is a polluted Superfund site that needs to be cleaned up. But will the EPA be able to do it? We appropriated $7 million last year. Next year, they will appropriate only $4 million, $2.3 million cut, 32 percent.

We expect our kids to look at us and say yes, son, we are going to make sure when you go fishing 10 or 20 years from now you can fish in clean water. When you walk outside you can breathe clean air. When you decide to grow crops, you are going to be able to turn over clean soil. Yet we are failing to provide EPA the kind of mechanisms they need to protect these natural resources.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. The gentleman from Louisiana does not know how right he is on the Environmental Protection Agency. I am as we speak dealing with a problem of lack of resources: An area in a community of 3,000 homes of individuals in my community, in the 18th Congressional District, Pleasantville, bedroom community, stalwart citizens, experienced in their nearby neighborhood, a very tragic, if you will, and disturbing fire of a warehouse that contained hazardous materials.

We have been trying to work for weeks now in order to get the resources put in by EPA that is so downsized already, to get into this area and do additional testing. That is why I am so opposed and concerned about a $2 million cut, because when neighborhoods that need to be secure, people who live in communities, have invested in their property, suffer this threat so close to their community, and then when we call upon the resources that need to be utilized for testing, to protect their lives but as well to make sure they are safe in their living conditions, we face this response of downsizing and no resources.

It is the same kind of response that you hear with the homelessness and that you hear with the question of the AIDS treatment, and the same kind of response that you may have to give now those 99.1 percent of Americans that have Medicare and Medicaid, that eventually you will have to say there is no more room at the inn.

The question that you have asked, I would like to answer, is that we do not have focus. We have taken away from the American people their dreams, their aspirations, and their hopes. I think once you do that you have turned away the responsibility of the Federal Government to capture hopes and dreams and aspirations of the American people. We have lost our focus.

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. Further in the environment portion of this legislation, as the gentlewoman knows, it also cuts money that deals with water treatment grants. Fiscal year 1995, we appropriated $2.6 billion. This year, for 1996, we appropriate $1.7 billion.

Now, there is some who probably do not appreciate, as I do, the need for these grants. I have several little small towns and villages in the district I represent that do not have water treatment plants and do not have the wherewithal, do not have the tax base to develop a water treatment plant.

I have citizens who live within the district that I represent who do not drink clean water everyday, not because they enjoy drinking water that is probably not safe. There are people who live in my district, I can give you a town; for example, the town of White Castle, I have an excellent mayor, Maurice Brown, who worked hard. We were just able to appropriate money to that town so they could improve their water situation. Before such time, we have citizens who were drinking water that had color in it. Some refused to drink it. Some just bought bottled water. Then they asked, Congressman FIELDS, I drink bottled water, but what do I do when I have to take a bath? Those kind of things. I do not think people really have a real appreciation of those kind of problems that really exist in rural America today.

To cut this kind of program to this degree will not allow this Congress to help small towns like White Castle. It will not allow this Congress to help little, small towns like the town of Donaldsonville and other small towns in rural America. That makes sense. It is through no fault of their own.

I want to thank the gentlewoman from Texas for coming out tonight to discuss some of these budget cuts in these appropriations bills, because they are devastating, and they will have an effect on real people back home in all of our districts. It is something we need to be cognizant of.

Lastly, I just wanted to say tomorrow, when we debate the amendment on the Commerce appropriation, that we will put 10 percent, earmark 10 percent of the dollars to prevention.

I would hope that Members of this body will stand up and support that amendment, because we cannot fight the crime problem in this country by only dealing with jails and penal institutions. We are going to have to fight it from both angles. That is incarceration, law enforcement, and prevention. I think that this bill fails to provide that.

PRESENTING THE FACTS ABOUT MEDICARE

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

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor this evening to present to you and to the American people the facts about Medicare. The course of the discussion I will take is well-traveled, but I do not think that there has ever been a more pressing issued facing our Nation than the crisis concerning Medicare. I want to lay out the facts tonight and discuss the very immediate steps which must be taken to preserve and to protect Medicare for everyone who plans to live longer than seven more years.

I am going to start with the bottom line tonight and work my way backward, back to the point which brings me to this podium late this evening. We must keep one singular, simple, and brutal clear point in our minds as we utter every word in the debate about Medicare: According to the Medicare trustees, the Medicare trust fund, which pays the hospital expenses for Medicare beneficiaries, part A, will be bankrupt by the year 2002.

I have with me tonight that report that was issued by the Medicare trustees. This report goes into detail as to why the Medicare trust fund is on a path to go bankrupt by 2002. Mr. Speaker, if someone was wanting to get a copy of this, they should call the congressional phone line, which is 202–224–3121. Mr. Speaker, that is 202–224–3121.

At that point, the trustees tell us, the system as we know it today will cease to exist. All of the accusations we have had and the political bickering and the semantics are pale when we compare the simple fact that the Medicare trust fund is going bankrupt, when we lay that fact on the table.

Medicare is going broke and will not survive another generation unless we act to save it today. In a sense, Mr. Speaker, I am speaking hypothetically about this situation tonight, because, as the Republican Party, we are going to do everything we possibly and physically can to prevent that from happening. We intend to provide quality, affordable, easily accessible health care for all of our seniors.

Nobody likes to hear the word bankrupt. I guess if you spend enough time in Congress or if you work for the Government long enough it might not mean too much, but as someone who spent a lot of time in the private sector, in the real world, I have a healthy respect for the word. The concept is clear: Everyone out there tonight understands that when you expenditures consistently and substantially exceed your revenues or your reserves, you will go broke.

I think this chart that I have very clearly says it all. The part A trust fund is going to be empty by the year 2002. It starts here with the current trust fund that we have in 1995 of about $150 billion. You can see that as time goes on, as we achieve the next 7 years, by 2000 the line here is marked zero, and the expenditure line, the trust fund, cross at 2002. That is an indication that the trust fund is at that point broke. It has no more money in it. You can see after that it runs a deficit for the next few years.

This situation though goes way beyond the Medicare system. It affects our entire budget once we start running a deficit.

I firmly believe that this Congress was elected in large part to balance the budget. The President has finally admitted that if we can balance the budget, it will actually be good for our

economy. He does have a plan, but according to the Congressional Budget Office it will not work. He is admitting to having a problem. I think that is a significant start, and we welcome him aboard in the fight to balance the budget.

But the fact is, without significant reform to Medicare, it is almost impossible to balance the budget. As a Congress and a nation, we must reform Medicare if we hope to preserve and protect the system, and we must balance the budget.

The crisis to Medicare confronts us to some degree because of an aging population and an ever-expanding measure to provide better health care longer, but there is also an inherent deficiency in the current system which has led to explosive growth in Medicare, over 10 percent annually for the last 11 years. This, Mr. Speaker, is in part what we can control and where the solutions must be found.

Egregious cases of fraud, abuse, and waste do exist, but we will attack them. We will not completely solve the problem, and I guess technically Medicare could continue to operate as it does today. We would just simply require the next generation to pay a payroll tax rate of 19 percent by the year 2050.

But that is not acceptable. What we need to do is simplify, cut out the red tape, open more opportunities to our recipients as we do in the private sector. We can and must do it.

I just cannot go home at night and look at my three young children, knowing that even though none of them are out of high school yet, our generation, my generation, is planning how we are going to spend their money. And the key to protecting and preserving Medicare is to control the rate at which the program increases.

The Republican proposal is to allow Medicare to increase. Let me repeat that. Our proposal is to allow Medicare to increase, simply at a slower rate than the current double digits we have. But this plan provides for an increase per person of over $1,900 by the year 2002. This is a 40-percent beneficiary increase.

This chart that is entitled ''Medicare Spending Per Recipient in the Republican Budget'' indicates the increase. In 1995, the average expenditure per person is $4,860. That is going to increase to $6,7834 per person by 2002. We have heard a lot about the cuts going to Medicare, but it is actually an increase. One has to think that those who keep talking about cuts would be losing credibility when there is an acknowledged increase in spending to Medicare. But this rate of increase is both sufficient to maintain the integrity of the Medicare program for the current and future beneficiaries, and to ensure its long-term solvency and survival.

Mr. Speaker, I came to the floor tonight to engage the American public with these facts. I believe this effort to save the Medicare system is so imperative, because it goes much deeper than one specific program designed to provide health care assistance to the older Americans. I believe it is going to serve as a test of our resolve. We must come together, we must overcome contrived generational lines, we must overcome the temptation of the liberals to use class warfare, age warfare, because we must ensure that as American, the America we pass along to the next generation, our children and our grandchildren, is a little bit better because of our efforts, that government can be the highest and best. This idea does not seem to be embraced much anymore. It seems that each generation has grown increasingly more pessimistic about their future. I am concerned about this because this is not the vision of America which I want to pass on to our next generation. I think that if we can succeed today in this endeavor, we will not only save the Medicare system but resurrect some of the much needed optimism that our Nation has lost.

□ 2145

There is a great need to preserve hope for the future. Just last July 4, I received news that I have a new nephew. His name is Kenan Tiahrt. He was born July 4, Independence Day, 1995. He represents hope for the future. I have three children myself, Jessica, who is 14; John, who is 10; and Luke, who is 7, and they are my hope for the future and why I am involved in Congress. We must give them the tools that they need to start on a hopeful optimistic career and it starts today with our efforts to balance the budget so we can preserve the Medicare system and protect it.

For our hopes to balance the budget we must be able to eliminate the unnecessary bureaucracy, and tonight I have with me several people who are going to be discussing how we are going to eliminate that unneeded bureaucracy and save the future for our children by balancing the budget. Tonight, speaking about elimination of the Department of Commerce, I have the gentlelady from Idaho [Ms. CHENOWETH], and I would like to yield to her for what time as he may consume to discuss the elimination of the Department of Commerce.

Ms. CHENOWETH. I thank the gentleman from Kansas for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, it is exciting to hear the gentleman from Kansas speak about the reduction of the size of Federal Government with more than just words in round pear-shaped tones. To lead into the fact that we are truly a Congress committed to reducing the size of the Federal Government is truly exciting in this revolutionary and historic time in the U.S. Congress.

Mr. Speaker, after several months of careful study, our task force on the elimination of the Department of Commerce has put forward a well thought-out, responsible program for dismantling the Department of Commerce bureaucracy.

The plan consolidates the duplicative programs, eliminates the unnecessary programs, streamlines the beneficial programs, and privatizes those programs better performed by the private sector.

The plan has bi-partisan support and is also endorsed by many former Commerce Department officials. In addition, the elimination of the Department of Commerce was accepted into both the House and Senate budget resolutions earlier this year.

First, I would like to dispel the myth that the Department of Commerce is the advocate for American business in the federal government.

Business leaders of both small and large companies would be far better served if federal efforts were focused on cutting taxes, enacting regulatory and tort reforms, and more importantly, achieving a balanced budget.

Incentives such as these translate into real sustainable economic growth by way of lower interest rates, a boost in capital investment, and the generation of more jobs. Yet the ''voice for business,'' the Commerce Department, has been notably silent on these issues.

Instead of being the advocate for business, Commerce is a federal department that is involved in everything from managing fish farms in Arkansas to providing federal grants to build replicas of the Pyramids and the Great Wall of China in Indiana.

Commerce officials have been forced to defend the entire Department based on the limited successes of its trade functions, and in doing so completely miss the mark. Only 5 percent of Commerce's budget is devoted to trade promotion, a responsibility shared with over 19 other federal agencies. In fact, Commerce does not even take the lead in U.S. trade programs.

We are not, however, disputing the importance of many of the trade functions currently performed by the Commerce Department. We understand and agree that we must aggressively pursue foreign markets and provide inroads for American businesses.

My colleague, Congressman MICA, has proposed the reorganization of the federal government's trade functions into one coordinated Office of Trade. This will begin to consolidate a very fragmented trade process in our government.

There is no need for the Bureau of the Census to be in a Department of Commerce. This agency would be better included in the Treasury Department, as our proposal suggests, or as the foundation for an independent central statistical agency as others suggest.

The Patent and Trademark Office is another agency that bears little relationship to the other programs in Commerce, and because it is already a self-funding program, it pays a 25 percent stipend just be in the Department of Commerce. This Office could be transferred to the Justice Department,

where most legal issues of the federal government are addressed, or it could be made a government corporation as Chairman Moorhead of the Judiciary Intellectual Property Subcommittee has suggested.

The technology programs of the Commerce Department amount to little more than ''corporate welfare'' as Labor Secretary Robert Reich has suggested. A prime example of this corporate welfare is the Advanced Technology Program, which provides million dollar grants to some of the nation's industry giants.

The Department's own Inspector General notes the agency has evolved into ''a loose collection of more than 100 programs.'' The General Accounting Office goes further, reporting that Commerce ''faces the most complex web of divided authorities * * *'' sharing its ''missions with at least 71 federal departments, agencies, and offices.''

In fact, of these more than 100 programs, we found that all but three are duplicated by other government agencies or the private sector.

Former Commerce Secretary Robert Mosbacher has called his former Department a ''hall closet where you throw everything You don't know what to do with.''

Over half of the Department's budget is consumed by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, an agency that has nothing to do with commerce. The functions of this agency would find a much better home at the Department of Interior.

Commerce's claim that it has been a ''proven business ally at the Cabinet table'' holds little weight in the eyes of America's business community.

In fact, a June 5 Business Week poll of senior business executives illustrated support for eliminating the Department of Commerce by a two to one margin.

Several leading business journals, including the Wall Street Journal and the Journal of Commerce, have carried stories reporting on the lack of business support for the Department.

Mr. Speaker, regarding the majority of the Commerce Department's activities, what Department officials call synergy, others simply call confusion.

From the Census Bureau to the Travel and Tourism Administration, it makes no sense for these diverse and disjointed functions to be huddled together in one Department of Commerce.

The wholesale approach in defending the status quo at the Department, lumping the good with the bad, the efficient with the wasteful, is symptomatic of how we got into our deficit mess in the first place. We need to take a new look at how we do business at the Department of Commerce, not only to improve on the beneficial programs, but to save taxpayers' hard earned dollars.

The Department of Commerce Dismantling Act provides a blueprint for the orderly termination of this bureaucracy, eliminating the waste and duplication, saving the American taxpayers almost $8 billion over five years. This is one step we can and must take to create a more efficient and effective Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, for the RECORD I include the articles referred to earlier.

[From Business Week, June 5, 1995]

A BALANCED BUDGET OR BUST

American business has spoken: Balance the federal budget, even if it means giving up corporate subsidies. That's the message in a new Business Week/Harris Executive Poll of 408 senior executives. A decisive 57% of corporate leaders said balancing the budget was a ''top priority'' that will only happen by setting a strict deadline. Only 23% felt such a step might harm the economy.

Given a choice between balancing the government's books or slashing taxes, 79% of executives opted for budget balance. Yet few thought it would actually happen: Asked if Uncle Sam's ledgers would be balanced by 2002, 86% said no.

FULL STEAM AHEAD

Republicans and Democrats are arguing over how to balance the federal budget. Which of the following statements comes closest to your point of view?

	Percent
a. Balancing the budget is a top priority that will only happen by setting a strict deadline	57
b. Balancing the budget is a worthwhile goal, but drastic cuts in federal spending could jeopardize the economy	23
c. The most important goal should not be balancing the budget, but rather setting different spending priorities	20
d. Not sure/don't know	0

SAYING YES TO SACRIFICE

Some Republicans say that the drive to balance the budget by 2002 will require most, if not all, business subsidies to be eliminated. Considering your specific industry, are you willing to forgo special tax incentives or spending programs for the sake of budgetary discipline, or not? [1]

	Percent
a. Willing to forgo tax incentives	57
b. Willing to forgo spending programs	56
c. Not willing to forgo anything	10
d. Depends on the circumstances	7
e. Not sure/don't know	6

[1] Respondents could pick more than one answer.

NO SACRED COWS

I'm going to read you a list of business subsidies or incentives that might be eliminated in order to balance the budget. Should each of the following be eliminated or not in order to help balance the federal budget?

[In percent]

	Should	Should not	Not sure/don't know
1. Farm subsidies	83	13	4
2. Incentives for energy development and efficiency	65	27	5
3. Federal loan guarantees	65	29	6
4. Export-promotion programs	59	34	7
5. Research and development support for emerging high-tech industries	51	45	4
6. Small-business grants and loans	49	47	4

AXING AGENCIES

Supporters of a balanced budget are proposing to eliminate some federal agencies. Do you oppose eliminating:

[In percent]

	Favor	Oppose	Not sure/don't know
1. Energy Dept	71	24	5
2. Housing & Urban Development Dept	69	27	4
3. Commerce Dept	63	33	4
4. Education Dept	52	46	2

READ OUR LIPS

Separately, GOP spending proposals would balance the budget by relying exclusively on spending reductions. As a last resort, would you favor or oppose modest tax increases to help balance the budget by 2002?

	Percent
a. Favor modest tax increases	39
b. Oppose modest tax increases	57
c. Not sure/don't know	4

TOP OF THE AGENDA

Which of these issues is THE most important to American business

	Percent
1. Balancing the federal budget	31
2. Improving the U.S. educational system	28
3. Helping to make U.S. companies more competitive globally	17
4. Cutting taxes	9
5. Fighting crime and drugs	6
6. Reforming the welfare system	5
7. Providing guaranteed health care for all Americans	1
8. Reforming campaign finance laws	0
9. Not sure/don't know	3

NO TIME FOR TAX CUTS

Which do you think is more important—balancing the federal budget or cutting taxes for business and individuals?

	Percent
a. Balancing the federal budget	79
b. Cutting taxes for business and individuals	19
c. Not sure/don't know	2

YE OF LITTLE FAITH

All in all, do you think the federal budget will be balanced by 2002 or not?

	Percent
a. Will be balanced	11
b. Will not be balanced	86
c. Not sure/don't know	3

[From the Journal of Commerce, June 27, 1995]

COMMERCE DEPARTMENT SEEN LESS VITAL THAN DEFICIT CUT—BUSINESS SUPPORT WANES FOR AGENCY

(By Richard Lawrence)

WASHINGTON.—The Commerce Department, struggling against its abolition by Congress, is mustering little business support.

Although Commerce is the business community's most vocal supporter in the administration, most business executives say budget deficit reduction is more important than retaining an advocate in the Cabinet.

However, there is growing support that Commerce's duties, especially regarding international trade, be distilled into a new Cabinet-level trade agency.

House and Senate leaders agreed last week to a budget resolution to eliminate the department by fiscal 1999, although some of its functions, such as the Census Bureau, Patent Office, Weather Bureau and import and export administrations would be transferred to other agencies or made independent.

The resolution, however, is not building, and senior Commerce officials maintain that ''at the end of the day'' the Commerce Department will prevail.

''I'm optimistic,'' said Jim Desler, a Commerce Department spokesman, ''that the department's essential functions will remain intact, although there may be some (funding) cuts.'' Business support for Commerce is

gaining momentum, he said, and will likely become more visible as the congressional proposals are more closely analyzed.

The department's fate will be up to a number of congressional authorizing and appropriations committees, though the president could have the final say. An early tip as to how Congress may proceed may come Wednesday when a House Appropriations subcommittee takes up Commerce's fiscal 1996 funding.

To survive, Commerce officials acknowledge, the department probably needs solid support from business groups, in particular small and medium-sized firms. But that has not yet come.

A spokesman for the National Federation of Independent Business Inc., which represents more than 600,000 small businesses, finds among federation members little support for keeping the Commerce Department. It is more important, they feel, to cut the federal deficit than save Commerce, he said.

The U.S. Chamber of Commerce reports its members feel the same. The key, says Willard Workman, the chamber's vice president-international, is that lower budget deficits translate into lower interest rates and higher profit. Commerce's budget fund about $4.6 billion a year.

''I've received only four phone calls from member companies asking that we lead the effort to save the department,'' Mr. Workman said. The chamber has more than 200,000 members.

But, he added, the chamber is open to proposals to consolidate the administration's trade functions, in particular the export controls bureau and the import administration, which investigates unfairly priced imports. Those functions must be retained, he said.

Others are more directly suggesting a possible new trade agency. The National Association of Manufacturers, in a letter to a House Appropriations subcommittee, argues that ''some elements of Commerce's trade and export functions should remain together under the leadership of a Cabinet-rank official.

A similar call came from the Emergency Committee for American Trade, which represents about 60 U.S. based multinational firms. U.S. business, like labor and agriculture, must have Cabinet-level representation, said Robert McNeill, the group's executive vice chairman.

Business spokesmen and the Commerce Department clearly share one view: strong opposition to a House Republican bill to scatter Commerce's trade functions to different agencies.

Meanwhile, support to be growing in Congress, although proposals differ over how this would be done.

Sen. Christopher Bond, R-Mo., promises to push for a consolidated, Cabinet-level trade agency once a bill to dismantle Commerce reaches the Senate floor. Senate Majority Leader Robert Dole, R-Kan., is reported considering the idea of a trade agency, but one below Cabinet-level status.

In the House, Rep. John Mica, R-Fla., is about to introduce a trade agency bill, which unlike Sen. Bond's proposal,includes the U.S. Trade Representative's office.

By mid-July, Sen. William Roth, R-Del., the Governmental Affairs Committee chairman who has long proposed a department of international trade, will hold hearings to explore these and other views. And House Speaker Newt Gingrich, R-GA., has said he favors a congressional task force to examine how best to organize the government's trade-related activities.

It probably will take a year or two, perhaps longer, to sort out the Commerce Department's future and more specifically how the government's trade activities should be organized, business spokesmen estimated.

[From the Wall Street Journal, May 11, 1995]

ORPHAN AGENCY—A LITTLE OF EVERYTHING IS DONE AT DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE TODAY—VAGUE MISSION IS ONE REASON IT MAKES GOP HIT LIST; BUSINESS SHEDS FEW TEARS

(By Helene Cooper)

STEPHENS PASSAGE, ALASKA.—The officers aboard the U.S. ship Rainier are smartly dressed, in khaki maritime workwear. In the captain's quarters, polished wood gleams brightly. At the helm, Lt. Commander Art Francis guides the vessel as it surveys the clear waters of southeast Alaska. ''I love this job,'' he says.

At the National Marine Fisheries Service in Seattle, meanwhile, government scientists work to determine the migration and breeding habits of the dwindling stock of Pacific salmon.

Nearby, workers from the Hazardous Materials Response and Assessment Division await the phone call that alerts them that there has been an oil spill—anywhere in the world. Then they whisk off to help in the cleanup.

These federal employees aren't from the Navy, the Fish and Wildlife Service or the Environmental Protection Agency, as their job descriptions might indicate. They work for the Commerce Department.

The Commerce Department? The tentacles of this cabinet department, marked for elimination by the Republican-controlled Congress, spread across the country and into the ocean. The Rainier, in fact, is but one ship in a fleet of 25 Commerce Department vessels commanded by three admirals.

With a loosely defined mandate to aid U.S. businesses, the department, with 37,000 employees and a $4.2 billion budget, is a hodgepodge of bureaucratic functions, some overlapping with other agencies. It is currently involved in tasks ranging from trade talks with Japan on cars to scientific research on the zebra mussel. Commerce, its critics say, is the very symbol of bureaucracy run amok.

Given the millions in business subsidies and technology awards that Commerce has doled out to U.S. businesses, one might expect its corporate beneficiaries to be leaping to the department's side as the budget-cutters approach; Not so.

Consider the congressional testimony of Eastman Kodak Co.'s Michael Morley, a human-resources executive whose boss accompanied Commerce Secretary Ron Brown on a trip to China to try to nail down some contracts. At a House Budget Committee hearing on how to streamline government, Mr. Morley noted that Kodak planned to ''sell, discontinue or close those businesses and functions that were not germane to our vision'' and added: ''For the federal government, an example might be closing the cabinet agencies of the departments of Commerce or Energy.''

DEFINING THE MISSION

Robert Mosbacher, Commerce secretary in the Bush administration, is harsher still. He calls his former cabinet office ''nothing more than a hall closet where you throw in everything that you don't know what to do with.''

With the party of business now in control, these should be salad days for Commerce in the Congress. Instead, Republicans are talking about either a gradual death (in the Senate budget plan) or summary execution (the House's plan) for the department of business. Part of the problem is that no one can quite figure out what business, exactly, the Commerce Department should be in. Even top officials of the agency have a hard time describing.

''We are at the intersection of a variety of significant policy areas that spur economic growth,'' says Jonathan Sallet, Commerce's policy director. Commerce, he says, ''is about combining them into effective parts of economic strategy. The strength of this department is in the fact that we make that connection.''

SOME GOODIES

Commerce does offer some goodies that business likes, such as $400 million-plus in annual awards for research in electronics and materials. But corporate lobbyists say these don't compare in importance with the feast of legislation they would like from the GOP Congress: tort reform, regulatory relief, a capital-gains tax cut and a scaling back of environmental restrictions. And even some Clinton administration allies appear hard-pressed to defend this bureaucracy. Asked if Commerce should get the ax, C. Fred Bergsten, director of the Institute for International Economics, replies: ''I don't think much would be lost.''

Adding to the department's woes is the battering that Secretary Brown has taken on questions about his private dealings. While Mr. Brown has received extensive media attention and praise for his work at the department, he is hobbled by a Justice Department investigation into how he made $400,000 from the sale of his assets in an unsuccessful company in which he invested no money and little time.

There is no question that some useful work gets done at Commerce, particularly in the National Weather Service. At the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, the Commerce arm that runs those ships (and that takes up almost 50% of the departmental budget), scientists do research aimed at averting oil spills. Map making that goes on aboard the Rainier is crucial to making sure tankers don't run aground.

But Commerce officials have a hard time explaining why some of these important functions belong in the department, and why others shouldn't be privatized. For example, some of the oceanic research—into zebra mussels, shark feeding and disposal of crab wastes—could be handled by industries that care about such things.

They are also often at a loss to explain how the department has grown so big. Mr. Mosbacher's hall-closet analogy isn't far off the mark. Departments and agencies that didn't fit in other cabinet offices were, over the years, simply tacked onto Commerce. This haphazard growth is typical of the federal bureaucracy. So too is the inertia and turf protection that may make it hard to do away with the department.

LIFE AT HAZMAT

Take a look at the Hazardous Materials Response and Assessment Division, often called Hazmat. A Commerce arm based in Seattle, Hazmat has branches in all the major coastal cities. It employs some 100 biologists, chemists, oceanographers, geomorphologists (geologists who work on beaches) and geologists who ''dash off to oil spills around the world,'' says David Kennedy, Hazmat's chief.

Mr. Kennedy explains the mission: ''We're a liaison and technical support to the Coast Guard for oil spills and hazardous-material spills,'' he says. ''We're involved in how to clean up the mess. . . . How clean is clean?''

If these duties sound similar to the EPA's; that's because they are. Hazmat scientists routinely work with EPA people. Critics say the agencies could probably be merged, and overlapping jobs cut.

No, Mr. Kennedy says, Hazmat is different. EPA's mandate is to focus on human environmental dangers, he says, while Hazmat focuses on spills that affect shipping and commerce. So he says Hazmat needs to remain separate.

Leonard Smith, a regional director of Commerce's Economic Development Agency, makes a similar argument in explaining why the Commerce Department is helping create a university in Monterey, Calif. When the nearby Fort Ord military base closed, officials were frightened for the local economy. ''Who's left to come in and help the community?'' Mr. Smith asks.

Who else but Commerce? So last year, the department put $15 million into turning the base into California State University at Monterey, whose doors will open to 1,000 students in September.

But if California needs another campus for its sprawling university system, shouldn't whatever federal help was needed have come from the Department of Education? No, says Mr. Smith. ''We're not just creating universities, we're creating jobs.''

At Commerce, job creation is taken especially seriously when the jobs belong to the department itself. Officials are upset over a proposal from Sen. Jesse Helms of North Carolina to return the department's U.S. and Foreign Commercial Service to the rival State Department where it rested before 1980. (''They're still stuck in the Cold War over there,'' a senior Commerce official says.)

EXPORTS AND JOBS

So Commerce has mounted a public-relations offensive. Reporters were brought in recently to tour the office's new export-advocacy center, where U.S. companies trying to enter complicated foreign markets can seek aid. Security is tight; special codes and complex locks restrict entry. One mission is to track the 100 biggest business deals around the globe for which American companies are competing. In an almost eerie display, a bank of empty computers each display the same message in purple letters against a turquoise background: ''Exports—Jobs.''

This is the Commerce Department's byword, and it has fueled a drive by Secretary Brown to open foreign markets. Mr. Brown has led corporate delegations to China, Brazil and Africa, helping to forge new contracts valued at $25 billion and creating 450,000 new jobs, according to department estimates. Past Commerce chiefs, including Mr. Mosbacher, also stumped on foreign territories for U.S. companies, but none with the zeal or effectiveness of Mr. Brown.

But even in this high-profile line of work, Commerce comes under fire. ''There's no economics in the argument'' that export promotion creates jobs, contends Robert Shapiro, a Clinton political ally and vice president of the Progressive Policy Institute, a Democratic Party think tank. ''These export subsidies certainly don't reduce the trade deficit. All you can do with [them] is increase jobs for companies with the clout to get the subsidy. But that's at the expense of industries that don't have that clout. You're just shifting things around.''

FAINT PRAISE

Given the energy Commerce spends seeking foreign business, one might think U.S. companies would be rushing to defend at least these Commerce initiatives from the Republicans' ax. Most aren't

''A few of their programs I see value in,'' says a lobbyist for a large U.S. company that has received several Commerce research subsidies. ''But the entire department, with what it costs to run it? It's hard to justify.''

For his part, Mr. Brown calls the proposals to eliminate his department ''the height of nonsense.'' He argues that rather than make it smaller Congress should make it bigger, a sentiment that President Clinton apparently shares. Commerce's fiscal 1995 budget is 28% higher than that for fiscal 1993.

''I think you can made a reasonable argument that money spent in Commerce gets more bang for the buck than anywhere else in government,'' Mr. Brown says. ''It attracts private investment. It creates jobs for the American people.''

And Commerce may be saved by the very thing that makes some people want to kill it: its long reach. If Commerce is axed, asks one of its midlevel bureaucrats, ''Who would forecast the weather? Who would do the census? Who would operate the Appalachian Regional Commission? Who would take CEOs to China?''

In fact, the Republican proposals to drop the department would save some of its key functions, such as weather forecasting, by putting them elsewhere. There are those who say talk of eliminating Commerce is a deceptive attempt by politicians who want to give the appearance that they are cutting government waste. ''You have to distinguish between programs that actually abolish Commerce and programs that simply eliminate the letterhead,'' Mr. Shapiro says.

Consider the antics of Republican Sen. Spencer Abraham, head of a Senate panel to consider eliminating Commerce. ''There is simply too much waste and duplication,'' he said last month. ''Our goal is to make government more efficient and less expensive.''

But the senator is from Michigan, where zebra mussels are clogging sewage pipes. Three days later he voted to restore $2 million for zebra-mussel research in the Commerce Department.

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentlelady from Idaho talking about a very necessary method of removing the unneeded bureaucracy, and we have on the floor with me tonight the author of the bill to dismantle the Department of Commerce, and I think that we should commend the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHRYSLER] for his efforts to eliminate the bureaucracy because it is really an historic event.

I was not surprised in my own efforts to head up a task force to eliminate the Department of Energy when I went to the Government Accounting Office, or the GAO, and I asked them how do you dismantle a cabinet level agency, and they said, well, we simply do not know. We have only been in the business of creating Government agencies and we have never dismantled one before.

So what the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHRYSLER] is doing now is he is going through the process of finding the best way to eliminate the Department of Commerce, and it is quite a task, an historical task, and one that has never been taken on.

There are some questions I personally have about how it is going to occur and I wanted to engage in a colloquy with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHRYSLER] to see if we cannot bring out into the open, Mr. Speaker, some of these issues.

I think one of the most fair questions is, is the gentleman's proposal simply a reshuffling of boxes on an organizational chart, or is it a serious transformation of a Government bureaucracy? Would it not be better to cut the fat out of the current Commerce Department, or is it better to eliminate the entire department?

Mr. CHRYSLER. Well, I thank the gentleman from Kansas, and that is a very good question.

Mr. Speaker, certainly as we looked at dismantling the Department of Commerce, it was a product of over 6 months of study by a task force of several Members of Congress: MARK SANFORD, MARK NEUMANN, from Wisconsin, HELEN CHENOWETH, of course, who we just heard from, and SUE KELLY, from New York; JACK METCALF from Washington, WES COOLEY, and JIM TALENT, our token sophomore on this group, as well as former Commerce Department officials and outside policy experts.

We looked at each of the over 100 programs within the Department of Commerce and asked three simple questions: No. 1, is this program necessary and should Government be involved in it, and is it worth borrowing the money to pay for it only to have our children pay it back? Is it necessary? Does the Federal Government need to be involved, or is this something better left to States, communities and/or individuals? If the Federal Government does need to be involved, are we currently doing the job in the most effective and efficient manner?

I think my colleague from Idaho, HELEN CHENOWETH, could tell me a couple of real life examples she has experienced out in the great northwest.

Ms. CHENOWETH. I thank the gentleman for the time.

Mr. Speaker, we have some very interesting experiences that we are going through in the great northwest and it involves the Endangered Species Act. By listing a species known as the sockeye salmon or the spring or fall Chinook salmon, because this is a species that crosses State lines in its trek back to its spawning grounds or spawning habitat in our streams in Idaho, it naturally falls under the Department of Commerce. Therefore, the National Marine Fisheries Service is competing with the Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, as well as various other agencies, including the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to manage this particular species.

In trying to manage the species to get it to the point where it is no longer endangered, they have proposed doing away with numerous dams, but, most importantly, because water is such a precious resource in the arid west, we find an agency under NOAA, under Department of Commerce, literally taking command and control of our water in the Western States.

Due to the planning of our Founding Fathers and the people who forged the western States and forged the living and the communities and built the irrigation systems and the reservoir systems, very well thought out systems, we were able to turn the west into a productive community. Today we have an agency, the National Marine Fisheries Service, who is calling on our water in our storage reservoirs over State law. They are ignoring State law,

absolutely ignoring State law, and calling on the State water for a very questionable program called flow augmentation.

□ 2200

By calling on the water in the storage reservoir, this means the irrigators cannot apply the water to the land for their crops. Truly, because of the action of an agency under Commerce, it is exacerbating a problem that we commonly call the war on the West, because without water in the West, we are not able to grow our crops. We are not able to produce electricity.

For one agency, under the direction of the White House, to be able to command the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to open the headgates and drain the reservoirs for a questionable program for the salmon is truly a taking of States' and individuals' property rights.

Mr. CHRYSLER, and Mr. Speaker, it is because, under Commerce, we saw an agency totally overreaching.

In addition to this, we have seen this agency, working with the Forest Service or the Bureau of Land Management, totally lock up our ability to work our resources in the West because no decisions are made. Our States are suffering under continual threats of lawsuits, and many of them are brought about by friendly lawsuits that are supported by the agencies.

So we look forward to having some common sense streamlining of agency responsibilities in the Northwest by doing away with the Department of Commerce and eliminating these kinds of responsibilities under the National Marine Fisheries Service, that has created so much confusion in the Northwest.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the time.

Mr. CHRYSLER. Mr. Speaker, certainly we can see that the Department of Commerce has been much more regulatory in nature than any kind of a supporter for the business community, and when measured against the criteria, the Commerce programs rarely live up to their expectations.

If we found a program that was duplicative in the Department of Commerce, we consolidated it. If a program was better performed by the private sector, then we privatized it. If it was beneficial, we streamlined it. If we found a program was unnecessary, then we eliminated it.

Mr. TIAHRT. I believe that you have laid out a good case for the elimination of the Department of Commerce, but does your proposal allow for an orderly termination? This is something, as we said earlier, that has never been done. Is it an orderly termination of this department that have you in mind?

Mr. CHRYSLER. What we are doing with this program, and of course we will vote tomorrow on the Commerce, Justice appropriations bill, and the thing that we are going to look at is in the consolidation of September 22, after the authorizers have acted, is to bring the House and Senate together and terminate the 21 different agencies that we are looking at in the Department of Commerce.

The Department of Commerce, as Ms. CHENOWETH has said, is a collection of over 100 programs and we had to analyze each one of those programs. Each member of the task force took a section of the Department of Commerce, looked at it very carefully, and made recommendations of what should be done with it. Seventy-one of them are duplicated someplace else in the Federal Government, so it was very easy to consolidate many of them.

Of the 100 programs, 97 of them were either duplicated someplace else in the Federal Government and/or they were duplicated in the private sector, so only 3 programs were really being done that needed to be done by the Government.

So we create a Department of Commerce Resolution Agency and that agency will be set up within 6 months and that agency will be a sublevel Cabinet position that will take care of resolving all of Commerce's business over a another 2½ year period.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very orderly transition to dismantle a department of Government, to give the people in this country a little less government, a little lower taxes. We want to let people keep more of what they earn and save, and make more decisions about how they spend their money and not Government, and we think that Americans will always make a better decision than the Government will.

Mr. TIAHRT. I am sure you have done a lot of research when you looked into how the Department of Commerce operates, and you must have spoken with past Secretaries of Commerce. What has been the reaction of not only the current Department of Commerce but also those who have headed up that agency in the past?

Mr. CHRYSLER. Well, certainly Robert Mosbacher, who was the last head of the Department of Commerce, has been a very strong supporter of the dismantling act. He has called this the hall closet where you throw everything when you do not know where else it should be.

In fact, the Department of Commerce, 60 percent of it is NOAA, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, which to all of us in America is better known as the weather. And when you look back through the history of this and start studying it, why did NOAA end up in the Commerce Department, you find that there was a point in Richard Nixon's presidency where he was upset with his Secretary of the Department of the Interior, and so he just took NOAA and gave it to the Commerce Department instead of putting it in the Department of Interior, where our bill will have it end up. That is where it rightfully should be.

Certainly the weather-related portion of NOAA will be in the Department of Interior. The satellites can be better managed by the Air Force, who does the best job in our Government of managing all satellites. I think, as we move through this process, looking at each and every area, there is a uniformed group in NOAA that will be eliminated.

We take this step by step in order to come to a very orderly, well-thought-out program of how we can dismantle this agency. And people like Elizabeth Bryant, who is at the University of Michigan now, who was the head of the Census Bureau, has absolutely endorsed this program to dismantle the Department of Commerce.

We have suggested putting the Census Bureau in the Department of Treasury, but there are others that have said we should create a separate statistical agency and use as a foundation the Bureau of Census and be able to share some of that information with other Federal agencies. I believe we could probably cut most other Federal departments by as much as 3 to 5 percent just by letting them get their statistical information from a central Government statistical agency.

Mr. TIAHRT. As a former businessman, you have been in touch with the business community, and I wonder what has been the reaction from the business community about this so-called voice for business in government? What has been their reaction to the elimination of this voice?

Mr. CHRYSLER. Well, we have many, many letters from the Business Leadership Council, National Taxpayers Union, Small Business Survival Committees, Competitive Enterprise Institute, Citizens for a Sound Economy, and the list goes on.

We also have a poll that was taken in Business Week magazine, that we entered into the RECORD on June 5, where business executives were polled on whether they would want to eliminate the Department of Commerce. And by a 2-to-1 margin, those business executives said, Yes, dismantle this Department of Commerce.

Certainly, business leaders like myself, and I had a company that I started in the corner of my living room, building convertibles after the automobile companies stop building convertibles, Cars and Concepts; 10 years later I sold that business to my employees. I had 1,200 employees at that point, and we did business in 52 different countries around the world, and not once did we call the Department of Commerce, nor did the Department of Commerce call us.

That is a certainly testimony of a person that has created jobs, have lived that American dream, and have not needed the Government. I contend that it is not big government and/or big government programs and/or government bureaucracies that have built this into being the greatest country in the world. It is, in fact, entrepreneurship, free enterprise, capitalism, and rugged

individuals that go out and risk their capital to create jobs.

You never see an employee unless you see an employer first. You have to have people to create jobs if you are going to have jobs. And that is what this is all about, is job creation. I think most business leaders, are convinced that the Federal efforts would be better focused on cutting taxes, enacting regulatory and tort reform, and balancing the Federal budget. That is what American businesses want us to be doing and that is what our business here in Congress is all about.

For the first time, TODD, we have elected more people from business to the U.S. Congress on November 8 than we did people from any other profession. That speaks loudly and we are here to conduct the business of the country. This is the largest business in the world called the U.S. Government and it needs to be run more like a business.

Mr. TIAHRT. I came across an article in the Washington Times today and there is a quote in here, it also quotes you talking about that you think that a lot of business has been successful without the help of the Department of Commerce, and they say that it would hamper American companies from performing in the global market if you eliminate this voice of business at the Cabinet level.

But there is a quote from Joe Cobb at the Heritage Foundation:

> The claim by the Commerce Department that its cheerleading for American industry has increased the sales is about as accurate as the belief that the Dallas Cowboy Cheerleaders are responsible for the football team winning its games.

I think, as you point out, that American business has done an excellent job of expanding. I have a company called Caldwell Incorporated, run by Art Tieschgraber, and it has done a great job expanding into Siberia and a lot of other places.

Mr. CHRYSLER. Along those lines, it is a fact that the Department of Commerce claims a lot of successes with their trade effort and a thing that we have to understand is that the trade effort of the Department of Commerce is only 4 percent of the Department of Commerce. What we are talking about certainly is the other 96 percent that we are looking at.

But with only 4 percent being focused on trade and of the programs that the Commerce Department claims to have brought new business and created jobs with, in fact, 83 percent of those are trade missions that American businesses would have completed successfully without the help of the Department of Commerce, and only 17 percent, again a very small number, that have really been directly helped by the Department of Commerce.

Now, I think that one of the things that we are looking at with the Department of Commerce in this dismantling act is my good friend from Florida, JOHN MICA is introducing a companion bill to H.R. 1756, to the Dismantling of Commerce Act, that will create an office of trade where we will take the USTR; there are 19 different departments in the Federal Government that deal with trade, and what we want to do is create one strong office of trade that will have a seat at the Cabinet level, or at the President's table, that will have a negotiating arm, an export arm, and an import arm that can do a better job at dealing with trade in this world than any other country in this world, and certainly the best job that the United States of America has ever had.

I think trade is an important part of our economy. We do live in a global economy today with fax machines and telephones and computers and all the technology. Moving into this new Information Age, the third wave of technology, we do have to compete on a global economy and I think we can build an office of trade that, in fact, will be the strongest that this country has ever seen.

Mr. TIAHRT. I appreciate your response to the questions I have given you. You know, we as freshmen had often sought the leadership of others and there is a gentleman from your State, Mr. CHRYSLER, Congressman SMITH from Michigan, that would like to give some comments on the elimination of the Department of Commerce. We really appreciate him being here and helping us with this.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. TIAHRT, thank you very much. I appreciate your yielding. I want to start out, TODD, DICK, HELEN, with the fact that the freshman class, having more businesspeople in that class than any class in recent history, has made a tremendous difference of bringing common sense back to Washington.

And you know, it is such a tremendous hole that we have dug for ourselves. I heard the analogy, how do you describe what it means to be $5 trillion in debt and why is it important that we look at departments that are not serving a useful function like the Department of Commerce to try to reduce the system of this overbloated bureaucracy?

□ 2215

Mr. Speaker, I heard one example that I thought was interesting, and it gives a little perspective, and that is, if you tightly stack a bunch of $1,000 bills and you make it 4 inches high, you end up with the equivalent of $1 million. If you keep stacking tightly that $1,000 bill stack and you go 300 feet high, it is $1 billion. If you go 63 miles high, it is $1 trillion. If you get over 300 miles into outer space, it is this Federal budget.

We have to start now. The reasonable place to start is with departments that are not fulfilling a useful purpose.

I would particularly like to commend my colleague from Michigan who has come from business and is trying to make some common sense out of this huge Federal bureaucracy. One of the issues that he has been working on is the dismantling of the Department of Commerce. I say yea. I say, the freshmen class and people like DICK CHRYSLER is what is going to make it happen to be a reality, to do what Alan Greenspan says.

If we are able to reach a balanced budget, then we will have such a strong underlying economy that this Nation is going to take off in jobs, and our kids and our grandkids are going to have a better standard of living than we do. If we do not do it, if we are unable to reach a balanced budget and we go back to the old ways of taking pork barrel projects home, of doing more and more things because we think it is going to help us get reelected, then we are going to end up with our kids and our grandkids not paying the huge debt that we are accumulating, but they are going to have a lower standard of living than we had.

I just think it is so exciting, after decades, after 40 years of moving toward a bigger and bigger, huge Federal bureaucracy, we are looking at not just freezing the size of this bureaucracy, but looking at actually reducing it, by taking one of the departments, the Department of Commerce, and we can eliminate the hub of corporate welfare and political patronage by doing away with the Department of Commerce.

Mr. Speaker, the Department is an amalgamation of Federal agencies, many of which have duplicate services. DICK CHRYSLER's bill moves us into a situation where we take the good, useful parts of the Department and we privatize them or we move them to other sectors of the Federal Government. The areas that are not serving a useful purpose, where we have just loaded up the different agencies with political patronage, we are doing away with. It is a start. It is a $7 billion start over 5 years.

I am proud to be a part of the discussion tonight, and I would like to ask DICK CHRYSLER the question of how you see American businesses expanding job opportunities in this country if we are not able to reduce the size of the Federal bureaucracy.

Mr. CHRYSLER. Thank you very much for the kind words and your support and your guidance.

Mr. Speaker, quite frankly, being a freshman here and going through all that we have had to go through in the first 6 months, well in excess of over 500 votes, and finding a place to stay and hiring staffs and setting up offices, it has been a real challenge, and it has only been through your guidance and your help and your advice that we have been able to keep pace with the guys that have been here for a few years, and they have been, and you especially, have been very helpful to us.

When you are looking at business and getting down to starting to run this Federal Government like a business, you know, I think that is really what

dismantling this Department of Commerce act is all about. Of course, I guess when you get right down to it, it is for our kids, my kids, Rick, Phill, Christy, and my grandkids, Chloe and Heather.

When it is their turn, we have to make sure that they at least have the same opportunity that we have been blessed with in our lives, and furthermore, I think they deserve it. They deserve at least the opportunity that we have had in our life. That is really what it is all about. I think it is the kindest and most compassionate thing that we can do for the American people and every child and every grandchild out there.

As we look at the job creation, which I think is the best welfare program we could have in this country is to create jobs, and as we go through with the Contract With America, creating jobs, creating a job provider's climate, which is so essential to job creation. As I said, you never see an employee unless you see an employer first, which means you have to have people that are going to be willing to take the risk, take the chance, risk their capital to create those jobs.

By streamlining this Federal Government, as Nick Smith said, reducing the debt and the deficit, Alan Greenspan has said that we can reduce by 2 percent the interest rates, at least 2 percent was his statement. What that means to just farmers, and certainly Nick Smith is a farmer from the State of Michigan, he still lives on a farm, has lived on a farm all of his life. For farmers alone, we could save farmers on just farm property in this country $10.65 billion just by reducing that interest rate by 2 percent.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield? It seems to me in discussing the Department of Commerce or any reduction in the Federal Government spending, there are two questions: Does it make sense to cut this particular program, and the overall picture is how important is it to cut? You related to the fact that it is important to cut. But I wonder how many people listening to us tonight realize what percentage of all of the money lent out this year will be borrowed by the Federal Government? The Federal Government will borrow 42 percent of all of the money lent out in the United States this year. That means that people that want to have that money available to buy a car or go to college or most importantly, expand their businesses and jobs, are not going to have that money available.

If government gets out of insisting that they take 42 percent of all of the money that is up for borrowing, Alan Greenspan, our top banker in this country, Alan Greenspan, the Chairman of the Federal Reserve, says that interest rates will drop exactly the way you say, DICK. They are going to drop some place between 1.5 and 2 percent. That means everything is going to be cheaper in this country for people that need to borrow money, whether it is going to school or buying a home or expanding their business. So it does make a difference.

On the second point, how about how are we going to know whether it is reasonable to close down the Department of Commerce? Well, I called our Michigan Department of Commerce in Michigan that is very active in promoting jobs and business opportunities in Michigan, I said, how often do you call the United States Department of Commerce? They said, never. They do not contact the United States Department of Commerce; it is not a service in terms of their efforts for business and job expansion.

I asked the Chamber of Commerce in the United States that has 200,000 members, how many of your members have called in expressing concern about closing the Department of Commerce? Four. They said, four. Out of 200,000 members, they said four have called in, saying are we sure this is the right thing to do?

I think it is evident that this is one department that people do not use that does not expand business, and I just congratulate the freshmen and encourage them to keep the spirit, because your spirit is what is keeping the rest of us going today.

Mr. TIAHRT. You know, we have been talking about this dream for a better America and pointing out that the Federal Government borrowing so much money and driving interest rates up by 2 percent is almost overwhelming, when you think about how much money, $10.65 billion just for farmers alone, extra interest that they have to pay.

When I went home to Kansas the last time, I got out of the airport and my necktie blew over my shoulder, so I knew I was home. But on my way home, it was 10:30 at night, and out there they were still combining, trying to get a few more bushels, because they want to save as much money, they want to pass on the farm to the next generation. My parents tried to do that for me. I grew up on a farm. But because things were too tough for them, they could not pass that on to their kids. So it is important.

When I think about how much money they spent, one year they spent $85,000 in interest alone, and how that could have gone toward taking down their notes, it is just amazing what they do.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I want to take just a moment to say really thank you to both of the gentlemen, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TIAHRT] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHRYSLER]. I think you really represent the hope of this country, and I cannot tell you how much I admire you and what you are trying to do. You were sent here with a specific message or directive of an overwhelming mandate, probably one of the rare times when everybody from one party across the board or across the country got elected.

But you are the leaders. I came just a few months before, 24 months before, this is only my second term, with some of the hopes and dreams and aspirations for changing the Government, making it a better place. But it was very difficult. We did not have the votes. You have the votes and I admire you.

I also would ask you to read this little comment up here above me in the back by Daniel Webster. You know, as I was sworn here, it impressed me, his words about leaving something worthy for future generations to remember. And that is what I think you are doing. You embody the spirit of change and reform that I think the American people want and have anticipated.

I ask you not to give up on your attempt to restructure one agency. You are down to one agency. I know you have been beaten over the brow; I know you have been urged not to proceed, and I know there are 1,000 reasons for deviating. But really, I think we can start with the Department of Commerce, and I think you have shown that that could be an example. It is an example of, you know, Commerce has been sort of a dumping ground over the years. Most people think it is 95 percent helping commerce and trade. That is why some people say well, save this, it is important today that we do that. Actually, they do not realize really, in trade and export it is less than 5 percent of the entire budget and a small number of the employees.

So there are many people, myself included, rooting for you. Let me tell the gentlemen, this place is the hardest place to bring about change. It is very difficult, but in fact you can do it. Our freshmen class, we abolished the select committees when they said you could not do that. We were threatened to be thrown out of here if we exposed who signed the discharge petitions and the gag law. We stood here, just a few of us, like you are standing here tonight, and we changed the course of this place and the way this place is run.

There are not many of you out here tonight, it is late at night, it is kind of like the night we were out here and made that dramatic change in the conduct of the business of this Congress.

So I salute you, I commend you, you are on the right track. Mr. CHRYSLER has not proposed—I have read his proposal to just trash all of the good functions in the Department of Commerce. In fact, I think he has started the debate. Let's look at how we can do things better. Does it make sense to have the Federal Government do these functions that have been done? Does it make sense for this to be done by the private sector? Can we apply a cost-benefit to this, which is something we tried to get?

The business thinking that you have brought to this Congress as an approach is so important, and that is what you need to apply to this dismantling of the Department of Commerce,

that we see that the functions are appropriately assigned and then revised. That is exactly what you are proposing, not any destruction, not any unnecessary elimination, but an improvement, and you can do more with less, just a totally different approach.

So again, I commend you. I have enjoyed working with you. I have a proposal that we are trying to reach a consensus on because we know there are some good things in the Department of Commerce, particularly in trade, where so many people have said, let's save the trade functions. We have a joint proposal which we hope to introduce later this week that saves all of the elements. It actually will spend less money, and it will provide us with the mechanism so that the United States can compete in the decades ahead in a new arena where most of the jobs are created, where most of the opportunities are in exports and in trade, and provide us with the tools to do the jobs.

□ 2230

So, we are working together and have, in fact, come up with a plan to salvage the most important elements. The other elements, as I understand it, will all be examined, looked at, by the appropriate committees.

So I cannot tell you from the bottom of my heat, from the bottom of the heart of everybody I talk to when I go home, around the country, how encouraged we are by what you are doing. Do not give up. Do not let them throw roadblocks in front of you. Continue, and continue on a responsible, reasonable course like you have, and you can make a change, and you can make changes that will be worthy of being remembered by future generations, just as that little edict up there commands each of us who have the honor and privilege of serving here.

So I thank both of you for your leadership for the other 71 freshmen. I thank the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] for his leadership, and the others on this issue and the others who have spoken here tonight.

Mr. TIAHRT. I suppose we get a little closer to the time. I want to allow the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHRYSLER] to close up his convincing story on the elimination of the Department of Commerce.

Mr. CHRYSLER. Well, I will only say to my good friend, JOHN MICA from Florida, that in the words of Winston Churchill we will never, never, never, never, never give up and you know, if we had a Department of Commerce that was a true voice for businesses, what that Department of Commerce would be taking about is eliminating the $550 billion worth of regulations that are put onto American businesses that make us uncompetitive in the rest of the world. We would also be dealing with this litigious society that we live in with some true, meaningful tort reform.

I mean in today's litigious society we would not even bring penicillin and/or aspirin to market; that is how bad things have gotten, and of course, most importantly, as we are doing, working to balance the budget, to create capital for businesses, and I think, and you look at the 163 job-training programs in the Departments of Labor and Education, of which they only want to claim about 70 because the rest of them have never created a job, and in fact one of them are spending about a half-million dollars for each job that they create, and I mean I said just give a person the money, why are you wasting their time here if they are going to spend that much money?

But I would like to see that consolidated down to about three job-training programs. I would like to see one of those job-training programs specifically work toward helping and training entrepreneurs because for every entrepreneur we can train and make successful, we can create 5, 6, 10, or maybe even 100, or certainly in my own case 1,200 new jobs. That is the way to create jobs. That is what a Department of Commerce should be doing to help the business community. That is the kind of government we want to create.

Mr. TIAHRT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I think my summation, Mr. Speaker, would be to the American people that, look, these are politicians down here. If the American people decide this is important, those of people that might be viewing this tonight, you know, call your Representatives in Congress, give them some encouragement, because we need the will of the American people to make sure we accomplish this giant task.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be here with this delegation, and I just hope the American people feel that it is important that we bring down the size of this overbloated Government, that we support this initial step of doing such things as closing one of the least useful departments at State government.

Mr. TIAHRT. I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MICA] for any closing remarks.

Mr. MICA. Again I salute you. This is just the beginning of the story. The rest of the story, as Paul Harvey would say, is that 19 agencies of Federal Government dealing in trade and export, spending $3 billion, and in fact you are creating a nucleus for many, many more potential savings in government and, again, trying to make an inroad.

The hardest thing to do around here, I have always found, is to present a new idea, but you have a new idea, you have a new approach. I commend you, and I urge you to go forward, and we can do a lot better, not only with the Department of Commerce, but with the rest of this huge government bureaucracy.

Mr. TIAHRT. I just want to thank the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MICA] for coming down and bringing this very important issue to the American public, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH], also the other gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHRYSLER], and I want to thank the gentlewoman from Idaho [Mrs. CHENOWETH].

You know the American public needs to know that this is an historical event. The elimination of a Cabinet-level agency has never occurred before in the United States. We are about to make history once again in the 104th Congress, so stay tuned.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BACHUS (at the request of Mr. ARMEY), for today after 3:45 p.m., on account of family matters.

Mr. FORBES (at the request of Mr. ARMEY), for today after 3:30 p.m., on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. TOWNS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. STUPAK, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. OBERSTAR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MCINNIS) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. METCALF, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCINNIS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HOKE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. LONGLEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. SMITH of Washington, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CRAPO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HOEKSTRA, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii.

Mrs. MALONEY, in two instances.

Mr. MFUME.

Mr. CLYBURN.

Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey.

Mr. HAMILTON.

Mr. ANDREWS.

Mr. MILLER of California.

M4. OBEY.

Mr. BARCIA.

Mr. FAZIO of California.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida.