The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

STREAMLINING THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

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

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak today about a very momentous occasion.

The freshman class of the Republican Conference along with representatives of the Senate and the House leadership that were involved in an overview and a study of the Federal agencies of the United States have come out with their results under the leadership of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. BROWNBACK] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHRYSLER] in evaluating for the first time just what the costs are of our Federal bureaucracies and how we can reduce those costs.

In a detailed summary today by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHRYSLER], we learned just how effective it can be to privatize, consolidate, and eliminate key functions that the Commerce Department has been undertaking up to this point; that a great deal of savings, $7 billion, in fact, over the next few years could be made by privatizing many of the functions, consolidating others and eliminating others that actually duplicate what other Federal agencies are doing.

Mr. Speaker, this is part of an overall review by Members of this House concerned with the fiscal responsibility that we have to make sure that we hold the line on costs. Before us today and in the coming weeks and months, we will be looking not only at the Commerce Department but the functions of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the Energy Department as well as the Education Department.

We can no longer be spending funds as if it is someone else's money. It is our constituents' money. They must get their money's worth.

The question we are asking for every Federal agency, for every department, for every bureau: Is this function best accomplished by the Government, or is it best accomplished by the private sector? If it is best accomplished by the private sector, it is our job, whether it be in the House or the Senate or the executive branch, the President, to in fact make sure that the private sector is where the function will rest. While the question remains, if it is going to be a governmental function, is it best handled by the Federal Government or the State government, county government, or local government?

We should not be duplicating services and programs best administered by governments closest to the people. We have seen this time and time again that the governments closest to the people oftentimes can get the efficiencies and the personal contact that the Federal agencies have not been able to effectuate on behalf of the people.

In addition to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. BROWNBACK] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHRYSLER] discussing the future of the Commerce Department today, we had former Secretary Mosbacher who himself was Secretary of the Department of Commerce who in very strong terms has recommended that in fact the department which has grown, from his point of view the department be privatized, be consolidated and certain functions be eliminated.

Secretary Mosbacher was someone who was well-respected as a secretary and who has been a leader in the public and private sector.

He was joined there today in our conference by none other than Senator BOB DOLE, Senator FAIRCLOTH, and Senator ABRAHAM. Senators ABRAHAM and FAIRCLOTH are part of the Senate committee which has been reviewing the Commerce Department and how it can be downsized and, for that matter, privatized and certain functions eliminated. We believe that this is a thoughtful and very contemplative report that has been issued.

If members of the public are interested in getting copies, if they would just contact Mr. CHRYSLER's office at the U.S. House of Representatives here in Washington, DC. His report has been exhaustive, it is over 3 months, it is part of the freshmen class and Republican leadership effort to in fact reexamine government to find out where we can make the savings, where we can take lessons from the private sector to in fact make sure that the services we are delivering are the ones the people want, that do not duplicate what State governments do but in fact provide the kinds of services that make a difference in people's lives.

We will be hearing forthcoming in the next few weeks the surveys and the reports and the analysis by those who have been involved with the other three departments I spoke of, HUD and its services, as well the Energy Department, and, in fact, the Education Department.

We heard today in the subcommittee headed by the gentleman from California [Mr. HORN] about how the Energy Department can be downsized as well. Many of the reasons for the creation of the Energy Department surrounded the shortage of energy two decades ago. We now have a better opportunity to provide the fuels we need, we can downsize according to two former secretaries of the Department of Energy who testified before our Committee on Government Reform and Oversight headed by the gentleman from California [Mr. HORN] today. The testimony was quite poignant about the savings that can be realized, about again the privatization that the Federal Government can have with the functions now being undertaken by the Department of Energy, and while there are many good public relations aspects of the Department of Energy, many of the functions have already been assumed by other agencies and in some ways duplicate some functions that the Department of Defense is now conducting.

We hope that these surveys on Energy, Education, HUD, and Commerce will give many of our citizens and hopefully many of our executives that work within the Federal agencies the enthusiasm to join us in this revolution to make our Federal agencies be more responsive, to reduce the waste, the abuse and the fraud that can exist in government, but to provide the funds for the services we really need. That way we will make the Government more responsive.

I know that the House, the Senate, and in fact the President for that matter will be very pleased to hear from constituents about services that the Federal Government is now trying to perform which may in fact duplicate services that are being performed by your State, your county, or local governments. It is not our intention to in fact duplicate those services but to make them outstanding.

At this time I would like to call on the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TIAHRT] who is heading up the Energy Department task force. It has been his mission along with other Congressmen who whom he is working to analyze the

Energy Department and where we can effectuate savings.

Like the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHRYSLER] who has chaired our task force on Commerce, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TIAHRT] has been hard at work over time to try to make sure that we make good use of the Federal executives and the services from the hardworking employees from the Department of Energy, but he is looking to the future where we can go.

At this time I would call on the gentleman from Kansas to join us in this discussion on how we can make sure that Government is more effective, it costs less and it is more answerable to the people than the Federal Government we have today.

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, when we started out in January, a group of us freshmen came together, we were subsequently called the New Federalists, with the idea of trying to make our Federal Government more user friendly, smaller, and make it comply with the requirements that we need to balance the budget.

We have not really talked about the significance of balancing the budget enough in my estimation. We have for the last 25 years existed without balancing the Federal budget. I have three children and I am concerned about the future that they have. My daughter Jessica is 14. I have two sons, John, who is 10 and Luke who is 7. If you take the 25 years that we have failed to balance the Federal budget and you add it to the 7 years which was in the budget resolution that we passed last week, we have a total of 32 years. If it takes as long to get out of this mess as it did to get into the mess, my 14-year-old daughter is going to be 53 years old. We have literally taken the problems of this generation and passed them on to the next generation.

In order to balance the budget, we are going to have to look at different methods of downsizing, of streamlining the functions that we now have. When we looked at our government, we picked out four departments: HUD, Housing and Urban Development; was one; Department of Education was another; Department of Commerce, which is the topic today at a news conference and here on the floor tonight; and the Department of Energy.

□ 1800

I selected the Department of Energy because after looking at it I determined that it was a 1970's tax guzzler, that it had really outlived its usefulness and it was time for a trade-in. We found out that many parts of the Department of Energy had duplicate missions, missions that existed elsewhere inside the Federal Government, and what we were trying to do was match up those missions.

We also found out, thanks to Vice President GORE and his national performance review, that parts of the environmental management within the Department of Energy were operating by missing 20 percent of their milestones; in other words, they were behind schedule. Every time they had a milestone, one in five of them were missed. If they scheduled five events one day, one of them would not occur.

He also found out according to the national performance review that they were 40 percent inefficient in environmental cleanup, 40 percent inefficient. That meant, according to Vice President GORE's report, that over the next 30 years it could cost taxpayers $70 billion, $70 billion, money that we could put to a lot better use in a lot of different ways, ways that we really have of meeting the needs in the Federal Government, but it is just going to be wasted unless we do something about it.

So we undertook the task of looking at the different parts of the Department of Energy and finding out what we would do in each one of them. One of them that came up was the power marketing administrations. The power marketing administrations, there are five of them in the U.S. They broker electric power that is generated like a hydroelectric plant, then broker it to the rural electric cooperatives, and then on to the consumers. It is a function that often occurs privately, it is done by the private sector, but now we have it under the Department of Energy, and it could best be fulfilled by the private sector. So we are going through this process of looking at consolidation, at privatizing and eliminating those parts we do not need.

We also have 28 laboratories that are funded by the Federal Government, and again we have duplication of missions, overlap. We are going to propose setting up a commission to go out and look at each one of these labs, develop a consolidation process, come back with a report that says which labs can combine their missions, which labs can privatize their missions to eliminate the corporate welfare that now exists in the structure, and just a consolidation process that is going to save hundreds of millions of dollars for the taxpayers.

So we have the environmental cleanup, inefficient labs, consolidating power marketing administrations that we are going to privatize. Then we have the Naval Petroleum Reserve, the Naval Petroleum Reserve at Elk Hills, which is an oil field, and the Government is in the process of pumping oil. We do not happen to do it as efficiently as the private sector would, so we are proposing to privatize the Elk Hills Naval Petroleum Reserve.

We also have the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, which we think we should sell off over a period of time. We have put oil into the ground at the cost of about $44 per barrel. Back in Kansas they cannot make a living on the current price of oil. It is about $18 per barrel. So if you could get the price up to $44 per barrel we would see renewed drilling in Kansas, stripper wells would become active, and then production would increase. So what we have is a very expensive oil supply. If the price ever got that high to justify it we would see a renewal of resources, we would see a pumping through the private sector to meet the need.

The last point I think I want to make on the Department of Energy is that we saw that the portion that was originally designed for waste gas lines, the perceived energy crisis in the 1970's, well that was in part brought on by cost and allocation controls imposed by the Government. During the Reagan administration we eliminated those cost and allocation controls, and by eliminating those cost and allocation controls we eliminated the problem.

We recently went through Desert Storm a few years ago and we had a large interruption in the supply of foreign oil coming into the United States, and yet we had no gas lines. So we had an original crisis and then we had the bureaucracy that developed to try to meet that need, then we had the need go away and we are left with the bureaucracy.

So if we are going to go about balancing the budget, if we are going to go about preserving a future for our children, if we are going to go about giving opportunity to those who are now just growing up, we are going to have to find ways of balancing the budget. Eliminating the Department of Energy is one; eliminating the Department of Commerce is another.

I stand in support of Congressman CHRYLSER and those on his committee, that he is heading up, to eliminate the Department of Energy, and MARK SANFORD is one, Congressman MARK SANFORD from South Carolina, Congresswoman HELEN CHENOWETH from Idaho, Congressman MARK NEUMANN of Wisconsin, Congressman WES COOLEY of Oregon, Congresswoman SUE KELLY of New York, Congressman JACK METCALF from Washington, Congressman ED BRYANT of Tennessee, and Congressman JIM TALENT of Missouri, all courageous young individuals who want to put this country back on the right track, who want to get a future preserved for their kids and all of the children in the country, and we are excited about the opportunity that is fresh and that we have to have the opportunity to provide a method to balance the budget.

I want to add that this is a historical event. When we started to draw up legislation we found out the legislative counsel had no reference point. We have never before eliminated Cabinet-level agencies in the U.S. Government. It is kind of like a hall tree. We had an umbrella, we did not know where to hang it, so we got a hall tree to hang it on. Then we started piling all kinds of stuff on top, and when we went back to the hall tree to find our umbrella, we found out it was gone. And the original purpose for these agencies is now gone, and it is time to pull out all of the duplication and consolidate and pull off all the stuff that can be privatized and

put it in the private sector and eliminate the portions we do not need.

So I am proud to be a part of the new Federalists, part of consolidating this Government down to a more friendly, user-oriented government and saving the future for the children, not only in my family but across his Nation.

So I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for yielding.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. We appreciate the gentleman's leadership on this task force to take the Department of Energy and make the consolidation, the privatization, and the elimination of functions that are best done in the private sector.

At this time, I would like to call on my colleague from Pennsylvania, Congressman CURT WELDON, who chairs the GLOBE International, which is an environmental cooperative of many nations working together for environmental support. And I would like to call on the Congressman for that purpose now.

(Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to focus on an event that is about to take place here in Washington that I think is significant to the world community. Back when the late Senator John Heinz was a Member of the Senate, he came together with legislators from the countries of Japan, Russia, and the European Parliament to form what has become known as Globe International. The acronym stands for Global Legislators Organized for a Balanced Environment. This bipartisan group both in this Congress and from the Japanese Diet, the Russian Duma, and the European Parliament meet on a periodic basis throughout the year to focus on ways that we can deal with and solve the problems of the Earth's environment.

I have been a member of GLOBE for the past several years and in my capacity as a Republican Member of this body had the pleasure of working with our two cochairmen. It is chaired at this point in time by Senator JOHN KERRY from Massachusetts and Congressman JOHN PORTER from Illinois. There are approximately 30 of us in the Congress, Republicans and Democrats, who lend our names to the support for Global cooperation on environmental issues, getting together on a periodic basis in different countries involved with GLOBE and finding ways that we can cooperate together.

Approximately a year and one-half ago I began my focus on what I think is potentially one of the most devastating problems for the ocean ecosystem, and that is illegal dumping of waste, especially nuclear waste, which has been a real problem now documented and now admitted by the Russian leadership of the former Soviet State.

In fact, it was a leading Russian environmentalist by the name of Yablakov who a year ago in January published a report which for the first time documented in great detail the extensive amount of illegal dumping that took place by the former Soviet leadership in the Barents Sea, the Sea of Japan, illegal amounts at Murmansk and in the area of Novaya Zemlya and the area around there, dumping entire nuclear reactors and power plants, in other cases dumping nuclear waste from submarines in an uncontrolled manner.

The issue of Russians dumping the waste however is not alone. We, for the first time, as matter of fact, only after prodding through a subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services that I served on in last session were finally able to get our own Navy to admit we have had two nuclear-powered submarines that have gone down. In fact, *Thresher* and *Scorpion* up until that admission last fall had not been acknowledged by our Government. Part of our effort is to get our governments to be more open and discuss not only the problems that exist but ways we can better improve the environment by working together.

To that end, last summer I suggested to the members of GLOBE International that we form a working task force on the oceans, and that we convene a forum in America, in Washington, sometime in 1995. They accepted my recommendation, and, in fact, asked me to chair that task force which I have done. And as chairman of that task force, along with Senator JOHN KERRY, we will be hosting the GLOBE Forum, which will take place on Thursday of this week in Washington.

Tomorrow evening we will be hosting a special reception at the Smithsonian. The reception will focus on technologies and new, emerging research that is being done in terms of our ocean ecosystem. I am here to encourage our Members to stop by that reception, to see first hand the kinds of technologies that we are working on.

In attendance, besides Senator KERRY, will be from the Smithsonian approximately 300 leading scientists from throughout the world, Admiral Watkins, and other major nonprofit groups that are focusing on cleaning up our oceans. That reception will be held, by the way, from 7 until 9.

On Thursday, in the Cannon Caucus Room, we will have the International Forum on the Oceans, starting at 9 o'clock in the morning when Senator KERRY and I will open the session, moving to a presentation on the state of the world's oceans at 9:15 by Dr. Kathy Sullivan from NOAA and 10 o'clock a presentation by Adm. Jim Watkins on the importance of understanding the ocean, a question-and-answer session for those in attendance, and then a break, followed by two presentations, one by the Honorable Tim Wirth, from the U.S. Department of State, on land-based sources of marine pollution, and a presentation by Senator TED STEVENS from Alaska on the development of sustainable international fisheries.

The morning session will then adjourn. We will have a luncheon where a presentation will be made by a Dr. Sylvia Earle. Dr. Earle is from the Deep Ocean Engineering Center, and she will discuss the work they are doing in terms of deep-ocean technology.

In the afternoon we will have three panel sessions running at 1:30, 2:45, and 3:45. The 1:30 session will deal with the importance of understanding the ocean. We will have a combined session with Members of Congress and some of our leading academics and engineering and marine biologists from throughout this country and the world to discuss the importance of understanding the ocean. At 2:45 we will discuss land-based sources of marine pollution, specifically the illegal dumping of nuclear waste and radioactive waste, and at 3:45 we will focus on the issue of declining fish stocks. That session will be chaired by Senator KERRY.

The purpose of this forum is for Members of Congress to come together with Members of the Russian Duma, with Members of the Japanese Diet, and with Members of the European Parliament to see first of all what the problems are with our oceans, focusing on those three areas, declining fish stocks, the illegal dumping, especially radioactive dumping, in the oceans, and finally the sharing of technology.

From that, we will hope to put together a proactive agenda that each of us can work on in our respective legislative bodies and an agenda that will allow us to cooperate as we did in the London Convention, which now has every nation except Russia as a signatory, saying it will not dump nuclear waste in the oceans of the world.

In this way, Mr. Speaker, we can cooperate on marine problems, on environmental problems, not necessarily just imposing new legislation on the American people, but rather finding ways that we can cooperate as a world community, so that when we take steps to improve the quality of our marine ecosystem that we know full well that our other major industrial allies will be sharing in that effort.

So I would encourage our colleagues to attend the sessions, both the reception tomorrow evening in the Museum of Natural History and the conference all day on Thursday as we discuss the problems of the oceans of the world.

I want to thank my good friend and colleague for yielding to me, and want to applaud him for the outstanding work he is doing in this Congress. He has become a shining star in this institution in a very quick period of time, and I want him to know we appreciate his leadership, not just in Washington but all across the country.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. If the gentleman will yield a moment, I want to ask a couple of followup questions, if I may, in relation to the conference you are having on the environment. We appreciate your leadership in moving

ahead on positive ways in the environment and appreciate your kind comments about how the freshman class is trying to work with you as a senior Member.

With regard to the results of your conference, will they be shared with Senate and House Members even if we cannot be in attendance?

□ 1815

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Absolutely. In fact, one of the purposes of Globe is to try to expand the work of Globe to other legislators. We are growing. We have 30 Members now in Globe USA. We hope to expand it and to find a basis for discussion and the ways that we can work together as nations, specifically, in my case, on areas concerning the ocean environment.

Other Members of the Congress are focusing on other areas. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] has done a tremendous amount of work on population issues, as has the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA] and Akika Damota from Japan.

So, yes, we will share these findings.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. I know our fellow Members and colleagues will be interested especially in illegal dumping. Would your Globe environmental group be looking to the United Nations for purposes of finding a joint agreement? Or are you going to be talking about treaties as between countries?

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Basically, in the case of the oceans, we will be looking to the London Convention, which is that body which focuses on the control of the oceans relative to dumping issues and trying to get Russia to join the nations of the world in agreeing to, on the record, legally enact legislation prohibiting it from dumping nuclear waste in the future.

Now, they have made some major changes.

In fact, I might add, if the U.S. Policy, had it been changed, and it was not supported by the London Convention until last year at our request and our urging; I applaud the Clinton administration for taking that step. We now have made that statement. In fact, I hope to codify that in this session of Congress.

But we will deal through the London Convention and nation to nation, not necessarily through the United Nations, but rather among the nations that are members of the Globe International.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. I think the key feature of why your program is going to be successful and has been successful, I say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON], happens to be the bipartisan nature, the fact you are looking to other countries to be involved and both sides of the aisle, Republicans and Democrats alike, in the House and Senate. Your cochairman is Senator KERRY. Am correct?

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Yes. Senator KERRY and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER], are cochairs of Globe International.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. I appreciate the gentleman taking the time to share with my fellow Members here in the House about what your environmental efforts are underway with Globe. We look forward to your findings and summary so we can make sure we take legislative action under your leadership.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON] for his efforts on the environment and reform in that arena and turn, if I may, Mr. Speaker, again back to the press conference today that involved the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CHABOT], who is part of a freshman task force and Republican leadership team looking to downsize Government, reform Government, and make it more responsive. He was part of that press conference today.

I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CHABOT] for the purpose of sharing with our colleagues what was accomplished today and what the hope for the future is.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for organizing this important special order tonight.

It should be absolutely clear by now. We are dead serious about limiting the size and scope of our overblown Federal bureaucracy. I do not think there is much doubt about that anymore—in anyone's mind. We mean to get this budget deficit under control; we mean to get the Federal Government out of areas it doesn't have any business being in; and we mean to improve the efficiency of the Federal Government in those areas where it does serve a useful role.

Today, I was proud to stand among a group of committed reformers pledging to reduce shameful corporate welfare by eliminating the Department of Commerce. Tomorrow, I and other colleagues of ours will announce plans to return control over our childrens' educations to parents, to teachers, and to local communities: Our Back To Basics Education Reform Act will bring an end to the meddlesome and wasteful Federal Department of Education, while enhancing local control over schools. And shortly, plans will be announced to dismantle the Federal Department of Energy, an agency that stands as a monument to bureaucratic solutions for problems of another era.

Let us be clear: The Department of Commerce is not being eliminated simply because the man currently in charge there labors under an ethics cloud so ominous that the Department of Justice has been forced to call for the appointment of a special prosecutor. No, the Department of Commerce is being eliminated because it is wasteful, because it duplicates the work of other agencies, and, yes, because it acts in part to funnel aid to corporations of vast wealth that frankly do not need to beg handouts from the taxpayers.

Our colleague from Michigan, DICK CHRYSLER, and the other members of the Commerce Task Force have done a superb job in crafting legislation to untangle the mess at the Commerce Department and save the taxpayers some $7¾ billion—that's ''billion,'' with a ''B''—over 5 years.

I venture to predict, Mr. Speaker, that our country can survive without the Federal Travel and Tourism Administration that is part of the Department of Commerce. Most of my constituents have never used the USTTA: We do not need it, and States, localities, and the private sector can do the job better.

Same for the Department's so-called Office of Technology Commercialization. Why should the Government pick winners and losers in the marketplace? The Government's not good at that, and it is just not fair for the Feds to come in on the side of one firm while completely ignoring other competitors. It is an insult to the productive, innovative private businesses in my district in Cincinnati and across this country to suggest that they need the Federal Department of Commerce in order to do their work. The business people I know do not need corporate welfare; what they need is a more rational, less oppressive Federal Government.

I could go on and on, but the bottom line is that the good things that the Commerce Department does could be done better and more efficiently in other existing agencies, while the wasteful programs that the Department pursues should not exist at all. The General Accounting Office has told us that the Department overlaps ''with at least 71 [other] Federal departments, agencies, and offices.'' We will save those programs that are productive and shift them to more appropriate agencies. Those that serve no valid purpose will be eliminated altogether. That is only common sense.

Mr. Speaker, the taxpayers are watching. They have been in a cynical mood for quite some time now. And they want to be certain that they are not going to get the same old song and dance from Washington. We have made a lot of progress in the last few months and we can take further steps to restore their confidence by acting on this important and very necessary legislation.

Again, I want to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for organizing this special order.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman.

I just wanted to ask a couple of questions in follow up to your far-minded work you have done on the special freshman class task force and the Republican leadership task force in reforming the Federal Government.

I believe you have experience as a school teacher yourself. Therefore, the Education Department review is something that is certainly going to come

under your purview. Could you share with our colleagues here tonight what your thoughts are on how we can reform the Education Department as one of the four departments we are looking to donwsize and privatize and eliminate?

Mr. CHABOT Yes. I think the gentleman for that opportunity.

We are going to be holding a conference tomorrow and announcing the elimination of the Department of Education, and when you first say that, I think some people might listen very closely and say, well, eliminate the Department of Education, and I want to make very clear that we are very proeducation.

As you mentioned, I am a former school teacher. I taught in an inner-city school in Cincinnati.

What we want to do is improve education, make it better than it is now. But we do not need the bureaucrats here in Washington telling parents and teachers and local school boards how they should educate their children, and we should not be telling them how to spend their dollars.

So, what we are doing is shifting the emphasis out of Washington, getting the Federal bureaucrats out of it, and save those dollars and shift programs back to local communities, where they can be monitored, where they can be watched much more closely and for parents and teachers to make the decisions rather than the bureaucrats here in Washington.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. That makes a lot of sense. Obviously, we want to make sure that while we want to make sure the student loans and grants programs are maintained, they will be.

Mr. CHABOT. Absolutely.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. We want to make sure we have funds for local education with milk and textbooks and transportation. The fact is many of the policy-level items are best left to the local school districts closest to the people. I think that is what you are getting to as far as the reforms you discussed.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. BROWNBACK], who as the chairman of the Federalists, a group of freshman Congressmen dedicated to reform, dedicated to downsizing Government, keeping that which is important and vital, but to eliminate the fraud, abuse, and waste that we have in the Federal Government, and I would ask the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. BROWNBACK] if he could share with the colleagues tonight, if he would, exactly what the purpose of the elimination of the Commerce Department is, the downsizing, the privatizing, and the consolidation, how that can be achieved and just where you are going with the elimination or downsizing, privatization, of four departments. If you could give us the genesis of that, I think it would be instructive to the Members who are here tonight to listen to you.

Mr. BROWNBACK. I thank the Gentleman very much. I appreciate the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania yielding to me to explain a key project we are working on at this time in the Congress.

I would like to give a quick bit of background of where we have come with this.

Starting in January, actually even a little bit earlier than that, in December, before the freshman class had even become a part of the this Congress, a number of us gathered to start discussing how is it that we could reform the Federal Government. If there was one very clear message of the this last election, it was that people believe and know that the Federal Government is too big, takes too much, is on their back and in their pocket too much, and they want it less, they want it less in their lives, they want it to tax them less, they want it to be demanding less out of them.

A number of us were talking about how is it then we could go ahead and deliver to the American people a smaller, more focused, more efficient Federal Government, one that does its core missions very, very well but does not do the thousands of activities it has done over the past number of years and the many activities it got into it does not do well or really should not be in the Federal Government at all.

So, we began discussing that. Then, in February, a number of us, actually it was on February 14 of this year, we were joined by the chairman, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], and the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOEHNER], chairman of the Republican Conference, in announcing the creation of four task forces to develop legislation to eliminate four Federal Cabinet bureaucracies, Departments of Commerce, Education, Energy, and HUD.

At that time, our critics thought it could not be done.

Well, today we announced the first of those proposals on the Department of Commerce, to eliminate the Department of Commerce, and we are proving our critics wrong.

Three of these four Cabinet-level agencies have been targeted for elimination by the House budget that was passed last week by this body, as we move to balance the budget by the year 2002.

And I would point out for people who are watching and our colleagues that are looking at this, a clear reason why we need to do this, and there are a number of them, one I want to draw their attention to is the thing that is right to my left, and that is the Federal debt. This is the mortgage on America, and it is now at nearly $5 trillion. If we do not balance the budget, this mortgage on America goes to nearly $7 trillion by the year 2000. If we do nothing on this, if we keep adding nearly $200 billion annually, and we just keep mortgaging and mortgaging the future of our children, and somebody some day has to pay.

Well, I think it is time for this Congress to step up to the plate and to make the tough choices and to do that in a responsible fashion. I think we can actually do this and improve the Government, making it smaller, more efficient, and more focused.

We announced today the plans of eliminating the Department of Commerce. We were joined today in our efforts by the Senate task force to release the first of these four proposals which represents a thoughtful approach to dismantling the Commerce bureaucracy.

The question we applied to each of these programs and these bureaucracies is this: Is this program an essential and necessary function of the Federal Government, of a limited Federal Government that was never intended to be all things to all people? Let me repeat that question: Is this program an essential and necessary function of a limited Federal Government?

James Madison, one of the chief architects of the Constitution, said this about the Federal Government and its limitations, he said, ''The powers delegated by the proposed Constitution to the Federal Government are few and defined.''

Yet lately over the course of this century we have lost sight of this vision. The Federal Government has tried to become all things to all people and done a poor job in the process. Every time our Nation has faced an internal challenge, we respond with centralized solutions. We look to the Federal Government to solve our problems; yet, by nearly every measure, these centralized bureaucratic command-and-control solutions have failed, and you can just go off and tick off some of the things we have done recently.

In 1965 we decided we had an urban problem in this country. And what did we do? Let us create a Department of Housing and Urban Development, in 1965. Where are we? In 1995. We have worse urban problems than we had at that time. We created a centralized focus.

We are going to solve the problems out of Washington, where the truth of the matter is these problems are solved at the local community by individuals and States and by people committed there, rather those focus our attention and our focus here in a centralized, bureaucratic approach.

□ 1830

We said we had an energy problem in 1979, and what did we do? ''Let's create a Department of Energy,'' that that is going to solve the problem, and yet I think, as we found, our real problem is we had too much regulation in a market sector in the Department of Energy, and we decided in 1979, or thereabouts, we had a problem in education. What do we do? ''Let's create a centralized, command-and-control answer that

we are going to answer it all out of Washington and create a Department of Education,'' and yet our test scores have gotten worse since 1979.

The truth is that the genius of America is not centralized planning, is not centralized control. The genius of America is the individual, that individual working out there, struggling, pushing to solve their own problems, and the more we focused on centralized answers, the more we will fail. We need to give it back to the people.

So we announced the program on the Department of Commerce today. Tomorrow we will announce the program on the Department of Education for a sensible, thoughtful elimination of the Department of Education that is proeducation, and elimination of the Department of Commerce is probusiness, and elimination of the Department of Housing and Urban Development is prohousing and urban issues, and elimination of the Department of Energy is proenergy. We just think the solutions are not here and we would be better off if we did not focus here. We would be better off if we got it out to the marketplace, to the community, to the individual, to States and local units of government, and certainly, if the debt is not enough of a reason, then we can just go back to our basic federalist principles of the Federal Government being a limited, focused Federal Government.

Those are the things that we are doing, and I think those are responsible, I think it is what the American people voted on this past November as things we are going to get done with this Congress, and I would yield back to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman for yielding back.

Congressman BROWNBACK, I think it is very clear today from the testimony that was given at the press conference that even former Secretary Mosbacher, who was in charge of the Department of Commerce, made eloquent testimony about the fact that many of these functions can be privatized, downsized, and eliminated, and I think that having a former Secretary of his renown coming forward certainly tells us a lot about what can be done.

Mr. BROWNBACK. It is interesting to note in all four of our task forces to eliminate these departments, we have a former Secretary of that department working with us on each of these that believes clearly we can get this eliminated, and do a better job in the process and get us back to that limited government.

One final point I would make is the Supreme Court is starting to look at this this way as well. The Lopez case that just came out said the Federal Government is a limited government, first time in 60 years that the Supreme Court has spoken about the Federal Government being a limited government. It is time we limited back in.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. I hope you will remain with us as we call on a colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GUTKNECHT], to tell us his impressions of where he thinks the reforms should be made and where the agencies should be downsized.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Thank you, Representative FOX, and I want to congratulate Representative BROWNBACK. He has been really the spirit behind a group that meets every Thursday morning at 7:30 in the morning, and I have been privileged to join him virtually every Thursday at that time. We do not seem to always get things done, so I suggested this morning we start meetings at 6:30 in the morning. It may be only SAM and I that will be at those meetings, but I want to thank you and congratulate you for sort of rekindling this whole notion of new federalism.

You know, if you look at what has happened in the private sector over the last number of years, the major corporations have understood that large, centralized bureaucracies cannot compete in the world marketplace, and, you know, earlier this year Speaker GINGRICH said to us—really he posed the question—can America compete in an increasingly competitive world marketplace going into the 21st century with a 19th century bureaucracy, and I think we all know the answer to that question, and the answer is ''no,'' and so I think it has been cast upon us to try and come up with some solutions, and look at things differently, and find out if we cannot maybe reshape government, reform government, reorganize government, downsize government, reduce the dependency on centralized bureaucracy, ship more of the decisionmaking back to the States, back to the local units and ultimately back to individuals, because I think the American people understand that they can spend money more efficiently than the Federal Government. The decisions made at the local level are much better decisions and are much more responsive to what people really need and want in those local communities.

I would like to talk for a few moments this evening just about the Department of Energy, and the Department of Energy, like all of the other departments, I am certain, has a certain constituency out there, and people can say it does a number of good things, and it does some things well, and I am certain that there are people who believe it ought to be retained, but let me just talk a little bit tonight, if I could, about the—an act that the Congress passed in 1982. It was entitled the Nuclear Waste Policy Act and essentially made the U.S. Department of Energy responsible for developing permanent waste disposal facilities for nuclear waste sites.

So, in 1982, the Congress went on record that we wanted to do something at the Federal level. The Federal Government would take responsibility for nuclear waste, and they would develop a permanent storage site for this nuclear waste.

Well, I think it is time we get a little report card and find out exactly how well the Department of Energy has been doing. To date, the American nuclear utilities' customers have paid well over $10 billion into a Government-operated nuclear waste fund. Let me say that again: America's electric consumers have paid over $10 billion in fees to the nuclear waste fund. We have spent from that fund in excess of $4 billion. The Department of Energy is still in a state—still on the site of determining where exactly that should be. They have spent most of the money on a facility or potential facility in Yucca Mountain, NV, but we have spent over $4 billion studying that facility, and here is the incredible fact:

We are nearly 15 years away from coming up with a permanent site. In other words, we have spent 13 years and $4 billion, and according to the latest study that I have seen, we are probably at least 15 years away from having an operational permanent waste repository, and I should remind the people who are gathered here on the House floor and people who may be watching in other places that we won World War II in less than 4 years, we were able to put a man on the moon in less than 8 years, and yet we have already invested over $4 billion and spent 13 years, and we are still 15 years away from a permanent waste repository site, which makes it even more interesting to me that I was told by someone from the nuclear industry that they believe they can build a facility complete for less than $150 million, and I am not talking about billion dollars. I mean that is just one example, and probably there are other examples that we can repeat again and again here on the House floor.

But the point really is this: All of these departments, I think, were started for the best of intentions. I think that many of them employ people who were very sincere and believed that what they are doing is important, but the bottom line is that the bureaucratization of many of these Federal bureaucracies here in Washington really has not done a very good job of solving some of the fundamental problems that they were supposed to solve, and so, as happened in corporate America, I think the time has come to downsize the Federal bureaucracy to eliminate some of the bureaucracies that are here in Washington.

I congratulate Representative CHRYSLER on what he brought up today in leading the charge with the Department of Commerce. We hope they will be coming out soon with the reorganization of the Department of Energy, the Department of Education, and ultimately I am actively involved in working with a task force that is looking at how we can ultimately eliminate the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and again I want to repeat something that Representative BROWNBACK said.

This is not some mean-spirited accounting exercise. We are not trying to do this because we want to hurt school children or hurt electric utility customers or destroy our ability to compete internationally in energy or education or any other field. We are doing it because we honestly believe that the only way to really change the way we do business is to take a serious look and find out if there are not better ways that these programs and these issues can be tackled without these huge bureaucracies here in Washington. I think that is what the American people want, and I think they have seen it happen in the private sector. We have seen a downsizing in the private sector, and I think it is long overdue here in the Federal Government as well.

So I congratulate you, Representative FOX, and, as I indicated, Representative BROWNBACK has been doing an excellent job in articulating the basic message that I think our founding fathers had, and that is that the best government is the least government. There are obviously legitimate functions for the Federal Government, but I think it is our task as Members of this Congress to turn over every rock, to ask the tough questions and to try and find more efficient ways to solving problems. I think that is what the American people want, that is what they expect, and frankly I hope that is what we are going to deliver before this 104th Congress is gaveled into history.

So I appreciate a few moments to share tonight some of the issues that I am concerned about, particularly back in Minnesota as it relates to nuclear waste policy, how much money has been wasted, in my opinion, over the last 13 years, and we have got to somehow bring closure to this basic issue because I think American electric consumers have been paying for it long enough. I think they expect some real solutions.

Again I thank Representative FOX for asking for this special order tonight and thank him for allowing me to participate a few moments.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Thank you, Congressman GUTKNECHT. I want to thank you for your leadership in the freshman class and this new 104th Congress in looking for ways to downsize wasted Federal dollars, but to put them where they are most needed, and I think that your private sector experience and experience in the legislature in your own home State in Minnesota has brought you the kind of leadership that is going to help us save funds and help our seniors, and our families, our small businesses and our children.

At this time I call on one of the leaders of the freshman class who is on the Committee on the Budget, and he is working to move us forward into the 21st century in a fiscally responsible way. I would like to call on Congressman SHADEGG from Arizona for that purpose.

Congressman SHADEGG, I appreciate your joining us here on the House floor tonight to give us your view on where the reforms need to go for this House, and this Congress, and, for that matter, this country, that it can move forward.

Mr. SHADEGG. Thank you, Congressman FOX. I certainly appreciate your allowing me to participate in this effort tonight and the leadership you have demonstrated on it in seeking this time and giving us an opportunity to raise the issues for the American people to consider.

I would like to start, and I know this sounds a little silly, but it is important to thank people and to recognize their efforts. Representative BROWNBACK, who was just here, and Representative GUTKNECHT, who just spoke, have been two consistent leaders in this area.

I recall, as I am sure, Mr. FOX, you do from the early freshmen meetings when we first met as a group of revolutionaries, when we drafted the idea of calling ourselves the New Federalists, when we got bold and talked about, well, should we propose eliminating an agency or maybe two agencies, and then we got even bolder and said, ''Well, why not four agencies?'' And I noticed that the Senate is now matching our trend and saying that if we can eliminate four in the House, we can eliminate four in the Senate, and some of the conservative think tanks around town, Heritage, I think, with a tremendous national reputation, is proposing eliminating, I believe, nine agencies. I have to say that Representative GUTKNECHT and Representative BROWNBACK have been in the lead in that effort and have demonstrated great courage and great determination in going forward. It is also interesting to me tonight to note that most of the people involved in this effort right now, at least here on the floor tonight, are freshmen who came here with a new sense of the direction the American people want this Government to go. Having said that about the other leaders of this, I could not—I would be remiss if I did not mention Representative CHRYSLER from Michigan. He has done yeoman's work.

The announcement they made today to eliminate the Commerce Department is indeed a bold step forward and a very important step forward for the American people. It is this kind of change that the American people want from us, demand from us, and they do it, and it is important to understand they are doing it out of a sense of frustration. We have spent 40 years building up the Federal Government larger and larger, ever increasing its size, ever increasing its scope, ever increasing its power, saying to the American people time and time and time again that, if they will just give us a little more power and a few more tax dollars, we will solve their problems, and at the end of this 40 years' experience, one message is clear:

It is failed. Central planning does not work. We cannot solve the problems of commerce in this country by creating a Department of Commerce. What we can do is suck a ton of money out of an otherwise vibrant economy, put thousands of bureaucrats into high marble buildings, and burden the economy even further, and that is what we have proven, and the bold steps taken today by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHRYSLER] and the others on his task force are testament to the fact we finally sat back and listened carefully and recognized that our efforts to centrally plan commerce in America has failed the way efforts to centrally plan commerce in the Soviet Union failed, and to centrally planned commerce in all the Eastern-bloc countries fails and to centrally planned commerce everywhere throughout the world has failed.

☐ 1845

Since the rest of the world got the message that planned economies do not work, it is about time the American Government got that message and began moving in the right direction.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. If the gentleman will yield for a moment, I think the gentleman has been at the forefront of working with Congressman KASICH, who is the budget chairman. His committee and your committee have done what has not happened since 1969, the last time we had a balanced budget in this Federal Government. So your fellow colleagues who are not on the Committee on the Budget, but respect what you have done, have to appreciate that we are part of a very important first, since 1969, that we have balanced the budget; that we are going to give our children and grandchildren, and in fact senior citizens, everybody, a chance to know that we can get out from under this debt.

I have to tell the gentleman that what you have done is handled in hand with what Congressman CHRYSLER has done and Congressman BROWNBACK in making sure we get the reform and the elimination of the duplication that we have seen here in the Federal Government.

Mr. SHADEGG. I appreciate that. It is actually a great segue into where I was going, and I would like to talk about that issue a little bit. I want to bring you some facts and statistics. Congressman GUTNECHT pointed out the elimination of these agencies is not just about numbers. It is not just about eliminating bureaucracy, but it is in part about that issue.

I want to bring you some facts and statistics, and I will try to go slow and want you to think about them. I am reading from statistics produced by the Browning Newsletter, and they tell an amazing, a shocking story.

Between 1963 and 1993, the average weekly wages of a blue collar worker in America went up 398 percent. Let's call it 400 percent. So average wages, blue collar worker, up 400 percent. The consumer price index is up 458 percent. Call it 460. Wages are up 400 percent, CPI is up 460 percent, consumer price index. That is the private sector, you

and me at home trying to get by everyday. Let me talk to you about what has happened to the Federal Government.

Receipts at the Federal Government in that same time period, between 1963 and 1993, receipts are up 1,024 percent. Expenditures, we all know we have created a deficit. It is no accident I put the debt up here. Here it is, the red ink, and it scares us. Expenditures at the Federal level, they are not up 400 percent or 460 percent like wages and the Consumer Price Index. Expenditures at the Federal level are up 1,241 percent, a staggering increase, three times the amount of increase in Government spending as the amount of earnings for the average blue collar worker in America.

The figure I like to cite the most is the deficit. Between 1963 and 1993, while your wages and my wages and the average American's wages were going up 400 to 460 percent, the deficit that you and I ran up by spending too much on the floor of this Congress is up a staggering 6,102 percent. 6,000 percent increase in the deficit that we are racking up.'

That burden is immoral. I look here in the audience and there are some people, I would say some young people, watching us here tonight, late in the evening, kind of watching the floor of the House when most of the Members are gone. And those people in that audience tonight and the people back home need to understand that it is simply morally wrong to impose that deficit, an increase of 6,100 percent, and this red ink and debt, on them? To carry their lifetimes? On our children? On my children? I have a 13-year-old and a 9-year-old. I am going to ask them to pay that back because I didn't have the discipline? And on our grandchildren? I am telling you, we cannot do it.

So that brings us to why we are about this task. We are abut this task because in part it has failed. Central planning has failed. But it has not failed to burden our children and grandchildren.

By dismantling the four agencies we are working on, Education, Commerce, Energy and HUD, we are simply recognizing it is time to think outside the box, that we can do better. That education, I will tell you, in education in my district in Arizona, the constituents are clear. They sent me with one message: Education is not the business of the Federal Government. They believe that their local school board ought to be responsible for setting the policy and the parents and the teachers can do the job.

Energy, I am on the task force to eliminate the Energy Department. In 1970 there was an energy crunch. There was a security concern. Today, with a $7.8 trillion debt being the greatest threat to our children and grandchildren, the Energy Department is a demonstrated failure. If we cannot recognize that and go into it conscientiously, seriously, thoughtfully, as we have done today in Commerce and as we are doing in Energy and see what are these functions, which should be performed at the Federal level and which of these should not, and which should be performed by some other agency and which should be handed back to the States and which do not need to be done by Government at all. That is what this problem is about. And it will, if we dismantle these inefficient agencies, if we have the courage to be bold, it will save billions of dollars on our national debt and begin to eliminate that line.

Let me conclude with just one last point. Each time I go home to my district, I do not run into people who say to me ''I need more government.'' I do not run into people who ask me for more programs. We did a town hall in my district a few weeks ago. A gentleman came up to me and said he was an executive, mid-level executive in a company in Phoenix, and that in the last 8 years his company had downsized 50 percent. It was half the size that it was simply 8 years ago. And he said,

> John, we are producing twice the product that we produced that 8 short years ago. Why? Because we have forced efficiencies. Each year I take my budget in from my department to this corporation. Each year I tell them what I think I need to get the job done. Each year they come back to me and give me a number that is too small. I tell them I can't do it. You know what? Each year I have done it. Each year we have become more efficient.

That kind of efficiency is what we need to bring to the Federal Government, and the elimination of these wasteful agencies, like Commerce, like Energy, like HUD, and like Education, which have small functions that perhaps should be borne by the Federal Government, but which ought to be passed on to other agencies, and then get rid of the Washington bureaucracy, the Washington bureaucrats, we do not need them. That is the way the American people expected us to lead their Government.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Thank you for your contribution and leadership not only on the Committee on the Budget, but as a federalist working to make sure the freshman class works with leadership to reduce the size of the Federal Government and make it more responsive.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the efforts to let us illuminate our colleagues on this issues.

REVITALIZING THE AMERICAN ECONOMY

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

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, to continue this discussion of why it is important to downsize Government and how we reach our goal of having fewer taxes and greater responsibility in Government and greater individual responsibility for our citizens, I would call on the esteemed chairman of the task force that led the effort to structure the dismantling of the Department of Commerce, Mr. DICK CHRYSLER from Michigan.

Mr. CHRYSLER. Thank you very much, NICK. It is good to be here. You know, this task force that we put together to dismantle the Department of Commerce, we had some very courageous and energetic and innovative freshmen work on that committee as well as some sophomores. Between the freshmen and the sophomores, we are 54 percent of the majority, so we are the majority of the majority. But HELEN CHENOWETH, MARK SANFORD, SUE KELLY, WES COOLEY, JIM TALENT, JOE SCARBOROUGH, MARK NEUMANN, JACK METCALF, SAM BROWNBACK, TODD TIAHRT, and even NICK SMITH from Michigan, helped us put this task force together and brought this proposal forward today.

It was only 3 months ago that we announced a goal that had been unthinkable in previous Congresses, and that was the elimination of the Departments of Commerce, Education, Energy, and Housing and Urban Development. The House budget resolution that passed last week calls for the elimination of three of those four Departments, and the Senate budget resolution calls for the elimination of the Department of Commerce.

We said it back in February that it was time to put the Department of Commerce out of business, and we promised to have specific legislation to do just that by the spring. Today we unveiled the vehicle to achieve this goal, the Department of Commerce Dismantling Act. It is promises made and promises kept.

Our Commerce task force spent the last 3 months studying every program in the Department, putting each one under the microscope. We asked three questions of every program: First, is this program necessary and is it worth borrowing the money to pay for it only to have our children pay it back? Second, if it is necessary, does the Federal Government need to be involved or is it something better left to the States, communities, and/or individuals? Third, if the Federal Government does need to be involved, are we currently doing the job in the most effective and efficient manner?

The result of this analysis is what I hold in my hand today, a specific step-by-step plan that will eliminate, privatize, or consolidate every aspect of the Department of Commerce.

The Department of Commerce Dismantling Act creates a temporary Commerce Program Resolution Agency that will oversee a 3-year windup period of the Department of Commerce. By cutting the unnecessary and wasteful programs immediately, we will save our constituents $7.765 billion over the