

You answered the call of duty, and we thank you for all that you have done for our great country.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all of my colleagues to join me in honoring these fine men and women.

**SALUTE TO OAKLAND PRIVATE  
INDUSTRY COUNCIL**

**HON. RONALD V. DELLUMS**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, October 11, 1995*

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the Oakland Private Industry Council. The city of Oakland has truly benefited from this organization. The Oakland Private Industry Council should be applauded for actively promoting job training and placement of the economically disadvantaged.

The Oakland Private Industry Council is nationally recognized for its creative development of nontraditional employment and training programs. Just recently, a \$1.2 million grant from the State of California was awarded to the council. These funds will provide retraining for civilian workers displaced by the closure of the Oak Knoll Medical Center. These persons will be provided with critically needed skills for high demand occupations.

Governor Pete Wilson has commended the Oakland Private Industry Council 4 consecutive years for making an outstanding contribution to the development of Oakland's work force. Each year the council has exceeded its established performance goals.

This year the council again honors its service providers which have exceeded their established performance goals and their business partners who assisted them.

I join in saluting the Oakland Private Industry Council and this year's honorees. In recognition of their dedicated and professional service to Oakland's economically disadvantaged population, I would like to commend the Auto Parts Club, Youth Employment Partner Inc., Federal Express, Career Resource Center, Port of Oakland, Berkeley Adult School, Oakland Neighborhood Center, and the Vietnamese Fishermen Association.

Today, I pay a special tribute to the Oakland Private Industry Council for its continued hard work and dedication to the community in providing employment and training services for our city.

**50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE END  
OF WORLD WAR II**

**HON. J.D. HAYWORTH**

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, October 11, 1995*

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, as we celebrate the 50th anniversary of World War II, I want to honor an Arizona National Guard Unit, the 158th Regimental Combat Team [RCT] or "Bushmasters" as they called themselves, which fought in the Pacific campaigns. When the war ended, they had spent 4 years overseas, 312 days in combat, and suffered approximately 1,600 casualties in three campaigns. While they went unnoticed with the

public, they were recognized by the Commander of the Army in the Pacific, Gen. Douglas MacArthur. The Bushmasters had earned three campaign streamers with two arrowheads, a Presidential unit citation, and the unending praise from General Douglas MacArthur. He proclaimed: "No greater fighting combat team ever deployed for battle."

Arizonans already knew what General MacArthur discovered about the Bushmasters because they were our soldiers. They were our husbands, our fathers, and our sons. They were citizen-soldiers who came from cities such as Phoenix and Tucson, from the many Indian Nations in Arizona, from the mining communities of eastern Arizona, from the timber and railroad towns up north, and from the ranch country in the south.

Before World War II, the Bushmaster Regiment already had a colorful past. The unit charged up San Juan Hill with Teddy Roosevelt's Rough Riders, secured the border when Poncho Villa raided the border towns, and fought in France during World War I. Arizonans had many reasons for joining the unit. Some of them joined for the camaraderie. Some joined because the unit was colorblind and it gave them dignity and equity that they did not have in civilian society. The unit had some of Arizona's more famous people come through its ranks, including the late Senator Carl Hayden and Pima Indian Chief Antonio Azul.

When the Bushmasters reported for Federal service, they proved their value during the Louisiana maneuvers in 1940. The regimental commander Col. J. Prugh Hernadon, a bookkeeper from Tucson, tried a new form of communication with his radios. He had native American members of his unit transmit messages in their native languages to keep the enemy from intercepting their radio transmissions.

The Bushmasters performed so well that the Army shipped them to the Panama Canal Zone shortly after Pearl Harbor was attacked. They were given the task of defending the canal from sabotage. A year later General MacArthur personally requested the Bushmaster Regiment to help him capture the island of New Guinea from the Japanese. In January, 1944, the 2d Battalion, under Lt. Col. Frederick Stofft of Tucson, were the first soldiers of the Bushmaster Regiment to enter combat.

The Bushmasters developed a reputation for their fighting skills. In the Philippines Capt. Bayard W. Hart, a Cherokee Indian, and his men of Company G from Safford, AZ, were awarded the Presidential unit citation for capturing a Japanese gun emplacement without a loss of life to his men. In Dutch New Guinea, they beat the battle-hardened Japanese Tiger Marines. Shortly after the battle they became feared by their enemy. Japanese shortwave broadcasts referred to them as "the butchers of the Pacific" for the rest of the war. It was no surprise to the Bushmasters that they were selected to lead the assault of the invasion of Japan.

When the war ended, the Bushmasters returned home to Arizona, going back to the lives they had known before the war. They may have come from different cultures, spoke different languages, and grown up in different traditions, but they fought for the values they all shared as Americans: freedom, democracy, and justice.

Mr. Speaker, Americans can best remember their sacrifice by striving to live by those values that they were so willing to fight and die for.

**OMNIBUS BILLS**

**HON. LEE H. HAMILTON**

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, October 11, 1995*

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Washington Report for Wednesday, October 4, 1995 into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

**FEDERAL GOVERNMENT REFORM**

The operations of the federal government have received enormous scrutiny recently. Many Americans saw the last election as a call to dramatically reduce the size and scope of the federal government. The House of Representatives has responded by passing bills to place limits on government regulations, and will soon consider measures to eliminate entire government agencies.

But in the midst of all the high-profile activity, less sweeping but important changes have been made to help government work more efficiently. The challenge before us is to determine what we want the government to do, and make sure that it does the job well.

Reinventing government: Two years ago, Vice President Gore came forth with recommendations for reforming the way the federal government operates. He recently detailed the progress that has been made on implementing these recommendations.

Last year, Congress passed legislation to cut 272,000 federal employees. So far, 160,000 have been cut. There are now fewer federal employees than there were when John F. Kennedy was president. Furthermore, federal agencies have closed more than 2,000 field offices.

In addition, 16,000 pages of regulations have been eliminated, and 31,000 are being reworked—resulting in an estimated savings to the public of nearly \$28 billion. For example, the Environmental Protection Agency has either cut or changed 85% of its regulations, thereby cutting its paperwork requirements by 25%. These changes are estimated to save industry 20 million hours of labor a year. The Department of Housing and Urban Development has eliminated 65% of its regulations; the Small Business Administration, 50%.

But just as important as cutting back on the size of government is making it work more effectively, and progress is being made on this front as well. Earlier this year, a national business magazine evaluated a number of businesses' telephone customer service. The magazine gave its highest rating to the Social Security Administration, which outperformed companies such as Southwest Airlines and L.L. Bean. The IRS has also significantly improved its telephone service, and has pledged to cancel penalties for taxpayers who are given incorrect information.

Congress has acted to improve government efficiency as well. A law enacted earlier this year makes it more difficult for the federal government to impose unfunded mandates on state and local governments. Congress also strengthened a law to lessen the paperwork burden imposed by the federal government on businesses and individuals.

Both the House and Senate have passed bills which would place limits on federal agencies' power to issue new regulations and require them to perform detailed cost-benefit analyses before new rules could usually be issued.

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.