medicine in South Carolina, for being a role model to all aspiring doctors.

To Maggie Lena Walker, who in 1867 became the first African-American and first woman to become president of a bank. Thank you Ms. Walker for showing our children that they too can run a bank.

Thank you to Granville T. Woods, who in 1901 received a patent on his invention of the third rails that are still used today on subway systems in New York and Chicago.

To Garret A. Morgan who in 1923 received a patent on his invention of the traffic light.

To Jan E. Matzeliger who in 1883 patented the lasting machine which improved the speed and reduced the labor associated with constructing shoes.

To those eight black slaves who in 1777, organized the first black Baptist church. Thank you for showing us the importance of establishing our spiritual base even though the devil is all around us.

To Harriet Wilson. Thank you for writing the first novel published by a black writer in 1859, your words continue to inspire.

To Nat Turner, who in August 1831 led a slave revolt in Virginia. Thank you for fighting and dying to be free.

To those four young girls that died in the Birmingham church bombing, my daughter's life has been made easier by your sacrifice, and rest eternally assured that that sacrifice will not be forgotten, by me or her.

To Arthur Ashe, Tennis Hall of Famer, writer, historian, philanthropist, and father. Thank you for courage, and wisdom and strength. You showed with your life what a man could become.

To madame C.J. Walker the first African-American millionaire. Thank you for showing us how to do business.

To Fred Gregory, Guion Bluford, the late Ron McNair, and Mae Jemmison. Thank you for showing our kids that the sky is not the limit.

To Parren Mitchell, former U.S. Congressman from Maryland. Thank you for believing in African-American businesses.

To Marion Anderson and Leontyne Price. Thank you for showing the world that we too sing in America.

To Dr. Daniel Hale Williams, the first man to ever perform open heart surgery. Thank you for showing the world how to heal an ailing heart.

To Dr. and Mrs. Walter R. Tucker. Thank you for being an example of excellence and ambition.

To Harriet Tubman, conductor on the underground railroad to deliver over 300 Africans from the south to the north out of slavery. You did not have to come back for us, but you did and we owe you a debt of gratitude.

Finally, I want to say a special thank you to Dr. Carter G. Woodson, who committed his life to telling the history of the African in America. Thank you Dr. Woodson for insisting that if a story of America were told, this story had to be included.

SAVE THE GREENBACK ACT

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

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the Save the Greenback Act, a bill designed to preserve the status of the American 1 dollar bill, also known as the American Greenback, which has been a staple of our currency since 1862, and since 1869 has carried the likeness of the Founder of our Nation, George Washington.

The Kingston Trio's song that said ''And I don't give a damn about a green back dollar,'' has maintained a timelessness and elegance for future generations. However, the plans to discontinue printing the 1 dollar bill and to phase it out of existence, will incite a great number of people into giving a damn about a greenback dollar, because their pockets will be weighted down with heavy change instead of having a few bills tucked into their billfolds.

During that entire period, we have never heard the American people express their disagreement, or their displeasure with the 1 dollar bill. In fact, as many of you are aware, the mere mention of any redesign of our currency inevitably triggers an onslaught of calls from constituents.

In past Congresses there have been misguided efforts by special interests to replace the 1 dollar bill with a coin. The proponents of this coin make three bold claims; that is will be easier to handle, it will be popular with the American people and that it will save money.

Let me address each of these claims in turn: Imagine if you will, replacing ten 1 dollar bills in your wallet with ten coins in your pocket. After several days, one might suspect a conspiracy by clothing manufacturers in drafting the dollar coin proposal, as everyone's pockets begin to wear out.

As to the coin's popularity with the American people: There have been three national polls on this issue in the last year. In every poll, the American people overwhelmingly rejected any attempt to do away with the dollar bill and have expressed their displeasure for replacing it with a coin.

The most recent poll was conducted in January, under the auspices of the House Budget Committee. Only 18 percent of those questioned preferred a dollar coin.

Earlier polls have indicated a very real concern by the American people that if the dollar coin becomes law, the price of items purchased from vending machines, such as food, laundry and diet coke will rise. They also expect to see increases in the costs of other items such as parking meters and pay telephone calls.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation designed to eliminate the dollar bill will an excuse by the special interests to raise prices on everyday items—a future sales tax, to be levied on all Americans but falling the hardest on those who can least afford it.

None of us really want to see a repeat of the Susan B. Anthony drama in which the dollar coin was overwhelmingly rejected by the public. It did not save a nickel when it was minted, although proponents said at the time that a substantial savings would be realized.

At this moment, there are over 300 million Susan B. Anthony coins sitting idle in the U.S. Mint. Will we have to make room a few years down the road for the new dollar coin because we did not heed the hard lessons of the past?

It is not enough to blame the failure of the Susan B. Anthony on its design alone. The people rejected it as part of the currency system. They had a choice, and they voted against it.

It is important to note that the proposed dollar coin legislation will not allow the American people a choice, but will mandate on them a coin that they do not want.

Further, the dollar coin will not generate sufficient savings to justify such a major disruption in the lives and habits of the American people. Given the serious economic challenges facing this Congress, I believe that there are more urgent problems before us than forcing a change from the 1 dollar bill to a coin.

The costs of changing to a 1 dollar coin would be significant to many in the private sector including but not limited to the small town banks which would have to retool their coin counting, wrapping and sorting equipment—costs which would inevitably be passed on to their customers. The facts is, the 1 dollar bill has remained in existence for so long because people didn't want to carry bulky coins. They still don't.

Mr. Speaker, many of us were elected to this body by a public tired of being dictated to by their Government, having unwanted legislation forced on them, and tired of laws enacted for the sole benefit of special interests. We would do well to remember that we are here to advance the interests of the American people and not put needless obstacles in their path.

□ 1520

HUGE SAVINGS POSSIBLE FROM ELIMINATING WASTEFUL EXPENDITURES ON HANFORD NUCLEAR FACILITY CLEANUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BATEMAN). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. WYDEN] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss how $274 million in wasteful expenditures can be cut from

the budget for cleaning up the Hanford nuclear facility in Washington State.

This matter obviously has great implications for taxpayers across the country, but it certainly has special implications for the 1 million Oregonians who live downstream from Hanford.

Last year the Energy Department made a binding commitment to citizens of the Northwest and to the American people to make progress in cleaning up the Hanford nuclear facility. Now, only 1 year later, the Department of Energy is threatening to break Hanford's contract with America by failing to fund critical cleanup work, while allowing its contractors to waste taxpayers' money on low priority projects and out-and-out boondoggles.

Working with the Hanford watchdog group, Heart of America, I have carefully reviewed Hanford's $1.5 billion cleanup budget for fiscal year 1995, and have identified over a quarter billion dollars of wasteful spending in this budget.

My staff has independently reviewed the budget data with Department of Energy officials and confirmed that the current budget figures in this report are accurate. Some of the areas where significant budget savings could be realized include significant contractor overhead costs.

The current overhead budget is more than $450 million, which is 30 percent of Hanford's total clean-up budget for fiscal year 1995. Reducing these overhead costs from 30 percent to 20 percent of the budget would yield a savings of $150 million alone.

Second, Hanford contractors should be prevented from claiming a bonus for purported cost savings from not constructing six new double-shelled waste tanks. The need for these tanks and the contractor's cost estimate of $435 million to contract them has always been a questionable expenditure.

The Department of Energy has now determined that it is not necessary to construct all of these tanks. Under the current contract, eliminating the questionable expenditure for constructing these tanks could be considered a so-called cost savings for which the contractor could claim a bonus equal to 15 percent of these so-called savings.

Eliminating any contractor bonus for purported cost savings for not constructing the tanks would yield a savings of $63 million.

Third, the Hanford Advisory Board has recommended that the use of cleanup funds to subsidize defense and energy programs at Hanford be ended, and that this would save $39 million.

Mr. Speaker, this waste of taxpayer money ought to be stopped, and the funds immediately redirected to urgent clean-up projects, such as preventing high-level waste tanks from leaking radioactive waste, and protecting the Columbia River. In these tight budget times, there is not a single dollar to waste on bloated contractor overhead, excessive legal fees, or flashy media production services.

Certainly there is money to be saved on museums, on economic development, and a variety of other services which is not related to cleanup at Hanford at all. Every cleanup dollar ought to go to fund real cleanup.

The money that is being wasted now, if it was put to more productive use, might allow Hanford to actually meet its cleanup obligations.

With all of the wasteful spending that we have been able to identify in the Hanford cleanup budget, Hanford is almost certain to come up short in meeting its cleanup milestones. That means greater risk to Hanford workers and it means greater risks to the public.

What is more, it also means greater expense to the taxpayers down the road, because as the groundwater contamination spreads, the cost of the cleanup will increase significantly.

For the past 2 years, I have worked to obtain information from the Department of Energy and its contractor, the Westinghouse Hanford Company, about how the cleanup money is really being spent. The Department of Energy repeatedly delayed in providing this information, and when it finally did come, a significant amount of the information was simply omitted or blacked out.

The reason for failing to disclose this budget information really was not clear during all that time that we struggled to get it, but it certainly is now. The reason the information was not forthcoming is that it is embarrassing, it is embarrassing to hear that the Department of Energy spent over $450 million on overhead last year at Hanford. That is more than twice the amount that was spent on actually cleaning up the soil and the groundwater.

This spending on contractor overhead is robbing Hanford of the funds needed to protect the public from the threat of a high-level waste tank explosion and to protect the Columbia River and the 1 million Oregonians who live downstream from the Hanford facility.

□ 1530

In fact, the Department of Energy and Westinghouse are cutting funds needed to properly characterize the contents of Hanford's nuclear waste tanks. This violates the recommendations of the Defense Nuclear Facility Safety Board and the intent of the law that I authored requiring the Department of Energy to identify the dangerous tanks that pose serious safety hazards.

Scaling back contractor overhead from current bloated levels to about 20 percent of the budget would yield $250 million in savings that could be used to fund this critical work.

Another area where there is rampant wasteful spending involves contractor legal fees. Again, most of this money has nothing to do with cleaning up Hanford. Taxpayer money is really being used to clean up contractor legal messes at a cost of over $40 million last year. So what happens is the taxpayer gets taken to the cleaners and the contractors' lawyers go to lunch and dinners on the taxpayers' dime.

These are just a few examples of how the cleanup dollars are being wasted. I have sent a letter to the Committee on Appropriations urging that the committee redirect the $274 million of waste in Hanford's budget toward urgent cleanups that are not funded, and also I have indicated to the committee involved in overseeing the budget at the Department of Energy, I serve as the ranking Democratic Member on the Investigations Subcommittee, that I believe that our committee should further investigate these examples of waste in Department of Energy cleanup budgets.

If the Energy Department wants to get its cleanup program on track, then the first thing that the agency has to do is clean up its own House to get rid of the waste.

I would like to conclude by talking a bit about what the response of the contractor, the Westinghouse Corp., has been to our proposal. Without even looking at the proposal, Westinghouse sent out a message to its employees about the various findings in our report. Westinghouse seems to be saying in its statement that I am calling today for the elimination of all of Hanford's overhead budget. That is not what I am saying at all. What I am saying is that there is waste, that there is more than a quarter billion dollars' worth of waste in that Hanford cleanup budget, and, frankly, the way they have dealt with this report, spending dollars on trying to spread more misinformation, suggests to me that they are not getting the message.

For example, to put into perspective some of the statements made in Westinghouse's message in response to the report that we did, that they did not write, I would like to make just a few points. Westinghouse says that the term overhead covers some expenses that are in reality indirect cleanup costs. I agree with that statement. Therefore, if the cleanup budget is going down, the overhead budget ought to be going down proportionately. The Hanford budget is being reduced by 20 percent over the next 2 years, so that means that the contractor should be reducing overhead at least 20 percent. Plus, Westinghouse has claimed that bringing Bechtel in as an additional cleanup contractor would lower overhead by 13 percent and that there would be additional overhead savings from the merging of Kaiser into the Westinghouse contract. Therefore, we should be seeing at least a 33 percent overhead reduction, which is almost exactly what I have been calling for.

Westinghouse also admits that the fiscal year 1994 overhead budget totaled $451 million, but the examples of legitimate overhead they cite only account

for $148 million, which is less than one-third of the total. That means that two-thirds of the overhead is unaccounted for. We say one-third is wasted. Maybe we should be looking at the remaining third of the overhead budget more closely to determine if maybe some of that constitutes additional waste.

Westinghouse cites a number of specific overhead expenses that they say are legitimately needed for their operations. For example, they talk about their utilities, they cite steam plant expenses and replacement of antiquated facilities. The steam plant replacement project included a 20 percent contingency, double, double the normal construction contingency. This project is not any different from building a steam plant in Ohio or Florida or New York.

Should the contractor get an exorbitant contingency for building a steam plant? The contractors were already paid for the design work on the steam plant so the taxpayers are paying to indemnify the contractors against the risk that their own design is faulty.

With respect to safety and insurance, we have not questioned any of their expenditures in their area, but certainly we have asked some questions about the services budget. Westinghouse cited costs of bus service as a legitimate expense. Recently the manager of the Department of Energy's Hanford operations, John Wagner, told congressional staff that the bus service could not be justified because it costs $4,000 per user per year to provide this service.

On the administrative side, Westinghouse cites its communications expenses as legitimate. In the past, this budget has been used to pay for expenses like having contractors attend our press conferences and doctoring photos to make drums of waste disappear from the photo, while in reality the drums have not been cleaned up. Certainly public relations expenditures that we have outlined today show again how cleanup dollars are being misspent on work that is unrelated to cleanup of the Hanford facility.

Westinghouse also cites regulatory analysis and compliance. This category includes expenditures for cleaning up those legal messes which I mentioned earlier, such as $8 million to defend litigations from those who live downwind from the facility. It also includes $2.5 million for Westinghouse lawyers and outside counsel whose overbilling and expense account padding was exposed last year by the Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee.

Finally, it includes two contracts totaling $20 million for second and third layers of redundant review.

Now Westinghouse says they have greatly reduced the costs that are not directly related to cleanup. What I have to say today is if that is the case, they certainly should not be against the recommendations I am making to save $274 million in addition.

Westinghouse goes on to say that they are committed to increasing cost savings through their productivity challenge. EPA and the Washington Ecology Department say that Westinghouse's productivity challenge relies too heavily on the elimination and deferral of required work. Cutting the required work is precisely where they should not be cutting, but they ought to be making savings in the $274 million in wasteful expenditures we have found and report on today.

Westinghouse says that they are working with the regulators to streamline the regulatory process and the compliance requirements at the facility. The Hanford Advisory Board found that regulatory processes where streamlining is needed the most are not the ones imposed by law or the regulatory agencies, but the ones that are imposed by the Department of Energy's own orders. Without the statutes and the legislators, it is questionable how much cleanup work would actually be taking place.

Let me conclude by saying that the Federal Government hastened into an agreement with Hanford that really constitutes the Federal Government's contract with the people of the Pacific Northwest. More than 1 million Oregonians live downstream from Hanford.

It is not acceptable that the Federal Government breach its contract with the people of the Northwest in order to fund public relations projects, lawyers' fees, free lunches, and unnecessary overhead. I am very hopeful that the Department of Energy will move to deal with these wasteful expenditures that we have identified.

□ 1540

Many of my colleagues from the Pacific Northwest and other parts of the country ran for this body on campaigns to streamline the government, to root out waste, to make the government more efficient. I offer to them, the Members from the Pacific Northwest, both sides of the aisle, and Members of this body from other parts of the country, a specific analysis going through line by line the Hanford cleanup budget. It shows how $274 million in wasteful expenditures can be saved, and I hope the Members who have spoken so often about cutting waste will look seriously at this report and move on a bipartisan basis to make these savings, to redirect them so that the cleanup work that is necessary at Hanford is completed and to make sure that the taxpayers of the Northwest and of our entire country are not ripped off in the process.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. EHLERS (at the request of Mr. ARMEY), for today, on account of illness.

Mr. ANDREWS (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for February 23 and the balance of the week, on account of a death in the family.

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. MFUME) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. FILNER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WISE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. VOLKMER, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. OWENS, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. BILIRAKIS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DUNCAN, for 5 minutes, on February 27.

Mrs. SEASTRAND, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, immediately following the vote on rollcall No. 165 in the Committee of the Whole, on Thursday, February 24, 1995.

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

Mr. FAWELL.

Mr. GOODLING.

Mr. BRYANT of Tennessee.

Mr. PACKARD.

Mr. SKEEN.

Mr. HEFLEY.

Mr. CRANE.

Mr. CLINGER.

Mr. PORTMAN.

Mr. UPTON.

Mr. GILLMOR.

Mr. DORNAN.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY.

Mr. FOGLIETTA.

Ms. ESHOO.

Mr. SKELTON.

Mr. VENTO.

Mr. UNDERWOOD.

Mrs. KENNELLY.

Mr. POSHARD.

Mr. HALL of Texas in two instances.

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

Mr. DAVIS.

Mr. MANTON.

Mr. PALLONE.

Mr. TRAFICANT.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.