There is wide agreement that the federal procurement process is much too cumbersome, time-consuming and wasteful. The House recently passed a bill to dramatically streamline the process and make it more competitive. In addition, many federal agencies and the House now allow employees to make some purchases like businesses would—at the local office supply store. As the procurement process becomes more efficient, government agencies will have less need for warehouse space for large inventories. Walter Reed Army Medical Center in Washington used to need seven warehouses to store its supplies—now it uses half of one. The House recently sold off thousands of unneeded office furnishings, eliminating the need for warehouse space that cost $245,000 a year.

Outlook: Many Hoosiers feel frustrated, irritated, even angry about the hassle and the inflexible rules they often find in the federal government. They rightly are demanding change. Having watched the private sector streamline and become more productive and lower costs, Americans know that the federal government must go through the same passage of change. Quite understandably they have a strong skepticism that it can be done.

There is a lot of discussion today about what the federal government's role should be, and I think that is good. My concern is that the debate is sometimes too simplistic, with the ''get rid of it all'' school on one side and the ''government as national nanny'' school on the other. Some people argue that the way to fix the federal government is to eliminate as much of it as possible. My sense is that most of us don't want to get rid of government; we want to limit it and make it effective. We want government to make sure that our meat is safe to eat and that the skies are safe for air travel; to aid communities in recovering from the ravages of natural disasters; to insure our savings if our bank fails, for example. We want to see a government that moves us toward meeting our nation's common goals, that recognizes people are its customers and gives them their money's worth. We want a government that recognizes that most people are neither crooked nor stupid and want to do the right thing so long as the right thing makes sense to them. They want to see a government that cuts obsolete regulations, rewards results, and negotiates and seeks consensus rather than dictates.

We need to do some hard thinking about what it is we want government to do and how we want it done. Our quest must be to reduce the cost and simplify the operation of government while maintaining essential programs and functions. We need to design a government that uses common sense to solve problems. We must stop doing things that government doesn't do very well and that don't need to be done by government. Where government can make a positive difference in the lives of ordinary Americans it must be made to work more efficiently and effectively.

Those of us in government must convince people that we are serious about limiting government and making it work better. This effort must become a way of life for all of us. It is a task that is never finished. As the world has become more complex so has the federal government. Too often it has become more master than servant. That is what has to change, and that's what reinventing government is all about.

TRIBUTE TO LINCOLN UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

HON. ROBERT S. WALKER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 11, 1995

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to be able to congratulate Lincoln University of Pennsylvania, America's first college for African-Americans, which will bestow honorary doctoral degrees on the President and First Lady of the Republic of Ghana, His Excellency Flight Lieutenant Jerry John Rawlings and Nana (Mrs.) Konadu Agyeman-Rawlings.

It is fitting that President Rawlings of Ghana—the first African nation to gain independence from Europe—should receive his first honorary degree from the United States first college for African-Americans, a college that is named after the author of the Emancipation Proclamation.

In fact, Lincoln University has longstanding ties to the Republic of Ghana. The first President of Ghana, Dr. Kwame Nkrumah, graduated from Lincoln University with a bachelor of arts degree, cum laude, in 1939 and a bachelor of sacred theology degree in 1942.

Dr. Nkrumah later received an honorary doctorate from Lincoln University, as did His Excellency Alex Quaison-Sackey, Ghana's first Ambassador to the United Nations. The first American Ambassador to Ghana was also a Lincoln graduate, His Excellency Franklin H. Williams, class of 1941.

President Rawlings is a leader both in Ghana and the world community. Under his leadership, Ghana has enacted the difficult economic reforms that lead to short-term hardships but long-term prosperity. With consistent economic growth, Ghana now serves as a model for African and other nations that are moving into the developed world. In addition, President Rawlings is a passionate advocate for American involvement—at the governmental and nongovernmental levels—in African affairs.

First Lady Agyeman-Rawlings has also displayed outstanding leadership qualities. She is the founder and president of the 31st December Women's Movement, a group advocating the empowerment of Ghana's women. In addition, the First Lady is a recipient of the African-American Institute's coveted Star Crystal Award for her work with women's groups.

Mr. Speaker, let me again congratulate Lincoln University on this important occasion. I am very proud of the accomplishments of this fine institution.

TEAMWORK FOR EMPLOYEES AND MANAGERS ACT OF 1995

SPEECH OF

HON. STEVE GUNDERSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 1995

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 743) to amend the National Labor Relations Act to allow labor management cooperative efforts that improve economic competitiveness in the United States to continue to thrive, and for other purposes:

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Chairman, the Teamwork for Employees and Managers Act of 1995 enables increased employee involvement in nonunion workplaces. However, in order to have an honest debate, we need to have an understanding as to the nature of the problem. And there is a problem.

Given the intricacies of labor law and the fact that most of us here are not labor lawyers, let me make this as simple as possible. Today, a nonunion employer may unilaterally impose any decision regarding how employees work, when they work and the job they do. If the employer seeks to work with their employees to devise a mutually beneficial solution to those issues, the employer violates the National Labor Relations Act of 1935 [NLRB].

Joint decisions are illegal in nonunion workplaces because of the interaction of two sections of the NLRB: Sections 8(a)(2) and section 2(5). The pertinent part of section 8(a)(2) reads:

8(a) It shall be an unfair labor practice for an employer:

(2) To dominate or interfere with the formation or administration of any labor organization or contribute financial or other support to it; NLRB sec, 8(a) (2); 29 U.S.C. sec. 158(a)(2).

So it appears as if a nonunion employer cannot dominate or interfere with a union. A quick look at the definitions section of the NLRB makes clear that the legal definition of ''labor organization'' is much broader than labor union, however. Section 2(5) reads:

Labor Organization—The term ''labor organization'' means any organization of any kind, or any agency or employee representation committee or plan, in which employees participate and which exists for the purpose, in whole or in part of dealing with employers concerning grievances, labor disputes, wages, rate of pay, hours, of employment, or *conditions of work*. (emphasis added). NLRA sec. 2(5) 29 U.S.C. sec. 152(5).

Essentially, a ''labor organization'' is any group of employees that ''deals with'' employers on conditions of work. The phrase ''dealing with'' is very important here. In *NLRB* v. *Cabot Carbon Co.,* 360 U.S. 203 (1959), the Supreme Court defined ''dealing with'' as broader than just collective bargaining. Instead, the term ''dealing with'' involves any back and forth discussion between a group of employees and the employer. In short, the definition of labor organization makes it illegal under section 8(a)(2) for nonunion employers to start up teams to address and resolve issues with their employees.

Let's look at an example. Suppose a small, nonunion manufacturing company has dramatically increasing worker's compensation rates. A reasonable assumption is that plant safety has decreased, resulting in more injuries and lost workdays. In response, the management implements a plant-wide health and safety committee by asking for volunteers from every area of the company from design to accounting to line and shipping employees.

The committee is established, meets on company time and the company furnishes the supplies—paper, pencils, current safety plan, etc. After three meetings over the course of six weeks, the committee pinpoints that many of the injuries are eye injuries and foot injuries. Working together, the committee devises a custom-made set of safety glasses and agrees that the company should purchase lighter but sturdier safety shoes.