

vote, but I think you ought to call up each one who voted to keep the B-2 bomber to explain "What is the magic, what is it that we cannot see through simple, ordinary logic?"

There may be some special kind of reasoning and logic, or some deep-seated wisdom that the people who voted to keep this \$30 billion monster in the budget have that the rest of us do not have. Let them explain. I see no rush to explain by many who voted.

Of course, there were people who argued on the floor that we need to give our troops the very best, and the stealth bomber would help make it safer for our fliers, et cetera, et cetera. The fliers do not say that. The experts in the military do not say that. The generals do not say that. The Secretary of Defense does not say that. They all gave these arguments, running counter to the people we trust and pay to run our defense.

Therefore, let the B-2 bomber be the deciding point in terms of determining the integrity and the consistency, the truthfulness of anybody who stands on this floor and calls for budget cuts. Let that be the determining, defining moment. It is worthy of saying "Before the B-2 I saw you this way. After the B-2 you are exposed."

Across the B-2, across the spectrum, there are some other B-2 bomber types of votes. We are voting to keep in the F-22, a fighter plane that is the most sophisticated fighter plane ever conceived. It is not needed, also. There are many others. Then we are going to be considering very soon a reorganization of the agricultural bill, continuation of agricultural welfare. Here you have very dishonest discussions about to shape up, similar to the B-2 in terms of the rhetoric is in one place and the action is in another.

If we want to eliminate welfare as we have known it, if we want to change welfare and eliminate welfare as we know it, then let us eliminate agricultural welfare as we know it. From New York, Chicago, Los Angeles, there are thousands, millions of people who would love to go to Kansas and be able to enjoy the benefits that Kansas farmers enjoy from the taxpayers. They get \$20,000, \$30,000, \$40,000 checks each year of doing nothing. They get checks for not plowing the soil, for not growing grain. The checks are without question. They do not have to prove that they are poor.

If you go in any city and say that you are desperately poor, you have no other means to feed your children, then you have to fill out forms. You have to have an audit of your expenses. Somebody has to investigate you before you get a penny. The average welfare check for Aid to Dependent Children recipients, for a family of three, is about \$300 a month across the Nation, it being much lower in certain places, like Mississippi, and higher in places like New York. However, the average check is \$300 a month for a family of three. Yet, you have to fill out numerous forms, be

investigated, and establish the fact that you really need it. There is a means test.

There is no means testing for farmers. There is no means testing. The rich farmers will get the same check that the poor farmers get. There is no means testing. Yes, true, when Franklin Roosevelt first established the program there were poor farmers in the Nation, and it served the purpose. That is no longer the case. We have rich farmers as well as poor farmers getting this welfare.

My time is up, Mr. Speaker, but my point is we are on the verge of a major catastrophe here in Washington. A state of emergency exists. All of America should wake up, particularly the caring majority, the large majority of people who are going to have a great deal of pain and suffering generated for them as a result of these terrible decisions that are being made here.

I hope people understand that in the final analysis, the war that is raging is for us to win. We are still a majority. We are not beggars. We are not in a situation where we have no arms to fight back with. We are still a majority. The caring majority can rally its forces and still prevail. We have to understand first that we are in a state of emergency, that we are threatened, before we rally, but we can and we shall overcome.

CONGRESS MUST LEAD BY EXAMPLE IN DEFICIT REDUCTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JONES). 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, we address the House tonight on some important issues, many of which are coming up tomorrow. The fact is, in the legislative branch of the Government, if we are going to lead by example, we need to reduce our own expenditures.

We have already seen in this 104th Congress, Mr. Speaker, there have been tax reductions. We have had spending reductions of \$190 billion. We have had a deficit reduction of \$90 billion. We have had regulatory relief to try to eliminate the unnecessary regulations on businesses and individuals, so they have a chance to succeed in life and be able to create jobs. Now we are talking about downsizing Government.

We talked about eliminating some Federal agencies and reducing others, privatizing still others and consolidating their functions, making sure that we have more direct services for people but less bureaucrats we are supporting. That is what the people of the United States want.

We see historically tomorrow a very important day in the life of this 104th Congress in the House, because House Republicans will continue to keep their promise to the American people by

making Congress smaller, more efficient, more accountable, and less costly.

In H.R. 1854, the legislative branch appropriations bill will bring to an end 40 years of largesse in the bloated congressional bureaucracy. By ending business as usual, the GOP bill slashes wasteful congressional spending and ensures that Congress will show its fair share of deficit reduction on the road to a balanced budget.

With me tonight is the gentleman from Minnesota, Mr. GIL GUTKNECHT. He will be working with me in discussing with the American people a number of issues where we can see the downsizing. For instance, Congress must lead by example in its quest to balance the budget by the year 2002. H.R. 1854 will cut congressional spending by \$155 million below the fiscal 1995 levels, and we think that is a step in the right direction.

Once the Senate considers its changes, Mr. Speaker, the total savings just within the Congress could be \$200 million. I would like the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GUTKNECHT] to in fact outline for those Members of the House who are present and listening tonight and others who are joining with us the kinds of changes we are fundamentally making in the way the House runs itself.

I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GUTKNECHT] to outline for us some of those points which are radically different than any prior Congress.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX] for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, my grandmother used to say it was wrong to tell our children that they should do as I say, not as I do. I think it is important, as the gentleman has indicated, that we lead by example.

Mr. Speaker, I was pleased and terrified on my very first day in this body to stand in this very place and be the freshman lead sponsor on the adoption of the rules for the Congressional Accountability Act, which essentially said that Congress is going to have to start to play by the same rules as everybody else. That, I think, was the first step in saying that we are going to lead by example in the 104th Congress.

The bill that probably has more to do with actual Members of Congress than any other bill we will deal with this year, the legislative appropriations bill that will be on the floor tomorrow, really begins to make a very important start, and more importantly, an important statement about what we are going to do.

Let me quote one other person who it may seem unusual for someone on our side of the aisle to quote, but one of my favorite quotations is from a gentleman by the name of Jesse Jackson. Several years ago Jesse Jackson said "If you want to change the world, you have got to first change your neighborhood."

I think if we are going to downsize the Federal Government, we have to start with our own House appropriations bill, and I am very pleased with the bill that the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS] and others have put together. I think it reflects what the American people voted for back in November 1994. I think it reflects what the American people want. I think it reflects what the American people expect.

□ 2015

Let me just talk about some of those things you have already mentioned and I don't want to be redundant but I think it bears repeating, that this legislative branch appropriations bill is going to spend \$155 million less in fiscal year 1996 than we are spending in fiscal year 1995. I think that people need to put that in perspective.

If in fact we did that throughout the entire Federal budget, if we reduced the Federal budget in every category as much as we are reducing our own budget, it would mean that we would cut over \$130 billion from the Federal deficit next year. I think that is important. I think the American people need to know that.

Among some of the things that they have included in this bill, and again I congratulate the committee and the staff and all the Members who have been working so hard, and frankly I think maybe, JON, you and I can take some credit as Members of the freshmen class in the 104th Congress, we have been applying pressure from day one to make certain that these kinds of changes were made. But let me just read a few of the changes that are included in this important bill. First of all we eliminate the funding for the Office of Technology Assessment. Second, we eliminate the Joint Committee on Printing, because there is an awful lot of duplication. We will still be able to get our documents printed. It is just eliminating some of the waste and duplication here in the House. We eliminate one House parking lot. I think long term we are looking at a plan perhaps of privatizing all the House parking lots and making it pay its own way. We eliminate complimentary Historical Society calendars. We eliminate the complimentary volumes of the United States Code for Members. We eliminate constituent copies of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. In other words, people who want this information are going to have to help pay for it. We privatize the Flag Office. Many constituents write in and they want flags that have been flown over the Capitol. We are still going to make that available but we are not going to do it as a Government-run operation. We are going to privatize. We are going to privatize the House Folding Room which has been a sore spot I think particularly with many of the reformers for a number of years. We are also going to reform, we are going to go right where it hurts, we are going to

privatize the House barber shop and the House beauty shop. More important probably than anything else, we are going to begin to consolidate all of these various Members' allowances into a single account.

Again let me just restate. I think this is what the American people wanted back in November when they sent such a clear message that they wanted to downsize the Federal Government. I think they want the Congress to live by example. I think they have seen over the years the number of abuses that Members of Congress have piled upon themselves in terms of perks and advantages that we enjoy, and I think this is a giant step in the right direction in returning some of the credibility to the U.S. House of Representatives and making us much more accountable and making us live within the means that we can afford.

Again, finally, let me just restate something else. If we downsize the rest of Federal spending as much as we are downsizing legislative appropriations in this bill that we will hear tomorrow, we will be saving the taxpayers over \$130 billion. I think that is a giant step forward.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GUTKNECHT]. I think the fact is that you have displayed repeatedly on the House floor and in committee your resolve as well as the Speaker's that we move forward in making those kinds of fundamental changes.

As we look to this budget for this year, and we look to reconciliation and the appropriations process, we have to keep asking ourselves, because our constituents will be asking us as well, is this a legitimate function for government? Could the private sector better handle it? If it should be government, could it be done with less money? And if it should be government, should be it the Federal Government? Could it be better handled by the State government or local governments which are closest to the people?

Extending if I may beyond what you have said already on some of the savings, the Printing Office would be reduced as far as what their actual budget items would be. The Office of Technology Assessment. The Architect of the Capitol would be reduced by \$9.9 million. I think part and parcel of reducing the legislative expense of running this House and of running the Senate which could, like you said, be sizable figures, part of what the freshman class has been doing, and you may want to expand on this, Congressman, after I reflect on it, that is, we have talked already and have obviously acted to reduce by at least one-third to 50 percent our amount of money for franking, that is the mail that is paid for by citizens to receive information which is supposed to be factual data but reducing that budget by a great extent which makes it better for challengers and more fair to the process. We have reduced already the pensions

which I would like to see reduced further. We have a bill to ban gifts from lobbyists, which is certainly appropriate and in line with our reforms. We are also looking to eliminate the frequent flier miles, as no one should personally benefit from the fact they have to fly home or fly back or go to a committee meeting, those personal flier miles should not go to the Congressman, they should go back to the Federal Government in savings for travel.

We also should be looking to election and lobbying reform. I think people want to see reform of political action committees and their involvement and influence in elections. This is just one more dimension as I see it in making sure we in fact reform the House, reform its operations, and reform the procedure by which Congressmen run their offices and run the Government to the extent that legislative branch impacts on the total Federal arena.

I would like to yield back to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GUTKNECHT] to reflect further if you have comments on these reform procedures beyond the downsizing of the House itself.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. I remember on that very first night, I was just thinking about it as we were standing here, one of the people I quoted, another person that I have a tremendous amount of respect for, is Vaclav Havel, the first free elected President of Czechoslovakia. I will never forget he came to Minnesota a number of years ago and he said something incredibly profound. Actually he was quoting Thomas Jefferson. He said, "Words are plentiful but deeds are precious."

I think the important thing about the 104th Congress whether we are talking about the Legislative Branch appropriations, a lot of the other reforms you are talking about, as a matter of fact, I think sometimes people say, "Well, what have you done for us lately?"

We are trying every day to press for these reforms, whether it is campaign finance reform, ethics reform, lobbying reform. I think those items are still on the agenda and obviously we would like to work together with our friends on the other side of the aisle and the President if possible on some of those things, but if they are not willing to work with us, I think we are willing to take those bulls by the horns as well and do it ourselves. But the important thing is I think we are leading by example, particularly with this legislative branch appropriation and I think the American people need to know that. I think they need to know that we are working to keep those promises that many of us made back in the campaigns last year that we do want to downsize the Federal Government, we want government to do what they have to do and that is to live within its means, that is why we fought for term limits, that is why we fought for all these other reforms.

Tomorrow I think is a very important day and marks one more milestone in this historic reform-minded 104th Congress.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. I appreciate the gentleman's quote from important individuals around the world who recognize the importance of the actions as opposed to just the words that we speak here on the House floor. Frankly we have been meeting in more days and more hours and more votes than any prior Congress in recent memory, and our work is obviously not completed. While we have done much to set the stage by reducing by one-third of House committee staff, eliminating 3 committees, 25 subcommittees, on the opening day \$93 million alone in savings, we are now looking to downsizing the Federal Government so that we have more for direct services and less in bureaucracy and paying for bureaucrats.

One of my pieces of legislation that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GUTKNECHT] is working with me on and many of the freshmen, that is, to have a sunset review of Federal agencies within an every 7-year cycle. This worked very successfully in Pennsylvania where each agency, bureau and department would have to justify their existence on a regular basis and to the extent they are not really fulfilling their original objectives or is duplicating another level of government service, it gets eliminated. The employees would move on to other agencies or into the private sector.

The fact is we need to downsize the Government which has to a great extent created a cottage industry of just more regulations, and more bureaucrats to in fact carry them out. We have legitimate services for which government is important but not just to have more regulations that cost individuals and cost businesses.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GUTKNECHT] has been working closely with me in our Government Reform and Oversight Committee. Some of the accomplishments we have already had is to make sure we have legislation when there is regulation? And correspondingly, what benefit will they get out of this new regulation? In fact, we have passed in this House this year a moratorium on new regulations until the inventory that we already have on the books and whether or not enforcing them is in the public interest.

We have also had a Paperwork Reduction Act, now trying to reduce our paperwork by at least 10 percent. The Government has not been really user-friendly. What we need to do is make sure that like as a business, we justify every dollar we spend, every service we are trying to perform and if the private sector can do it better, then the private sector ought to be left to doing it because the Government usually is slower, more costly, creates more barriers and does not reward initiative.

I know the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GUTKNECHT] is a leader in

his State in this movement. The gentleman might want to reflect on regulations and where we have come thus far in the 104th Congress and where you see us going from this point.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. I would just go back to a couple of points you made as well. Not only I think has this Congress been reform-minded, we have also been about opening up the process to the public, reminding Members of exactly who pays the bills and who we work for.

Despite some of the cuts, I want to point out that in this legislative branch appropriation, one point that I missed and I do want to come back to that, that we fully fund projects to bring Congress into the information age, including Office 2000 Network and the National Digital Library. We want to encourage all agencies to move towards electronic formatting of documents. We want to make it easier for people to get information about what is happening here in the People's House. I know the Speaker has set that as the standard from day one and I think that is something we are going to continue to work for.

Despite some of the budget cuts that we are going to sustain here in the legislative branch appropriations bill, we are not going to close the process to the American people.

One of the other reforms that we passed on the very first day, we said we are going to open all the meetings, so the meetings that we are having now are open to the public. One other thing we have found now as we have been through these markups, and I know the gentleman has been in some, I was in one most of the day and will be in one most of tomorrow. We do not have proxy voting anymore. Members actually have to be in those committees and we have to actually cast our own votes.

I think many folks would come in from other parts of the country, would come to Washington, they would see some of these committee meetings where almost no one was actually there to listen to the testimony or to participate in the process in terms of marking up these bills and actually voting on amendments, where the committee chairman would sit with a handful of proxies and literally vote half of the members of that particular committee or subcommittee. I think we all knew that that was wrong, and it took the 104th Congress to begin to end that.

Despite the cuts that we are making, we are going to continue to press to make this much more open, much more user-friendly and much more available to the average American so that they know what is happening with their government here in the People's House.

I wanted to mention that. I also want to get back, you began to talk a little about being more businesslike and doing some things as relates to regulatory reform. There is no question that one of the things that we need in

this country is regulatory reform and if I might just continue on the time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX] for just a little bit, talk about one of the committees that I serve on and why I believe it is important that we continue to press for regulatory reform.

I happen to serve on the McIntosh subcommittee that deals with regulatory reform. It has got a name much longer than that but the short title around here is the Regulatory Reform Subcommittee. Let me just share some of the things that we have learned in testimony in that committee so far. One think tank told us that they believe that the cost of unnecessary Federal regulations to the average consumer in the United States per household works out to about \$4,000 per household. It totals about \$400 billion a year, according to that one particular think tank.

Federal spending to run regulatory agencies in 1994 was \$144 billion. We have approximately 130,000 Federal employees, some might call them bureaucrats, but 130,000 people whose principal job it is to write, interpret or enforce new rules. What we hear from many small business people that have come in to testify, and we have had field hearings around the country, is that they really cannot bear the cost of all of these new Federal regulations. Let me give a few examples.

When we talk about the FDA. It is estimated that on average it will cost a drug manufacturer, a pharmaceutical company over \$350 million and 10 years of time to come out, to get approval for FDA of one new drug. Sometimes we wonder why our drug prices are so high. I certainly would not be one that would defend some of the high drug prices, but certainly the amount of regulation and redtape that the pharmaceutical companies have to go through to get one new drug approved is almost staggering. In fact, one estimate said that 25 cents of every dollar spent by consumers on new drugs falls within the FDA empire. This is the largest consumer protection agency in the world and sometimes we have to ask ourselves, how much protection can we afford?

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. If the gentleman will yield, the fact is we just had a hearing in my district on FDA reform. Most of the new miracle, life-saving, life-extending drugs that are created in the country, in fact in the world are created here in the United States.

Many of our experts in the biotech and pharmaceutical companies have informed us that in fact we may be the last recipients, our constituents, of these miracle lifesaving and life-extending drugs because of all the delays in approvals.

□ 2030

And people who are waiting for the drugs say, "Well, if my insurance company will not approve it because the

FDA has not, in fact, sanctioned it, then we cannot get it." We had witnesses who had ALS, epilepsy, cancer, or AIDS, all waiting for drugs that, frankly, have gone through appropriate protocols, have had the clinical trials, which most countries might approve.

We are just saying in new legislation we are trying to get passed is, "please speed up the process of approving or disapproving the drugs." We want them to be pure. We do not want overregulation. That is what you are getting at. When we overregulate, we delay the time period by which our constituents might be able to extend lives or the quality of their years.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. It is not just in terms of the number of lives and people waiting for new drugs and chemicals and new procedures, new technologies. I must say that is an issue that is relatively near and dear to our heart back in the State of Minnesota. Obviously, the largest employer in my district is the Mayo Foundation. We are very keen in making certain we have the latest technologies, latest developments for patients who come to visit Mayo Clinic.

As a matter of fact, I like to share the story; it is told that shortly before he retired, one of the Mayo brothers gave a speech. He said, "The plain truth is the average American becomes seriously ill 11 times during their lifetime. They recover 10 times. The reason they recover as many times as they do is because we know as much as we know. When we know more, they will recover more times."

The problem we have in the United States, as it relates to new technologies, new drugs, new procedures, it takes so long from the time they have been developed until they are on the market and the result of which is not only are we losing the benefit of some of those new technologies, in many cases they are very cost-effective as well, but we are also losing some of the jobs that go with producing those new devices and those new technologies.

The medical advice business is more and more being exported to Europe and Japan where they can get approval much faster. They do not have to go through as many hoops, and, as a result, the manufacturers are saying, "I am not going to fool with the FDA. We can get approval much faster in Sweden, Germany, France and Great Britain, and so forth."

So we are not only losing the advantage of having those technologies and drugs available to the American consumer, we are also losing all of that economic growth and development, the jobs that go along with that very important biotechnical industry.

So that is another thing we are losing, and as we talk about the rules and regulations, and we have had so many examples, it is not just FDA.

I will give you one more example about the FDA. The last food additive that was approved by the FDA was in 1990, 5 years ago. When you talk to the

food processors in the Midwest or anywhere, they tell us that you know, it is next to impossible because you have to almost prove or disprove the negative. I mean it is next to impossible.

In fact, just a few years ago, we had a scare, you may remember about Alar in apples, and everybody thought, well, we should not eat the apples because some of the apples have had, you know, a very minute amount of Alar applied to them.

Well, only late did we find that the average consumer would have to consume 28,000 pounds of apples a day for 70 years to have something like a 1-in-a-million chance of additional cancer in their particular body.

The point, I guess, of all of this is we can never make things that are completely 100 or 1,000 or whatever, 1-in-a-million percent safe. And so I think we have to have some reasonable regulation, and it is going to be placed upon us to change some of those things.

And, you know, it is like the Alar example, there are lots of examples. Just because we can measure in parts per billion does not necessarily mean that a drug or a chemical is completely unsafe for the American consumer. At some point I think we are going to have to deal with that.

I think American consumers are ready for that.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. One of the things I wanted to say is the fact that on all of these items we are dealing with, whether we are dealing with reform or dealing with items of reduction of our spending or tax cut adoption, or whether we are talking about deficit reduction in this House, the 104th Congress, I am very heartened to tell you and those who are listening, in fact, reforms have been bipartisan, that it has largely been the majority of both sides of the aisle. I think that tells us a lot about the fact that our agenda has been pro-people, pro-active, pro-jobs, pro-business, because the American business cannot depend on having all of these regulations. If we have to over regulate ourselves, as you just said, our jobs are going overseas. We have to make sure regulations are reasonable, not overly expensive, overly intricate. They have to be related to safety and not related to a bureaucratic maze.

I have just seen in my own district, where a gentleman wanted to deal with the Federal Government, but there were 187 pages of forms, a small contract, \$25,000. He would have had to hire an architect, an engineer, attorney, to get through the maze of those documents. He said to me, "Well, you know the Federal Government is not user-friendly."

And, you know, the fact is if the Federal Government was a business, it would be out of business. So we have to make sure we continue our bipartisan situation where we are looking at the focus of the country and saying what can we do to make sure the Government is really delivering the services the people want, that they cannot al-

ready take care of themselves, that the private sector is not taking care of.

FDA reform, I believe, is one of the major areas, not only in your district, but my district as well. Some 12,000 jobs are dependent just on pharmaceutical and biotech areas where they helped to make people live longer, live better, and actually provide employment for a great number of high-tech jobs.

So I believe that in this Congress you are going to find some reform legislation adopted which will make the system work better.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. I wanted to restate something else about that. It is not just the jobs and all the other things, but in many cases, the use of some of these new technologies, new drugs, pharmaceuticals and so forth, are very cost-effective, even though the cost of that drug, even at today's prices, because of all the regulations and, to a certain degree, because of the litigation that goes on, we are paying probably for more than we should pay for those drugs, it is still more cost-effective than a hospital stay or the alternative that people might have to confront.

So it is not just that. There are a lot of factors here. I do not think we want to leave the impression with the American people we want no regulations. All we want is reasonable regulations, and we cannot prove something is safe to 1 in 1 million or 1 in a billion. At some point we have to understand that there are some risks. Every morning when we get up in the morning, we take a certain amount of risk. When we get in our car, we take a certain amount of risk. Some of us fly home almost every weekend. We take a certain amount of risk.

I wanted to also share a story of some things I have learned here recently, for example, about the Department of Defense. I believe these numbers are correct, and this is all about all of regulations that, in part, we create, but, more importantly, are created by the various other Federal agencies.

But I am told we have working for the Department of Defense 106,000 people, now, you almost have to be sitting down to hear this, 106,000 people whose principle job it is to be buyers. In other words, they buy things for the Department of Defense, everything from toilet paper to F-16 fighters.

In fact, F-16 fighters are a good example. I think we have something like 1,646 people to buy one F-16 fighter. Now, we pretty much know what one looks like. We know what it is supposed to do. I understand there are certain specs. We have got to make certain the contractors are meeting those specs. But it is hard for me to believe we need 1,646 people to buy one F-16 a week.

Now, 106,000 buyers seems a bit exorbitant, at least it did to me. What bothered me even more, as a matter of fact, I think the story is bad but it gets worse, I am told they have over 200,000

managers to manage the 106,000 buyers. Largely, it is because we have this convoluted set of rules and regulations and regulations piled on top of regulations.

As a matter of fact, I have to tell this story. This morning I gave a talk to a group of electronics folks who were in town. One of them gave me this little circuit board. This circuit board, I guess, goes into an M-1 tank, and it helps to monitor the fuel supply in an M-1 tank. It is a very simple, and I am not an expert on circuit boards but I know just about enough to be dangerous, but this is a very simple circuit board. In fact, the gentleman told me it costs about \$3. But because of all the Federal regulations and all the hoops they have to go through, when they sell this circuit board, I think General Dynamics, they sell it for \$15.

He said the biggest reason is we have to deal with all the various rules and regulations of the Federal Government, the procurement process and everything that goes with it, and they have to certify, and now, this has a life cycle of about 20 years, but they have to certify at the end of 20 years that this will have no detrimental impact on the environment.

Now, this is going into a machine whose principal mission it is to destroy the environment, a tank; I mean, what it does is break things and destroy things, and yet this circuit board has to prove beyond any doubt that it will do no environmental damage, and, you know, again, I want to say that we want regulation. We need regulation, and there certainly is a role for the Federal Government to play, and I know that left to its own devices, the free markets will not take good care of our environment. I understand that.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. The point you make is well taken. The fact is that this U.S. Congress and this House and Senate will have to take those kinds of examples you just showed us with regard to what one circuit board for \$3, that we need to reexamine every single department. What we are talking about with sunset review might eliminate some useless jobs, some duplicating jobs, some positions that are really redundant.

We certainly need to make sure our defense is combat-ready and that our people have the technology and training that goes with having a job with the military, and we have the finest units in the world. There is no question about it.

But to have us spend \$12 extra for overregulation, environmental conditions that really not applicable, shows to me that the sunset review legislation would certainly be an idea whose time has come.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. I would say absolutely it is just indicative; I think it does tie together with this whole legislative branch appropriations.

I think we are showing that if we operate our House more efficiently and show how it can be done, if we begin to reduce the needless regulations that

the Federal Government has created over the years, and I sometimes do not like this term, if we begin to run the Government more like a business, maybe a better way to say it is we ought to say use more business principles and common sense in achieving some of the things the American people want us to do, I think, and I am an incurable optimist, I believe you can balance the budget. I believe you can make the Federal Government live within its means. I believe you can have reasonable regulations. I think you can have a strong economy.

I do not think these are mutually exclusive. It is just that it takes a little bit of common sense. I think that is what the American people want. That is what we promised, and, as I say, I think that is what we are delivering every day for the American people here in the 104th Congress, and it has been a privilege for me to be a part of it, and it has been a privilege for me to have been working with people like you, and I think we are making a difference, and this legislative branch appropriation is important tomorrow because it sends the right kind of signal.

It is going to demonstrate to the American people we can run the Congress on a much smaller budget. If we can do it in the House of Representatives, it can be done in Federal agencies all over. We can reduce the bureaucracy in the Department of Defense. We can have a strong national defense. We do not have to spend 70 percent more than we have to when we buy circuit boards, whether we are buying toilet paper, toilet seats. You know, the examples go on. Many times, though, those things happen because of all the regulations that we have piled onto the bureaucracy, and it is not just on the Federal Government. We are piling those kinds of regulations on the private sector as well.

So if we unleash some of those powers, use business principles, use common sense, I think we can balance the budget. We can have a clean environment. We can have safe drinking water. We can have new drugs and pharmaceuticals. We can have a growing industry in all kinds of fields. We can have all those things the American people want.

We do not have to sacrifice. We just have to have some common sense.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. What you stated is very much on point. The fact is what we need to do is have a new orientation. Your positive aspect I certainly applaud, and I think the enthusiasm is infectious.

Beyond that, what is even more important is the commonsense ideas, good business ideas. We can take a look at industry and say what have they done well. Frankly, business people have to balance the bottom line every day. If something is not working, is not profitable, they eliminate it. In the government, if it is not profitable we just send it onto the taxpayers, more taxes, more regulation, more waste,

and, the American people are tired of that. They want less waste, more accountability, less taxes, less wasteful spending, more direct service they need which the private sector cannot take care of themselves.

I am very happy tomorrow, you will you and I will be leading the charge, along with our colleagues here in the House, to make sure the kinds of changes fundamental to the running of the House, to downsizing, privatizing and consolidating will be the hallmark for the future on how we look to each Federal agency.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. I would only say in closing, I thank the gentleman for giving this opportunity to speak for a few moments here on the House floor, and some of our Members who may be watching back in their offices, that downsizing the Federal Government is a very difficult task, and I think as freshmen we are beginning to learn how difficult that can be, as the various groups come in and say, "Well, but do not cut this program, do not cut this program."

We can reduce the size of Government. We can reduce many of the things that the Government does without hurting people, and unfortunately sometimes the debate we hear is if you reduce this, it means people are going to get hurt.

One of the examples you used, and I just want to come back to it very briefly, you talked about in the private sector if something is not working and it is too expensive, it is downsized or eliminated. Unfortunately, what happens so often in the Federal Government, they do not downsize anything, do not eliminate anything, but come out with a new program and fund the old program at even larger scale. As a matter of fact, I think that is one of the reasons we have something like 160 different job training programs which are subsidized in whole or in part by the Federal Government, and we have been told by private consultants that most of those job training programs really do not work.

□ 2045

But the answer is never to eliminate any. It is to come out with more programs and prop up the ones that are not working, and I think we have to have the courage as we go forward to do what we are doing with the legislative branch appropriations, and that is to make real cuts, to make some of those tough decisions, and to force the use of technology and other ways to get more efficiency so that we can get more bang for the buck because again I think that is what the American people want, that is what they expect, and hopefully this is just one more example of our promises made and promises kept.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. I say to the gentleman from Minnesota, "Thank you, Congressman. I want to take this opportunity to thank you for participating in this colloquy and dialogue with the American people on how

to make sure the Federal Government, through the Congress, can be more accountable to the people and to make sure we stay openminded to hear new ideas from our constituents whether it be by town meetings, by letter, or by phone call. We certainly will be responsive as our colleagues have been in the past."

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate your indulgence in giving us this opportunity to speak out on some important issues of the day.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. UNDERWOOD of Guam (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today and the balance of the week, on account of personal business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

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

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

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GEPHARDT, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mrs. SEASTRAND, for 5 minutes, on June 21.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

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

Ms. HARMAN.

Mr. CLYBURN.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida.

Mr. MCDERMOTT.

Mr. GORDON.

Mr. BROWN of California.

Mr. SKELTON.

Mr. KLECZKA.

Mr. RAHALL.

Mr. NADLER.

Mr. MILLER of California.

Mr. PALLONE.

Mr. TOWNS.

Ms. SLAUGHTER.

Mr. DURBIN.

Mr. SKAGGS.

Mr. WILLIAMS.

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

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas in two instances.

Mr. LEWIS of California.

Mr. SHAW.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina.

Mr. ROTH.

Mr. FUNDERBURK.

Mr. QUILLEN.

Mr. HOUGHTON.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

Mrs. SMITH of Washington.

Mr. WAMP.

Mr. BRYANT of Tennessee.

Mr. GILLMOR.

Mr. PACKARD.

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

Mr. GUTKNECHT.

Ms. NORTON.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 46 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 21, 1995, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1074. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled, the "District of Columbia Emergency Highway Relief Act"; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GOSS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 170. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1686) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes (Rept. 104-147). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BLILEY: Committee on Commerce. H.R. 558. A bill to grant the consent of the Congress to the Texas Low-Level Radioactive Waste Disposal Compact (Rept. 104-148). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MYERS: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 1905. A bill making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes (Rept. 104-149). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Mr. CAMP):

H.R. 1889. A bill to encourage organ donation by enclosing information in income tax

refund check mailings; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. ESHOO (for herself, Mr. FARR, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. MINETA, Mr. MILLER of California, and Ms. LOFGREN):

H.R. 1890. A bill to establish a California Ocean Protection Zone, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HAMILTON:

H.R. 1891. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Ohio River Corridor Study Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. HOEKSTRA (for himself, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. EHRLICH, and Mr. GILLMOR):

H.R. 1892. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to clarify the requirements applicable to hearing aid compatible telephones in workplaces; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. HOUGHTON (for himself, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky, Mr. VOLKMER, and Mr. SHAW):

H.R. 1893. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude length of service awards to volunteers performing fire fighting or prevention services, emergency medical services, or ambulance services from the limitations applicable to certain deferred compensation plans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota:

H.R. 1894. A bill to amend title VIII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 regarding impact aid payments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

H.R. 1895. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, relating to a vehicle weight and longer combination vehicles exemption for Interstate routes 29 and 129 in Iowa; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

H.R. 1896. A bill to waive requirements mandating that States use the metric system in erecting highway signs and taking other actions relating to Federal-aid highway projects; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Science, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. LOFGREN (for herself and Mr. MOORHEAD):

H.R. 1897. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to assure immigration priority for unmarried sons and daughters of citizens of the United States over unmarried sons and daughters of permanent residents; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of California (for himself, Mr. FAZIO of California, Mr. MATSUI, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. LANTOS, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. FARR, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. TORRES, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. MINETA, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. WOOLSEY, Mr. PALLONE, and Mr. BEILENSON):

H.R. 1898. A bill to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to cease mineral leasing activity on submerged land of the Outer Continental Shelf that is adjacent to a coastal State that has declared a moratorium on such activity, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.