

My colleague from Illinois had offered an amendment to H.R. 5, the Unfunded Mandate Reform Act. This amendment would have exempted from the provisions of the bill my Federal mandate that protects aviation or airport security.

Mr. Speaker, had my vote been accurately recorded it would have reflected a nay vote. I believe that we can not exempt numerous programs from the provisions of H.R. 5.

H.R. 5 does not restrict mandates such as ones which aim to protect aviation or airport security. Rather it requires a cost-benefit analysis and strives to minimize the burden of unfunded mandates. We must thoroughly examine the mandates that we pass on to our States and localities. I do not find this unreasonable.

TRIBUTE TO NEWPORT HARBOR HIGH SCHOOL FOOTBALL TEAM

HON. CHRISTOPHER COX

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 25, 1995

Mr. COX of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the Newport Harbor High School football team, which completed its first undefeated season in 64 years by winning the California Interscholastic Federation championship title.

Led by Head Coach Jeff Brinkley, the Sailors' triumphant season was the culmination of an extraordinary year for these young men. It was a year that was marked not only by notable individual accomplishments and exemplary team play but also by a tremendous sense of courage and determination rarely seen in prep football. The coaching staff, the players, the fans all made their dream a reality.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I ask my colleagues to join with me in saluting the Newport High School football team and to congratulate their championship year.

GOVERNOR WHITMAN'S SPEECH TO THE NATION

HON. BOB FRANKS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 25, 1995

Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, last night New Jersey Gov. Christine Todd Whitman delivered the Republican response to the President's State of the Union Address from the historic assembly chamber in Trenton.

As my colleagues are aware, Governor Whitman has a growing national reputation for cutting taxes, slashing onerous regulations, and eliminating unnecessary spending. She has demonstrated the leadership, determination, and guts to govern effectively. She has proven that government can be smaller and less costly and still be responsive to the people it serves.

Mr. Speaker, many political pundits are touting Governor Whitman as a possible Vice Presidential nominee, and rightly so. Governor Whitman's successful policies are a model that should be adopted nationally.

I commend Mrs. Whitman on her excellent speech last night. Below is the text of the Governor's speech for my colleagues' review.

STATE OF THE UNION RESPONSE

Good evening. I'm Christie Whitman, Governor of New Jersey, and I am addressing you tonight from the historic legislative chamber in Trenton, one of the oldest in the nation. Speaking to you this evening is a tremendous honor for all of us here in New Jersey.

It is appropriate that we have come together tonight in Trenton. On Christmas morning in 1776, George Washington crossed the icy Delaware River and surprised King George's mercenaries in their barracks here—on these grounds. The Battle of Trenton was a turning point in the American Revolution.

Just as that revolution two centuries ago began in the colonies, there is a revolution sweeping America today, begun not in Washington, D.C., but in the states. In Wisconsin, in Ohio, in Massachusetts, in South Carolina, in California. The American people are seeking freedom in a new revolution that began before I ever came to office.

It is a revolution of ideas, one in which the voters are given a clear choice between bigger or smaller government, higher or lower taxes, more or less spending.

It is a revolution about a free and sovereign people saying they want power to return to them from their state houses, their county governments, their city halls.

In elections all across America, the voters have chosen smaller government, lower taxes and less spending.

They rejected the tyranny of expanding welfare-state policies, the arrogance of bigger and bigger government. The frustration of one size-fits-all answers.

In a word, they have chosen freedom. They elected leaders like Governor Bill Weld of Massachusetts—who, in his first month in office, cut state spending by 1.7 billion dollars. Since then, he's cut taxes five times and brought Massachusetts the third-lowest unemployment rate in the nation.

And Governor Pete Wilson, who has already reformed health care in California—using market forces to guarantee access for millions of uninsured and made health care more affordable for small businesses.

They elected governors who said we should have a smaller, more efficient government—and they meant it. Like Governor Tommy Thompson in Wisconsin—he's cut spending, cut taxes, and led the most comprehensive welfare reform movement in the country.

And Governor Fife Symington, who became one of several Republican governors to cut tax every year they were in office and see their economies boom.

In state after state, the revolution of ideas took hold.

By 1994, Governor George Allen reformed the criminal justice system and abolished parole in Virginia.

And the same month Bill Clinton signed the largest tax increases in American history, Governor John Engler signed the largest tax cut in Michigan history, helping bring the lowest unemployment rate to the state in twenty years.

Here in New Jersey—like so many other governors—I was told my tax-cutting policies were a "gimmick." I heard we couldn't do it—that it was "impossible"—that it would "hurt the economy."

But I had given my word to the people of New Jersey that we would cut their taxes. And we did.

In the first year, with the help of the New Jersey legislature, we cut business taxes.

We reduced income taxes not once but twice. We lowered state spending—not recklessly—but carefully and fairly.

Just yesterday, I announced a third wave of income tax cuts—another 15 percent, taking us to a 30 percent reduction, to put more money in the hands of families like yours.

The results have been solid: State revenues are up even from the income tax—and 60 thousand more New Jerseyans are at work today than were a year ago—making this year our best year for job creation since 1988.

And we did it all under a balanced budget amendment to our state's constitution.

In November, the revolution came to Washington.

Now people want less government, lower taxes, and less spending from the federal government.

People want results.

In both houses of Congress, the Republican party has been elected, like many of us in the states were on an agenda of change:

We're committed to reforming welfare—to encourage people to work, and to stop children from having children.

We want to force the government to live within its means by stopping runaway spending and balancing the federal budget.

We want to lower taxes for families and make it easier to achieve the American Dream—to save money, buy a home and send the kids to college.

We're going to stop violent criminals in the tracks—with real prison time for repeat offenders and a workable death penalty.

We must send a message to our young people that crime doesn't pay.

And we're going to slash those unnecessary regulations that strangle small business in America, to make it easier to create more jobs and pay better wages and become more competitive in the global marketplace.

We intend to create a new era of hope and opportunity for all Americans.

Many of these ideas are the same ones Governors have been enacting here in the states.

Time after time, Republicans and Democrats—have found that things work better when states and communities set their own priorities, rather than being bossed around by bureaucrats in Washington.

Our colleagues on Capitol Hill are facing the same opposition we did—the same cries of "it can't be done" from the Washington-knows-best crowd. People who think government can't be too big and that there is virtue in raising taxes.

Well, there's nothing virtuous about raising taxes. There's nothing heroic about preserving a welfare system that entraps people. And there's nothing high-minded about wasting other people's money on Big Government spending sprees.

We overcame the same objections, the same stalling and distortion, the same footdragging. We've heard it all. And in the end, we have won the battle of ideas in our states.

Now it's time to win the battle of ideas in Washington.

If the people's agenda is to succeed in Congress, everyone needs to work together.

And while at times tonight some of the President's ideas sounded pretty Republican, the fact remains that he has been opposed to the Balanced Budget Amendment—he proposed even more government spending—and he imposed the biggest tax increase in American history.

It's clear that your votes in November sounded a warning to the President. If he has changed his big government agenda, we say great—join us as we change America.

Republicans welcome your ideas for making government not bigger but smaller.

As we move forward in the next two years, the President and Congress should be reminded that success is not measured in the number of laws passed, but in the results.

Is government serving the people better?

Are neighborhoods safer?

Are families stronger?

Are children learning more?

Are we better prepared to meet the future?

Do we have more freedom?

The election in November was a beginning, not an end—and we are committed to fulfilling the verdict of the voters and enacting our agenda of hope for the families of America. Change is hard. But we're going to work hard.

We will keep faith with America.

We will keep our word.

We will do what you elected us to do.

We will give you results.

On election day you gave us your trust. We accept your mandate.

President Clinton, you must accept it as well.

Put the principles of smaller, more effective government into action. Reduce spending and cut taxes.

Two weeks ago, in my State of the State address to the people of New Jersey, I made them a pledge which, in closing, I would now like to make to the American people on behalf of the Republican Party. By the time President Clinton makes his next State of the Union address:

We will have lower taxes.

We will have more efficient government.

We will have a stronger America.

We will have more faith in our politics, more pride in our states and communities, and more confidence in ourselves.

We will go forward together, as one family with many faces, building a future with opportunity.

A future with security.

A future based on mutual respect and responsibility.

And most of all, a future filled with hope—for our children and our children's children.

Thank you very much and God bless America.

CONGRATULATIONS TO SORENSON BROADCASTING FOR 13 YEARS OF EXCELLENCE AND 10 YEARS OF GREAT TALK RADIO

HON. ROBERT A. UNDERWOOD

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 25, 1995

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, in my home district of Guam, we have many fine radio personalities and journalists. One of the island's communications corporations has been around for the last 13 years, and has been the only all talk radio station on our island for the last 10 years. The company is known as Sorenson Broadcasting, and its all talk radio station is NEWSTALK: K-57. Since there is only one all talk station on our local radio dial, K-57 is more like an electronic village meeting which convenes every day.

The mornings are very alive with one of Guam's solid citizens, Jon Anderson. This is morning talk radio at its finest. For 4 hours beginning at 6 a.m., Anderson engages, encourages, stimulates, and informs. Jon Anderson is the most well-known voice throughout all segments of Guam's varied communities. He has been concerned with island issues for many years now, and Guam is enhanced by his show and his concern.

Then, in the afternoon when things seem to be slowing down, Myk Powell hits the air waves. If you need a little humor, albeit tongue-in-cheek, to keep going, Myk, gives you exactly that, a little humor. He'd be proud of me for stealing that joke. But seriously folks. . . .

Myk carries on the same important role of channeling emotion, conveying information, and encouraging debate. He has that rare gift of being able to intelligently sprinkle humor throughout his show. From his Uncle Myk-ie alter ego to his hilarious commercials. Myk can tease an audience immediately after causing them to question their stance on important issues.

Beyond all the talk, NEWSTALK K-57 features the Island's only radio news team guided by news pro, Patty Arroyo, the island's only on-the-go Shakespearian traffic reporter, Jefferson Cronin, and knowledgeable news anchors and reporters.

Yes, we the radio listeners on Guam are fortunate indeed. The naysayers said you'd run out of things to talk about. Ten years later, we continue to enjoy the fine programs which K-57 radio offers today and, we hope, for many years to come.

FEDERAL MANDATES

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 25, 1995

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Washington Report for Wednesday, January 25, 1995 into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

FEDERAL MANDATES

Local officials and small business owners in Indiana often tell me of the difficulty they have paying for unfunded federal mandates. One of their top priorities is to limit the ability of Congress to shift costs to businesses or state and local governments by requiring them to meet certain federal standards. I agree. Congress is responding to these concerns by considering a bill this week in both the Senate and the House to limit the practice of imposing unfunded federal mandates. This bill is similar to legislation I co-sponsored in 1993.

In the past, state and local governments have been told they must do things such as provide safe drinking water, reduce asbestos hazards, or impose tough criminal penalties. Businesses were required to improve workplace standards, protect their customers from fraud or abuse, and comply with numerous environmental regulations. The objectives of these federal requirements are almost always worthy: clean water, safer roads, trustworthy banks, or consumer protection. But collectively they often drain funds from local governments and discourage business growth. For example, compliance with the Clean Water Act is expected to cost state and local governments \$32 billion this year. By one estimate, compliance with twelve other federal mandates will cost \$33.7 billion over the next five years. In all, federal mandates consume an average of 12.3% of local revenue. In the private sector, an EPA study found that environmental compliance costs can at times exceed profits for some small businesses, including many dry cleaners, truckers, farmers, and wood finishers.

Unfunded mandates have imposed costs and inflexible rules on governments and

business. They often dictate priorities to those who must comply without considering their views. But since many of the laws and regulations in question prevent discrimination, promote worker safety, and protect health, safety, and the environment, the proposals to reduce unfunded mandates must be approached with great care. The challenge is to alleviate the financial burden of unfunded mandates without letting the worthy objectives slip away.

FEDERAL BUDGET CUTS

The major impetus behind growing federal mandates is the federal budget deficit. In the 1960s and 1970s, federal money to state and local governments grew steadily as a percentage of state and local outlays, peaking at 27% in 1978. More recently, the federal government's response to budget deficits has been to reduce its share of state and local aid to about 18% of their budgets. But mandates did not decrease, and local costs escalated.

CONGRESSIONAL ACTION

There is broad support in Congress to curb unfunded mandates. At a minimum, the House and Senate should be required to take a separate vote on any measure that would place costs on state or local governments.

Without such a vote, the House bill's "no money, no mandate" provision would require the federal government to provide funds for new mandates. Before Congress takes action on a bill, the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) would have to determine if the costs of the proposed legislation would exceed \$50 million for states and localities, or \$100 million for the much larger private sector. For bills that exceed these thresholds, any one Member of Congress could demand a separate vote on whether or not to impose an unfunded mandate.

In addition, federal agencies would be prohibited from imposing unauthorized costs on states and localities when issuing new regulations. There would also be reports to Congress on the costs incurred by state and local governments and the private sector in meeting existing mandates.

DRAWBACKS

There are, however, several drawbacks to any blanket prohibition on federal mandates. First, civil rights advocates fear restrictions on mandates could gut constitutional rights and anti-discrimination laws. Thus, the measure should not apply to laws protecting constitutional rights. It should also exempt laws to protect against fraud, provide emergency assistance, and protect national security. Second, eliminating mandates may make it more difficult to apply worthy existing health and safety standards. Third, protection from mandates should apply equally to the public and private sector. For example, local governments should not be exempt from labor safety laws just because the federal government does not subsidize their implementation. Fourth, the analysis of mandates should include potential benefits as well as costs. It would be shortsighted to abolish public health requirements that pay for themselves many times over in long-term health care savings. Fifth, estimating the effect of complex legislation is extremely difficult. Calculating direct and indirect costs of a mandate is so exacting that analysts will be hard-pressed to present accurate figures.

While this bill is not perfect, it is a good start in dealing with the complex problem of unfunded mandates. It can and will be improved over time. A major flaw in the bill is that it delays taking effect until October. We should curb unfunded mandates now, not later.