff of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] tried suggestions which would have avoided this meaningless extension of debate tonight. All of them were turned down by the majority party leadership.

I regret the chaos which has afflicted the House on the latter part of this day. It seems to be simply an extension of the chaos which is occurring within the majority party caucus.

I would note that I find it strange indeed that the Committee on Appropriations seems to be able to do its work in committee on an almost totally bipartisan basis on bill after bill after bill. But then when those bills come to the House floor, they are in fact first taken to the Committee on Rules and the Committee on Rules establishes a set of rules under which the bills can be debated which systematically denies to the minority member who has the re-

sponsibility for carrying the bill the right to participate in any meaningful way in the debate on the House floor.

As the gentlewoman from California said the other night in discussing this, almost without exception the amendments that were allowed the minority party by the Committee on Rules on appropriation bill after appropriation bill are only those amendments which everyone understands will lose. Any time there appears to be an amendment that we want to offer that has a chance of winning, the Committee on Rules rules it out. That is what has caused the problems around here.

I would suggest if you want the House to work, the majority party and the Committee on Rules needs to work out the same kind of working relationship with the minority that we have been able to work out on the Committee on Appropriations between the majority and minority.

We manage within our committee to get our work done. And then every time it is frustrated by the overt and undue partisanship that permeates the way the Committee on Rules handles its business. That is the reason why I was told by a member of the majority party in the Committee on Appropriations that the reason the agriculture appropriation subcommittee came to the floor without a rule was to avoid the chaos in the Committee on Rules.

I would suggest we have a fundamental problem with the leadership of the majority party in this House which is apparently in chaos. That chaos is spilling over into an incredible exhibition of arrogance on the part of the majority party in the Committee on Rules. Until that chaos is eliminated, until that arrogance is eliminated, we are not going to be able to proceed apparently in any orderly fashion to deal with the House's business. I regret that, but that is in fact the case.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR].

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

As ranking member on the agriculture subcommittee, I have to say what a true tragedy it is that a subcommittee that has labored hard to bring a bill to the floor that can pass has now been handcuffed under this rule, and tomorrow it is almost laughable that key amendments will be limited to 5 minutes on each side, not even enough time to explain to our colleagues what the content of these amendments are and to fully appreciate the debate on both sides.

Whether we are talking about crop insurance, peanuts, whether we are talking about the WIC Program, our Members will be handcuffed and it is wrong. It is wrong for the Committee on Rules to do this to the Committee on Appropriations.