

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

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

#### FDA'S EXPENSIVE NEW FACILITIES

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

(Mr. DUNCAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the most wasteful, inefficient agencies in the entire Federal Government is the Food and Drug Administration.

In their bureaucratic and arrogant way, they have held medicines and medical devices off the U.S. market, sometimes for years, to the detriment of the health of American citizens.

By their rules, regulations, and red-tape, they have driven up the price of drugs and have helped the big drug giants by making it extremely difficult or almost impossible for small businesses to compete in the field.

Now, however, they want to do something which should outrage every taxpayer in the Nation.

At a time when we are supposed to be downsizing the Federal Government, the FDA wants to build a Taj Mahal complex of buildings in Maryland for a new headquarters.

Part of this project is to be in Montgomery County and part in Prince Georges County.

However, the important point is not the location. It is the cost.

The original cost estimate for these buildings was almost \$1 billion dollars.

However, because the FDA has become concerned about the appearance of this exorbitant and excessive spending at a time when most people want frugality in Government, they have lowered their estimated cost, all the way down to \$875 million.

Even if this project comes in on budget, which I seriously doubt, it would still be at a cost of a whopping \$257 a square foot.

State governments are building beautiful buildings for half this cost.

And is the FDA doing everything possible to hold down costs? Well, since the money is not coming out of their own pockets, they chose the most expensive site they looked at and some of the most expensive land in this Nation.

The original cost estimate for the Prince Georges facility was \$290 a square foot.

The Montgomery County complex is to be several buildings interconnected, in a college campus-like setting, on a 530-acre tract of land—530 acres when they could build a beautiful headquarters on an acre or less.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, the FDA should be greatly reformed. It should

be greatly downsized. It should stay where it is now.

Perhaps the most phenomenal thing of all is the size of this project—3.4 million square feet—to house only 6,500 employees. This comes out to approximately 750 square feet per employee.

Most Members of Congress have approximately 1,000 square feet to house 9 or 10 employees, or about one-seventh of what the FDA wants.

Moreover, FDA's current offices and laboratories occupy 2.1 million square feet of office space.

The new FDA complex will be 3.4 million square feet in size. This is one million, three hundred thousand square feet more than what they have now—a 60 percent increase—at a time when the Federal Government is supposed to be downsizing.

With a national debt of more than \$4.7 trillion, we should not be spending almost \$1 billion to build plush new quarters for FDA bureaucrats.

The bureaucrats want to live like kings while taxpayers foot the bill.

I am pleased that today, the Citizens for a Sound Economy came out strongly against this project.

I know we have a Government that is of, by, and for the bureaucrats instead of one that is of, by, and for the people, but, Mr. Speaker, this is one I hope we can win for the taxpayers.

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

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

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

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

□ 2000

#### THE PRIVATIZATION OF THE HUMANITIES ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BE-REUTER). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CHABOT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. CHABOT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, we've been told time and time again that spending has already been cut to the bone and that we can't cut anything without shredding the fabric of our society. Well, that's not true. All sorts of needless bureaucracies continue to waste all sorts of money and eat a hole in our wallets. Today, I'd like to call attention to one of the more egregious examples I've seen during my first month on the job.

I am referring to the tripe that I and all my colleagues received this past

week from the National Endowment for the Humanities.

The NEH produced and sent around to us something called a Conversation Kit, more formally entitled a "National Conversation on American Pluralism and Identity."

Inside you'll find 20 or so high-gloss pamphlets, some of them 30 or 40 pages long, that contain readings of varying quality, simplistic questions, and the Government's edicts on how folks should talk to each other.

This is the brainchild of NEH Chairman Sheldon Hackney and his band of "culture bureaucrats," as George Will has labeled them. Its basic assumption is that we, as free-thinking Americans, need the Government to tell us how to engage in day-to-day conversations. The plan, as I understand it, is for NEH-types to go around the country circulating these packets and instructing us all how to talk with one another.

Besides assembling arcane questions such as "When do we act as public people and when as private people?" or the more abstract "Where do we belong?" the Conversation Kit suggests readings by militant feminists such as Patricia Williams and Charlotte Bunch, and provides a list of movies that, quote, "might make good conversation starters." I must thank Mr. Hackney for spending our tax dollars to tell us about a little known film called "Casablanca."

So the American public can see first hand some of Mr. Hackney's handiwork, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD a small excerpt from the Conversation Kit.

Besides the kit's skewed content, every American should be outraged by the expense of printing these Conversation Kits. This particular program, I'm told, is going to cost us \$1,700,000 just by itself. And remember, given our huge national debt, that's \$1.7 million that we don't have and that we're charging to our children's accounts.

Mr. Speaker, the NEH again has thrust the Federal Government into another venture in which it does not belong. And once again, we see the Federal Government pushing its inane, self-righteous agenda on the American public.

These conversation kits maybe politically correct, but they're fiscally foolish. They're also insulting to the intelligence of our citizens.

America's filled with sensible, kind, and intelligent people who know how to talk with one another. The last thing we need is a group of condescending academics squandering our tax dollars to tell us how to talk to each other. This is not the proper role of the Federal Government and we need to end, forever, this type of wasteful spending.

That's why I urge my colleagues to join me in cosponsoring Congressman JOE HEFLEY's bill, The Privatization of

the Humanities Act. Let's tear down Sheldon Hackney's fiefdom. The critics and the naysayers believe we cannot balance the budget. Well, here's a golden opportunity to begin that process by trimming \$177 million of fat from the Federal budget.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the following information:

APPENDIX A

CHECKLIST FOR CONVERSATION PLANNING

*People:*

Do you need to contact organizations that can help you assemble a planning committee and find participants for the conversation?

Does your planning committee have the same racial, ethnic, and cultural diversity as the people you hope will participate?

Have you divided responsibilities among committee members?

Have you identified an effective discussion leader?

Have you appointed someone to take notes or tape-record each session?

Have you personally invited the participants or responded to them personally after they have expressed interests in joining the conversation?

Have you sent information and directions to participants several days before the first session?

Have you made reminder phone calls to participants one or two days before each session?

*Content:*

Have you decided how to focus your discussion? If there will be more than one session, have you identified all the topics? Or will participants choose the later topics at the first session?

Have you selected the materials—e.g., readings, videos, conversation starters, Scholars' Essays, news clips—for each session?

How will you use the materials? How will you distribute them?

Have you considered inviting an expert to provide background information for the discussion?

*Format:*

Have you chosen an appropriate conversation format (number, length, and frequency of sessions)?

Do you have an agenda, including time for opening remarks, introductions, and ground rules?

Is the discussion leader familiar with the reading materials and the makeup of the group?

MEXICAN BAILOUT

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

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Today the administration, with the acquiescence of the top leaders in this Congress, announced a sweeping \$47.5 billion bailout of the Government of Mexico and its Wall Street creditors by our taxpayers through the instrumentalities of the United States, including our U.S. Treasury, our Federal Reserve, the International Monetary Fund, into which the United States pumps money, and the Bank for International Settlements, on whose board sit the chairman of our Federal Reserve and the

chairman of the New York Federal Reserve.

All of this was done without a vote of the Congress of the United States, the only federally elected officials representing the people of this country.

This newest proposal is a perpetuation of the worst kind of manipulative politics, both here in our country and in Mexico. And from a constitutional standpoint, it is absolutely precedent setting in the abuse of power by our own Federal Reserve, in collaboration with the U.S. Department of Treasury.

This new proposal is nothing short of a circumvention of the democratic process and a circumvention of the proper role of the elected leaders of the Congress of the United States.

The administration chose this path because they knew that they did not have the votes in this Congress, nor the support of the American public. In fact, over 80 percent of the American people oppose this bailout.

This new proposal is representative of what is wrong with politics in our country: not reflecting the will of the people.

Federal Reserve Chairman Greenspan, officials in the administration, and the top Republican leadership of this Congress have all exhibited this type of behavior during the present Mexican peso crisis and further through past trade policies which created this mess, an arrogance and abuse of power which knows no bounds.

It is well known that people tend to change once they come into the beltway in Washington.

In October 1979, Federal Reserve Chairman Greenspan told the Senate Banking Committee that a proposed \$750 million loan, one-fortieth of what is being proposed here, for near-bankrupt Chrysler Corp. was a bad idea that flew in the face of the principles of free enterprise. This is the same man who by raising interest rates has increased your mortgage payments and increased your monthly credit card payments, eating into your wages over the last 20 years.

Chairman Greenspan and the Federal Reserve are trying desperately to cover their own tracks in this crisis. In fact, it was the Federal Reserve's own interest-rate policies of the past 3 years that helped set Mexico up for a fall.

Low United States rates in 1992 and 1993 led speculators to pump record levels of money into Mexico, some estimating over \$70 billion, and other emerging markets, but then the Fed's interest rate increases of 1994, all six of them, led those same investors to pull their money back out and bring it home.

If Chairman Greenspan was so concerned about Mexico, he would certainly not have raised United States interest rates six times over the last year.

The latest increase in interest rates means that if you own a \$60,000 home with a 30-year mortgage, your mortgage payments have gone up by an ad-

ditional \$100 a month. And as a result of the Fed's actions, your home will cost you about \$1,200 more a year or about \$36,000 over the life of your mortgage.

Chairman Greenspan is unelected, unaccountable, and evidently unaware of the people's lives in this country that his policies affect.

There is absolutely no reason that a proposal of this magnitude should not be considered by the Congress of the United States.

Under the Constitution, we have the absolute authority to coin money and to regulate the flow of money between nations. What was done here, very cleverly through the back door, was that an entity within the U.S. Treasury Department, the Currency Stabilization Fund, took deutschemarks and yen that they hold and they said to the Federal Reserve, we will borrow against those. And essentially a flow of funds came from the Federal Reserve to the U.S. Treasury against the terms of the Constitution of the United States, which require all appropriated dollars to be voted on by the Congress of the United States.

INVESTIGATION OF COMMERCE  
SECRETARY RON BROWN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from Indiana, [Mr. BURTON] is recognized for 60 minutes as the majority leader's designee.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, let me first say that I just listened with great interest to my colleague from Ohio. I think she is right on the money.

I would like for my friends who are paying attention to this special order to know that this is a bipartisan concern about the circumvention of the will of the people and the will of the Congress. I think it is wrong.

□ 2010

Mr. Speaker, there were many of us that worked on the draft legislation for the loan guaranty program with Mexico. In the draft legislation we had many conditions spelled out to protect the American taxpayer and to put in some other things that were very important to our hemisphere.

I am the chairman of the Subcommittee on Western Hemisphere Affairs of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. We put things in there that we thought would put the heat on Castro in Cuba and stop Mexico from giving aid, direct or indirect aid to Castro. We wanted to put \$3 billion in hard assets in American banks to protect American taxpayers against a loss or a default. All those things are circumvented by this Executive order.

I think the gentlewoman is right on the money. The people of this country ought to be outraged, as well as their