

there. Yet we cannot, have not been able to build on that to this point because we are caught up in this controversy of whether we build more dams. The issue seems to be portrayed that the construction of a dam is somehow antithetical or contrary to the environmental interests, and yet in this very case the construction of that particular dam, and I would submit in many cases I would believe, at least in this one, we would enhance all of the environmental uses in the region. This dam would ensure that there is enough water flow in the lower American River Parkway, a unique recreational resource in the State, a river flowing through the urban areas which is heavily utilized by rafters in the lower American River and by those walking alongside it to ensure the natural beauty. So fish are being killed right now, or they were for the 6-year drought that we had when the water levels dropped so low and the water became too warm for the fish and they died as a result. And any time when we have less than the normal supply of water, they will continue to die.

The reservoir at Folsom Lake was the most heavily utilized federally owned, State-managed recreation area in the State until the drought and the lake level dropped. And our county in San Joaquin County is heavily dependent on groundwater. They were induced by the Federal Government not to develop this additional source of water, but to defer that, and to become part of the Auburn Dam project. So the result has been that we have steadily been overpumping the groundwater, in many cases permanently damaging the aquifer because we do not have enough surface water.

So here is an example of where water development would actually enhance all of these environmental uses from fisheries to maintenance of the flows in the lower American, to recreation on the lower American and at the Folsom Lake, and of course, one of the most important environmental considerations in terms of quality of life for people is having an adequate supply of drinking water and water available for domestic and municipal uses, as this particular dam would surely do.

So I for one join in this special order just to add my belief that we have got to put people first. I think that was one of President Clinton's campaign themes, putting people first. We have to be good stewards of that which God has given us, including the land, and the water, and the air, and the resources, but we have to recognize that we need an intelligent, balanced, multiple-use approach which recognizes the priority of human beings over other concerns, while respecting those other concerns as we develop our policies so as not to damage or destroy them.

In the case of this particular dam, the water development actually furthers every interest, environmental as well as nonenvironmental, and it is my

belief that we are going to have to develop more water in the West, which is a naturally arid region, if we are to continue our progress. And I am not asking, by the way, nor am I advocating or even indicating I would support the idea that somehow we do this at Federal taxpayer expense.

□ 1520

I think the Reagan administration was right to suggest that these are areas of concern that are appropriate for State and local action, but obviously where the Federal Government has so much land and where the policies come in, it has to be a willing partner where we develop these resources. I think it is very important for the Nation, as we move ahead in these areas.

I thank the gentleman from Wyoming for the opportunity to discuss some of these issues.

Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for pointing out a particularly important area.

We do live in a dry area. We have, I guess, in Wyoming about 14 inches of annual precipitation. Someone there said that when the Lord had it rain 40 days and 40 nights, we got an inch-and-a-half.

So you have to have some kind of multiple-use program. We talked about that.

Let me comment on one area, and that is grazing. Obviously grazing is a major interest and concern in the West. I have already talked about the land patterns where you have to put together the private and the Federal lands in order to have units that work out very well.

Let me just make a couple of points about it. One is that we hear a lot about deterioration of the range. In my view, there is very little connection between the rate paid on grazing fees and the condition of the range. Those two things are separate issues, and you can argue about them separately.

But you manage the range on the one hand, and you charge for it on the other.

The other difficult part, you know, it blends its way all the way through this that we have been talking about, that it is difficult for people in the East to have quite a different thing. They have lots of water. They have no public lands to really understand the differences.

One of them is the difference in the value of forage in an acre of land in Wyoming and one that you might lease in Maryland. It is not unusual in some of those ranges to have 30 acres per cow, per calf unit, because it is not productive land. It takes a long-legged cow to be able to keep on the move to get enough to eat sometimes.

So these are the kinds of things we have to deal with. And, of course, in recent years when every year we go through this annual ritual of trying to decide what the price ought to be and

the certainty goes away, it is very difficult to keep available the value of the base land.

So I want to thank my colleagues for the contributions they have made in the various areas of multiple use. I think it is a terribly important issue that we need to come to grips with, and we do it every year.

We have tried to make the point that decisions made about our Federal land resources go far beyond the boundaries of national parks and forests, monuments and refuges. They affect tax base, they affect schools, they affect jobs, they affect small communities and towns and businesses and banks, and it is important to manage these lands for their resources, but also for the multiple-use kind of returning renewable resources that are there.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the time and the opportunity.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MORELLA] is recognized for 60 minutes.

[Mr. MORELLA 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 California [Mr. DOOLITTLE] is recognized for 60 minutes.

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

BUDGET AND APPROPRIATIONS REDUCTION PROPOSALS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. TAYLOR] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, today a number of us would like to talk about a very relevant subject. Most of the people in our audience may or may not know that the \$1.5 trillion budget is put together by 13 budget bills, 13 bills that go through 13 appropriations subcommittees and come forth then in this body at the end as one full appropriations bill.

We are beginning that process now, and tomorrow the first of those committees will be reporting the legislative branch, the branch that oversees Congress, almost \$2 billion of cost. I serve on that subcommittee and on the Committee on Appropriations and would like to tell briefly what we are trying to do.

We have offered up through the process a recommendation for cuts of up to 25 percent. Now, the cuts will be surgical cuts, not across-the-board cuts. They will be cuts where we have tried to think through what we are doing with those cuts and how it impacts this body.

We all know that it is imperative that cuts be made. I have sat in this

House, now my second term, and I have watched while major corporations have reduced their employment and reduced jobs in my district and all over this country because they have had to cut costs, but government has not cut.

I have looked at small business that has had to take steps to cut their employees, to cut expenses because of the onerous numbers of regulations and additional costs they are having to face while government has cut almost none at all. I have watched throughout small communities local governments having to struggle with cuts while they are being forced to accept more and more mandates from the Federal Government and pick up the costs from those mandates.

The President ran a year ago on the basis of change, and many people interpreted that statement of change as being one where we would now come and ask major government, the Federal Government, the Federal bureaucracy, to start contracting, and for government to make changes and make cuts. That has not been the case so far. The packages that have come before us, the so-called jobs bill, presented \$16 billion of additional spending to this body with no revenue covering it.

The Senate wisely took out over \$12 billion of those spending increases. The tax package that came through offered some cuts, but it was primarily a tax-increase bill, and even during the talks of compromise in the Senate now on that legislation, the tax increases are still going to be four or five to one, and the cuts will still be put toward the end of the President's term, and we know what that means. They rarely ever happen.

So we must today make change, make time for that change, and address these budget bills one by one as they come before us in the next 6 weeks.

We are starting with the legislative branch subcommittee. It is important for us to start there, not because it has the most money, not because it will make the most impact on the deficit, but, ladies and gentlemen, it sets the standard for the other areas of government, sets the standard because the legislative branch will be watched. If we make significant cuts, if we look toward reforming government and cutting our budget, then we will set the standard for the other 12 subcommittees and the other larger branches of government that will, indeed, give us the billions of dollars of savings that are going to be necessary.

We are recommending a 25-percent cut. It is a sizable cut, certainly, but it is not one without background.

Several people will speak today and will address different segments of that cut.

But what we have tried to do and what we have proposed to the subcommittee was that we need to really change in this Government. We need to look forward. We have numerous duplicative agencies, branches, committees, organizations. We have, for instance, if one wants information in taxation and economic matters, one can go to the

CRS that has 875 employees, one can go to the Congressional Budget Office that has hundreds of employees, one can go to the Government Accounting Office and ask for a study that has thousands of employees, one can go to the Joint Economic Committee and ask for a study, one can go to the staff on the Committee on the Budget and ask for that, one can go to the staff on the Committee on Ways and Means and ask for that one, one can go to the Senate Finance Committee for their staff and ask for that, one can go to the Committee on the Budget in the Senate and ask for that, one can go to the Office of Management and Budget on the administrative side with its thousands of employees and get responses in each of those areas.

Now, while there are people with expertise in all of these branches, they duplicate, and they cost hundreds of millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money. And, ladies and gentlemen, we cannot afford that duplication today when we are asking millions of people across this country to sacrifice.

And so we are recommending a consolidation of those forces. We are making a recommendation of a consolidation of the legal staff, the plethora of attorneys that represent committees and subcommittees and various branches of the Government. We are asking that we look toward a pool in that area that will give us adequate legal advice but not the numbers and the costs that we now have.

□ 1530

In many ways we are trying to put together cuts. We will be talking about some of those as they affect the legislative branch appropriations which will yield us a 25-percent cut that will then give us a chance to go to all of the other 12 subcommittees and say, "This branch has sacrificed. It is now time for you to sacrifice also." Then I think we can gain the budget confidence to make real budget reductions in this House of Representatives and in this Congress.

That is essential, I think, because we only have a few years to attack this problem and to bring about those cuts.

I yield at this time, Mr. Speaker, to an outstanding Member of this body who has been leading in the area of cuts and who has just been before the Committee on Rules to get the rule and to plead for a rule for the debate tomorrow that will allow the amendment to place that 25-percent cut on the floor.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much and commend my colleague for the leadership he has shown on this important subcommittee.

Mr. Speaker, it is possible for us to reduce Government spending. And certainly the gentleman has suggested the place that we ought to begin is cutting in the spending on Congress itself.

All of us receive a great deal of mail, telegrams, phone calls from our constituents. We go home and meet with

them and ask what their concerns are and what they would like us to accomplish in Washington.

I dare say not a single Democrat nor a single Republican Representative in the House has ever been lobbied, cajoled, urged by any one of his constituents to spend more money on himself or herself, to spend more money on Congress and congressional staff. That just has not happened.

There is no lobby for this in America except Members of Congress themselves. Not every Member is a supporter or sponsor of increased and ever-growing congressional spending by itself, and yet because of inattention, because of lack of aggressiveness in trying to cut, we have been on autopilot. This spending has grown and grown and grown over the years.

Back when F.D.R. and Harry Truman won World War II, Congress declared war and won the victory and Harry Truman moved on to the Korean war, the number of committee employees in this Congress was 193. One hundred and ninety-three people got the job done back in 1947.

Since that time, committee staff has grown at a rate six times that of inflation. The legislative branch appropriations increased by 3,540 percent during that period.

At the same time, inflation was 569 percent; we had a 3,540-percent increase in the amount that Congress spends on itself.

There is no excuse for the fact that today, to take care of 535 Members of Congress, 435 in the House and another 100 in the Senate, we have over \$1,000 staff employees. There is no excuse for the fact that it costs roughly \$2.4 billion to run the Congress of the United States, nearly \$2 billion to run the House itself.

There is just no excuse.

A big part of our congressional budget is devoted not only to committee staff but also to congressional agencies. That is, rivals to the executive branch departments, which under our system of separation of powers are set up to carry out the dictates of law; congressional agencies created to rival these departments, such as the Congressional Budget Office, such as the General Accounting Office.

Let us take a look at GAO's budget. In 1960 this one part of congressional staff cost \$204 million. By 1985 that had grown to \$299 million; in 1988 it was \$330 million; in 1989, \$346 million.

The average increase between 1960 and 1990 was 8 percent per year.

The next year, in 1991, we had a 14-percent increase. So that the total budget was \$409 million. Nineteen ninety-two, another 8-percent increase, \$443 million, virtually all of this for staff. In 1993 our budget was \$485 million, and we are going to hang right in around that number for fiscal year 1994 if things are not fixed, if things are not changed.

So part of our amendment would reduce the budget for this one part of our

congressional staff to one-third of a billion dollars per year. Now I am quite confident that this agency, which was begun in 1929 to look after, ironically, government waste, could do a fine job of it for one-third of a billion dollars per year.

That happens to be roughly the amount that Price Waterhouse spends on all of their outside audits for all of their private clients in a year.

Now Price Waterhouse has over 9,000 professionals and 110 offices. They could do this job for us, unquestionably, at much lower cost.

Much of what goes at GAO, General Accounting Office, is accomplished at the behest, and to say, of committee Chairs, people in this Congress who know the results they want in advance and who in fact dictate that result to GAO; not so much because they control the way GAO puts the staff report together but because they control the design of the inquiry.

Back in 1969, not very long ago compared to the time that GAO has been operating—when it was founded in 1921—back in 1969, as recently as that year, only 10 percent of GAO's reports were initiated by Members of the Congress. By 1980 that had increased to more than a third of all the reports handled by GAO.

By 1985 more than half, 57 percent of all the reports that GAO, this watchdog agency that is supposed to be keeping an eye on things, did were dictated by this Congress. And in 1991 that number had risen to 80 percent.

So this is the result of increasing funding. We spend more money on staff and Congress in essence co-opts that staff and uses it as its own. This is not trimming government waste; it is itself a source of government waste, now about half a billion dollars when it could operate for one-third of a billion.

I would like to yield back to the gentleman additional time so that my colleague, so that he can discuss further why it is that we feel it is so important that President Clinton's campaign promise to cut 25 percent of the legislative branch spending be honored. It is going to require action by the House and by the Senate. The President cannot force this. We have got to do it ourselves. But it is vitally important that we cut away some of the fat in our own staffing here. We could do a much, much better job than we do of legislating if most Members paid attention to the laws we drafted, if you did not see this unseemly procedure so often when a bill comes to the floor of the House that nobody has had the opportunity to read, it is over a thousand pages, might be billions or hundreds of billions of dollars, all of this has been accomplished by staff members. They have no idea what they are voting on, and the American people are worse off for it.

We could improve the legislative product and process by cutting money and saving money for the taxpayers. This is an opportunity not to be missed. Let us help President Clinton

keep his campaign promise. I say let us get on with it.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. I thank the gentleman, Congressman COX. I appreciate the work that he has done and his insight. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TOKILSEN], who has worked as a Member of the freshman class on cutting costs.

Mr. TOKILSEN. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, the entire issue of congressional reform is very important to all of us. As a freshman, as a new Member here, I joined with my colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle and with Congresswoman TILLY FOWLER of Florida we formed a Congressional Reform Task Force. We have been meeting almost on a weekly basis since the year began and talking about a number of issues.

We have a plan for 19 specific reforms of the way the House operates, as well as just today we released our plan for congressional campaign finance reform.

I want to focus on those areas, those parts of the freshman Republican reform package which directly contribute and support the gentleman from North Carolina's remarks about why we need to and why we should cut a total of 25 percent from legislative appropriations.

There are a number of areas that the Republican freshman task force recommended. First off, we also endorsed the 25-percent total reduction in committee budgets. We did not say that every committee had to have a 25-percent cut, as long as the cuts combined would equal 25 percent.

□ 1540

We wanted to show the American people that we know cuts have to be made. Cutting spending is more than just a slogan. We thought it was only fair and appropriate that the cuts start right here in the U.S. Congress. So we recommended a 25-percent total reduction in committee spending.

In addition to that, we recommended a 25-percent cut in the franking allowance, the account by which all Members send out free mail.

With that, we also wanted to ask for automatic disclosure of monthly franking reports. That is an amendment that we will be trying to propose to the appropriations bill tomorrow. We hope we receive the approval of the Rules Committee to offer that amendment, and to require that we think is very important as well.

We want to return any savings of the debt to the Treasury for reduction of the Federal debt.

Also importantly, we want to reduce the amount of money we spend on former Speakers of the House. Right now that is a substantial amount of money that we spend, even after a Speaker of the House has retired 5, 10, 15 years later, we are still spending

money on that individual, supposedly for him to complete his business.

We recommended 3 years. We understand that a compromise version of 5 years will be offered. We think as long as we can draw the line and say we are going to stop spending, that is the best thing to do.

But the freshmen Republicans stand committed to reductions in spending. We think those spending cuts have to spend here first.

Again I commend the gentleman from North Carolina for leading this effort, as well as all the other Members who have worked on it, because it really is a role where many Members have added their voices and their time.

Once again, I would like to thank the gentleman for yielding to me. This is an extremely important issue and the more the American people stand about it, I think the better off we are all going to be.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts.

I appreciate the efforts the freshman class has made. There are many Members from the freshman class that were elected to come here to make change, real change, change that is going to be hard to do and it needs to start in this body and with the congressional budget, and I appreciate the efforts of the gentleman in that area.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COBLE]. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COBLE] has been a fiscally conservative Member of this body for a number of years, but is especially interested in cutting this 25 percent, the cuts in the legislative body this year, as a real chance for us to make change in our budgeting process.

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from western North Carolina for having yielded to me.

I say to the gentleman from North Carolina, I had not planned to participate in this special order. I just saw the gentleman on television. I came running over here because this is very much of interest to me.

I introduced a bill, and I am sure the gentleman is familiar with it, which I appropriately called the triple play bill, just on the eve of the opening of the baseball season.

I would like to touch on a couple of those and emphasize specifically where the gentleman from North Carolina is coming from as far as the legislative cutback is concerned.

My three-pronged bill addresses former Presidents' pensions, for one. It would change the eligibility of former Presidents to claim their pensions thusly.

Now as the gentleman knows, when a President leaves the White House, the next day he starts drawing his Presidential pension. I have provided a remedy to that. My bill would delay the eligibility of the President to claim that pension until he reaches, he or she reaches the prevailing Social Security

age. I do not think that is unfair nor unreasonable.

Now, President Clinton if he were to serve one term would collect \$2.2 million from the time he left the White House until the time he reaches the prevailing Social Security age, clearly not right.

Another portion of my triple play bill addresses Secret Service protection to the former Presidents eternally. I can appreciate a transition period of perhaps a year, but at some point it seems to me that the former Presidents and their spouses ought to be able to blend into the woodwork without the benefit of Social Security Secret Service protection at the expense of taxpayers.

Finally, I say to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. TAYLOR] getting down to where the gentleman is today legislatively, I am concerned about the Speaker's benefits, the former Speakers who leave that podium, go into private life. They appear to become beneficiaries eternally of the Speaker's perks; that is, office supplies, office space, secretarial assistants. I think clearly this is abusive.

I am not blaming the former Speakers personally, but it is just another trap into which we fall around here and let the taxpayer worry about paying the fiddler when it comes time to pay the fiddler.

I think what the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. TAYLOR] is directing toward this legislative expenditure package is well overdue. I commend the gentleman for having done it.

I think probably echoing what the gentleman has already said, because I have not been here on the floor from the outset, but I do not think the gentleman from North Carolina nor am I being unduly critical of the legislative branch.

We are not saying they have to dismantle and cease operating tomorrow. We are not suggesting that at all.

I think what the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. TAYLOR] is saying is let us make some sort of parameters whereby we can all live reasonably.

Let us address a question finally, is it good for the public? Will it benefit Americans at large, or is it in some self-serving way only benefitting those of us in this Chamber? It is time that we direct attention to it.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from North Carolina for having taken a lead role generally as a Member of this 103d Congress, and specifically as a member of the Appropriations Committee.

I thank the gentleman for having yielded to me.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the work that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COBLE] has done in past years in fiscally responsibly moving toward cuts in the budget.

As the gentleman pointed out, we have all had to make sacrifices. Those of us who find our family budgets have to be cut, we have to sit back and set

priorities and then go with the amount of money we have. Businesses we find have had to make those same cuts, and many times in communities it costs employees, it costs jobs, it costs the economy, but they have to do it to remain solvent.

Now, we are asking in this body today that we make the same cuts. The administration has come to the people of this country and said, "We want to cut Social Security benefits from Social Security recipients. We want to take that money, which is paid from employee withholding taxes, a special tax for the Social Security fund, we want to take those funds out of that special trust fund and over to the general fund to pay for more spending."

We are taxing Social Security benefits for that purpose, and you, the elderly, the administration is saying, should make that sacrifice.

They go on to say to Federal employees, "We want you to take COLA cuts, cost-of-living cuts. We want you to take the money the retired money that you have to live on, we want to be able to cut that. We want you to make that sacrifice."

Those are significant sacrifices when you consider the overall budget of the average Social Security recipient or the average Federal retired employee.

Social Security recipients will be asked to pay on something around \$25,000 to \$30,000 in income, to pay a tax of 85 percent of their benefits.

We are also telling small business that we are going to in the tax package the administration passed through this House and is now over in the Senate, that we want to increase taxes on small business significantly, not to mention the number of regulations that are coming.

We said to the average person, middle class and lower income individuals, for that matter, "We want you to sacrifice and pay higher fuel taxes, gasoline taxes, Btu taxes and the like and everything else and all the inflation that follows the increase in those fuel taxes, we want you to sacrifice and make that sacrifice for this country."

Then we as a Congress report out a bill from the subcommittee and the full Committee on Appropriations that says we do not think we ought to make any cuts. We will trim around the edge here. Some of us were successful in getting a few things through, but it is less than 1 percent that this body will be sacrificing, and when you really shake it out probably is not making any cuts in the legislative body.

What we are saying today is if you are going to ask the elderly to sacrifice, if you are going to ask the average individual to sacrifice and small business to sacrifice and Federal employees to sacrifice and everyone else to sacrifice, then we should make a meaningful cut in the legislative budget, of nearly \$2 billion in order to send a message that we are sharing the sacrifice and that is what a lot of this is all about.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize other distinguished Members who have worked toward cutting. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] has worked specifically trying to reduce spending in areas of former Speakers, and that amounts to several hundred thousand dollars, and it is hard to justify in the long term.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS].

□ 1550

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Carolina for yielding to me, and I very much appreciate his taking this time to make it clear that a very serious effort is, in fact, ongoing right now as we speak in the Committee on Rules to try and come up with innovative ways to cut our spending basically as it deals with the legislative appropriations bill; that is, the money we use to support the House of Representatives because it is in that area that we have had so much concern expressed from our constituents: Are we using the money wisely? Are we getting it on target? Is there redundancy? Are we spending it on the very highest priorities when there are so many needs for competing needs for dollars? Could we do other things better by privatizing rather than have general support?

Mr. Speaker, these are very valid questions, and we have had some extremely creative amendments offered to the Committee on Rules, which they will take under advisement for possibly making in order when this legislation comes to the House floor which I believe could be as early as tomorrow. Many of the amendments get right to the franking privilege. I think it is well understood that there is some abuse there, and I think it is well understood among the constituency that there is some overuse as well. The rules are extremely generous with the use of the frank; that is, free public mailing, and I think that there has been a fair amount of hue and cry across the land to bring that under control.

We have talked about whether or not our legislative service organizations are properly the best use of taxpayers' dollars these days and are those dollars being properly spent at this time when it is something like 20 percent of the funds that have been used for those purposes over the last 10 years and apparently have not been properly accounted for. That does not mean they have been mispent. It just means they have not been properly accounted for. We do not know exactly what has happened. Mr. Speaker, that is pretty sloppy oversight from a House of Representatives that has two responsibilities. One is legislation, and the other is oversight, and, if we are not getting the oversight done, we are not doing our job, and I do not know who would want to support a legislative appropriations bill that clearly has problems in oversight in the way the money is spent. It seems to me that that would

be a bill killer if we do not sort that out.

The specialty that I have been working on, as the gentleman from Carolina well knows, is the former Speaker's bill, and we have made a request that that amendment be made in order because the taxpayers are now spending perhaps three-quarters of a million dollars every year to support three former Speakers' public offices, staff of three, office support and franking privileges, and the stated purpose of the law that allows for those moneys to be spent that way was for these former Speakers to be able to administer, settle, and conclude their business as former Speaker.

Now clearly even the most slow-going pace would suggest that that job could be done in a few years, and we are trying to make an amendment so that, instead of perpetuating the former Speakers' activities, we are now terminating them after a decent period of time for wind-down, and we are, thereby, going to save the taxpayers a fair amount of money.

This is somewhat symbolic. What it means is the U.S. Congress is listening to the people out there, saying, "You're right. We are taking better care of ourselves than we are of the people we represent in a number of instances, and we need to stop doing that, and pay attention to the people we work for, and say, 'You're right; we are going to get better use out of precious tax dollars."

Mr. Speaker, that is what this process is about in the Committee on Rules. I hope we are able to make that abundance of amendments in order so that these debates will come out of the Committee on Rules and will come out here to the well of the House, the people's House, for all to see, for all to debate, for all to be persuaded to, and for all to listen to and for all to have their input, and I thank the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. TAYLOR] for having yielded to me.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker; I thank the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] for his efforts in this area, and, as he mentioned, the Speakers' dollars we are talking about are three-quarters of a million dollars. Now that is a lot of money to the average taxpayer. It is not a lot in this budget. But it says volumes if we cannot make this kind of cut, if we cannot show that this expenditure that we are still paying for, a staff of a Speaker who was last here 16 years ago, for instance, that he has not wrapped up his business, and all those Speakers that have served in the past, then how can we ask people in this country to make real major sacrifices if we cannot make that one, and I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield for just an instant, I would point out that of the three former Speakers, two have been retired for a lot longer than they served in the Speaker's chair, and they are, therefore, getting these benefits in a very

great disproportion, and one has been retired now for about 8 years, I believe, and served not quite the same amount of time, maybe 10 years, so is coming up on the anniversary date of equalizing.

What all this means, however, is: What are the funds being used for, and the funds are not being used by the former Speakers for the legislative purpose that the funds were set aside for, and the funds are not being used by the former Speakers for the legislative purpose that the funds were set aside for.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. It is difficult to imagine anyone still has legislative business to carry on after 16 years.

Mr. GOSS. That is right.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. The gentleman has pointed out privately also many times we are not talking about the retirement of these individuals, or health care or other benefits that they get as part of a retirement package. We are talking about staff and the accompaniments of that staff, that sort of cost, not the individual's retirement or personal things.

Mr. GOSS. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. TAYLOR] is absolutely correct. These former Speakers are wonderful, distinguished Members of this institution who have done great service for this Nation, but the legislation is being abused, and it needs to be corrected. That is what the amendment is about.

But I am satisfied that these gentlemen are well provided for in terms of their pension benefits, their retirement and their health benefits.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and I now yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. DOOLITTLE] who has taken an outstanding stand many times for fiscal conservatism and would like to speak on this matter today.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, I very much thank the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. TAYLOR] for his leadership.

As my colleagues know, one of the frustrating things to me that I have felt keenly for the past several months is we hear speeches by the President and members of his administration telling us we all need to have shared sacrifice, and I do not necessarily disagree with that ultimately. I think we all, as the American people, are going to have to pull together and do what it takes to put our Republic, once again, on a firm fiscal footing.

I guess what so deeply troubles me is that the rhetoric of shared sacrifice is always directed to the sacrifice of the American taxpayer and never to the sacrifice of the government. The government does not need to sacrifice what those individuals claim. In fact, the role of government is so important that, far from sacrificing, it needs to be augmented, it needs to be expanded, and for that purpose vast new tax increases on the middle class and on ev-

eryone are being proposed in order to fund an expanded government.

Mr. Speaker, government needs to go on a diet like most Americans. I suppose we all could benefit from shedding a few pounds, and the government needs to shed a few pounds; that is, a few expenditures it is presently making.

The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. TAYLOR] has taken leadership in trying to have us do just that beginning with the branch that we most are directly associated with, the legislative branch.

I was not here for the beginning of this special order, but I very much join in the remarks of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS]. I mean it is absurd that we have in essence unlimited funds being provided to three former Speakers of the House to wind up their affairs. This is not to denigrate these men who have served. But if we are going to identify areas where economies can be made, in my opinion this expenditure never should have been made in the first place, but now that we have got it, we should certainly terminate it, and that is just, as my colleagues know, one little area.

The Republican leaders' plan, which I endorse, and this was a plan indicating how the world would be different in terms of running the House of Representatives if the Republicans ever ran it, but that plan calls for a 50-percent reduction in the staffs on the committees. I am very concerned about big government, as I think most Americans are. The bigger the government gets, the more laws and regulations we have to have in order to justify all of its employees. We see this very clearly.

In fact, the gentleman from North Carolina, the sponsor of this special order today, has wisely coauthored a bill which I am very proud to be a co-sponsor of that goes directly to the heart of that issue by requiring that, before any administrative regulation proposed by an administrative agency can take effect, it must be actually voted upon here in the Congress of the United States.

□ 1600

Believe me, Mr. Speaker, that would do more than just about any other practical thing we could do to reduce substantially the promotion or the promulgation of new regulations.

We are, after all, the legislative body of the country, created by the Founders and the drafters of the U.S. Constitution. But in practical effect today for years we have been passing very broad laws and leaving the details to someone else, that is, the administrative agencies.

As someone once said, the devil is in the details. It really is. That is where the specifics actually are provided that institute the new burdens on businesses and individuals.

So, you know, I commend the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. TAYLOR] for that effort. As we debate this

bill or concept that the gentleman has discussed that would reduce the expenditures of the legislative branch of Government, I think it is very appropriate.

I am convinced we would not only see no reduction in the quality of legislation if we cut these committee staffs by 50 percent, I would represent that the more staff we reduce overall in the House of Representatives, and the Senate, to a certain level, the more we reduce, the better the quality of the legislative product. Because all of a sudden the men and women elected by the people of the United States to come here and serve would give more of their personal attention to these issues. If they cannot read the thousand-page bill, if they cannot be bothered with the details, then there will not be any bill. That is the approach we need to be taking.

We need, as representatives of the people, to be able to digest it, to understand it, and to act upon it, rather than simply just kind of putting it on automatic pilot and letting it go out to the administrative agencies.

The size of this legislative budget and the staff that this budget supports is what makes all of those things possible.

So the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. TAYLOR], by proposing these reductions, is not only saving the taxpayers money, which is vital in this time of fiscal crisis, but he is also going to be giving us better government, more effective government, more bang for the buck.

Sure, we want certain things taken care of by government. Well, let us see that they are taken care of. Let us get a healthier economy. Let us increase job opportunities. Let us increase opportunities for people to better themselves financially.

In order to do that, we have to have smaller Government. In order to do that, why, we have to take some of these measures being advocated by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. TAYLOR].

So I am very pleased to be here today and join in this special order, and thank the gentleman for the opportunity.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. DOOLITTLE]. The gentleman has been a leader in fiscal conservative motions in the past, and I appreciate his efforts today.

Let me just review for a moment for the gentleman and others who may be on the floor that are interested, because the people are often confused with the various bills coming through.

In the first part of the year we debated on this floor a budget bill. The budget is a blueprint. It may be ignored by the appropriating process and it may be ignored by the administration in many cases, although with the majority party being the same party in the White House, it pretty much was in

synchronization this time. But it is not the standard that this body goes by.

After we propose a budget and pass a budget as a blueprint we vary from it in great detail.

We have also had a so-called stimulus package that was brought before the Congress where the President asked for \$16 billion of new expenditures, all of it to be added to the deficit. None of it was paid for. This House passed it. I voted against it. I daresay the gentlemen on the floor with me voted against it.

It went to the Senate. It was cut by \$12 billion because it was recognized as pretty much a pork spending piece of legislation to pay off political debts.

But you have had the budget, the so-called stimulus package, and then recently we had the budget package that proposed tax increases and some budget cuts.

As it passed this House and left this House some 2 weeks ago it had something like \$8 of taxes for approximately \$1 in spending cuts. Those spending cuts were set at the very back of the President's term. We have seen that so many times, where we get the taxes retroactive to the first of January when it left this House, and the spending cuts never come.

So we have had the budget proposal that has been debated, which is a blueprint, the so-called stimulus bill, which was \$16 billion of spending with no coverage, which was trimmed to \$4 billion in the Senate, and the tax package, which called for almost \$275 billion in new taxes and something around \$40 or \$50 billion in cuts.

Now we get to the appropriations process. This is really the \$1½ trillion that we appropriate in this country. We do it in a manner with 13 budget bills. We have 13 subcommittees and 13 bills.

The Legislative Branch Subcommittee will be reporting on the floor tomorrow and that will be the first budget bill we will be taking up. That is why we are here today, to tell the public what is in that legislation now as it has been reported from the committee, to tell you what we think ought to be done and how this bill ought to be amended, and hope that we will get a chance on this floor as Members, many Members, to both debate the amendments we would like to put forward and to have a vote on those amendments for reducing the legislative budget some 25 percent. This would not be across the board, but in selective cuts, and we are talking about those selective cuts today.

Having said that, I would like to recognize a freshman Member of this Congress who has been a leader in the budget cutting process, who just today went before the House Rules Committee arguing for a cut, to cut this legislative branch budget by 25 percent, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. DICKEY].

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to say that when I was campaigning, gosh, it was this time last year, that I saw these shows on television on C-SPAN and I saw the empty seats, and I thought, "Well, I am never going to do that." And now here I am.

But I want to explain to people that, first of all, there are people in the gallery. I am talking to you all, too, because we are all citizens here.

But this thing is that important. What we have as an opportunity tomorrow is going to be monumental as far as the people of America are concerned as it relates to spending cuts.

I get in my office tons and tons of communications on spending cuts first, taxes later. We cannot have a replay of what we had in 1990. There is no reason for us to think that we can tax our way into prosperity. No nation has ever done it. I get that time and time again.

Now, what has come before us in this House, or what might come before us, depending on this rules decision, is the opportunity for us to take leadership in this body among the committees and in our personal office operations to cut expenses by 25 percent.

Now, when you hear that being said, what we are talking about is we take what was last year's expenses and we just knock 25 percent off. We are not doing it all the way across the board, which was my approach at first. But we have kind of gotten a bunch of people together and we are doing it selectively so we are fixing those things that are duplication services and are not necessary, and we are saying zero to those, and others we are keeping at 100 percent.

But the bottom line is 25 percent would be cut from this budget, from the budget of the House of Representatives, for the coming year.

Now, what this means is a certain amount of dollars, and you have heard people mention that. But more than that it is going to be an element of leadership.

I want to tell a little story from a man in Arkansas about a man named Sam Walton. He built the largest, most successful retail operation in the world on the basis that he did it first, that he did everything that there was. He fixed bicycles, he waited on customers, he put the inventory in his shop, and he learned it. And his employees knew that Mr. Sam would do it if they did not do it.

Now, what we do in this Congress is we sit up here and we say okay, we are going to have some cuts because that is what you all want. But we are going to have it cut from every other area except our own.

We cannot answer the question as to why in the world we are not cutting our own expenses when we face the American people. We can answer it around here when we are talking to colleagues and we are talking this fraternity talk that goes on here, and we can say that is not wise. But when someone says we cannot cut the ex-

penses up here in Congress by 25 percent, ask them why.

□ 1610

They may say, well, it is better that we cut 14 percent, it is better that we cut 5 percent. Ask them, for whom is it better? And that is what we have now.

Mr. Sam's example, do it yourself first and that is leadership. If we are going to have shared sacrifice, let us do it from the top down. And that is what is behind this rules bill that is going to come up.

If we vote on it tomorrow, it is going to be a great day. That is why I take this time here to talk to an empty Chamber, but I know it is not empty out there in America, because you all are crying for us to do what is right.

I want to say, the legislative branch has in its greed increased its spending by 5 percent every year for 15 years. So if we do nothing, we are going to be increasing, because of the appetite that is here. It is like a carnivorous plant. It just keeps growing and building and growing and building. And because of it, we have so many excesses.

Our President, my former Governor and now our President, supports efforts to make "meaningful congressional spending reductions." That is what he says, and I think we can follow that. We need to do this, as I said, so that we can say to the American people, yes, we will sacrifice and, yes, we will give the leadership.

What I am not convinced of is that these people here who are voting against this bill or who might vote against it think there is a life after spending cuts. I cannot imagine what we would do if our Nation operated like we operate here, where we have got this fear or neurosis about spending cuts and what might follow.

So what I am saying is, I am looking forward to the debate tomorrow, if we can have it. If we cannot have the debate, the debate on whether or not the American people will get the 25-percent cut, leadership out of this body, I am hopeful that if we do, you will understand that we are doing it for you, the American people.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota). The Chair will note that, being charged with the responsibility of preserving decorum in the debate of this body, the Chair would remind all Members that under the rules and precedents of the House, it is not in order to direct remarks in debate to persons viewing the proceedings in the galleries or on television or even to other Members who, not being present in the Chamber, might be viewing the proceedings on television.

All remarks should be addressed to the Chair.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the remarks of the gentleman. I think they were from

the heart, and I think he was speaking from his experience in this body, both now in his time of service and his practical experience before coming here.

One of the things the selective cutting of this body allows us to do, it allows us to keep the funds available for Members who do service in their district. It is only about 20 percent of the dollars in the total congressional budget that go to what could be called a specific congressional service to the public. And we know that need is out there.

We all know that in our congressional offices, we are working every day to help small business people, to help clear up snafus in the bureaucracy.

The dollars that would be available to help those people are still there. We are not cutting other services, like the services for the blind in the congressional Library of Congress, which is under our budget.

We are leaving those funded, 100 percent. We are leaving funded the dollars that are there for the Library of Congress that conducts exchanges with local libraries. In fact, we would like to see in the future us to be able to further transmit the knowledge collected in the Library of Congress out into our local communities so that we can further enrich those communities. These dollars are left in place.

As the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. DICKEY], who just spoke, we are, however, making substantial cuts in duplicative services, in numerous committees, in the small fiefdoms that are often built up and duplicated around the some 117 subcommittees, the 23 committees, and the 5 joint committees. And so what we want to do is to work toward modernizing this process, not destroy this process, but making this trimming a budget and leading an example in that way.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to a former member of the Gang of 7, an outstanding Congressman in this body who has worked toward fiscal responsibility, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOEHNER].

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. TAYLOR]. I want to thank him for yielding to me and commend him for his efforts on the Subcommittee on Legislative of the Committee on Appropriations and his effort to cut that budget by some 25 percent.

In the case of myself, I have been to the Committee on Rules just today offering 2 amendments that I would like to be made in order tomorrow, as we consider the legislative appropriations bill.

The one change that I would like to suggest is with regard to the Architect of the Capitol.

Currently, this body appropriates money for the Architect, who is charged with the responsibility of maintaining the buildings here in the Capitol. Those moneys that are expended to the Architect's Office do not

show up in the Clerk of the House Report, do not show up in the Senate reports, and I, as one Member of this body, would like to know how those funds are expended.

So I suggested in my amendment that all of the funds appropriated by the House to the Architect's Office, in fact, show up in the quarterly report from the Clerk.

The second amendment that I have in front of the Committee on Rules that I hope they will make in order tomorrow deals with unsolicited mailings, deals with the congressional frank.

The Congress, this past year, spent \$34 million in free postage for Members to send mail throughout their districts. I believe that this number can continue to be cut, and I expect to support several amendments that will be offered tomorrow to reduce that amount of money.

The fact is that my office, we answered all of the letters we received from our district. We did no mass mailings. We spent about 7.5 percent of our budget or about \$14,000 in 1992 and about \$14,000 in 1991. That is out of a budget of approximately \$170,000. I believe that we can continue to make dramatic progress in reducing the amount of franked mail that goes out of this body.

I think the frank goes back to the first Congress, some 200 years ago, when Members did not have the ability to communicate very well with their constituents. And over these 200 years, our ability as Members of Congress to communicate with our constituents has increased dramatically, even in the last 10 years, whether it is local newspapers, whether it is cable television, whether it is radio, and I do not think that Congress needs to spend this vast sum of money sending out newsletters and other types of mass mailings.

I would also like to say that I intend to support the amendment of the gentleman from Washington [Ms. DUNN], if it is made in order tomorrow, for a 25 percent cut in committee staffs, both statutory and their investigative staffs.

I think the exponential growth of committee staff here in the Congress has been too much, and it is time that we head in another direction.

As I said earlier, the amendment of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS], to cut \$10 million in the franking budget, is an amendment, if offered, that I will support.

I think the amendment of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS], offered with the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUUG], to eliminate money for former Speakers, the money that we give to former Speakers to set up and maintain an office, is something that is probably inappropriate.

If I leave here, I get no money to run an office. I do not think former Speakers need that as well.

But I think it has become clear to all of us that have been here, even as short a time as the gentleman from North