

amount which individual taxpayers are currently allowed for IRA's. The legislation does not increase the \$2,000 limit. Second, the legislation addresses the spousal IRA issue. The legislation allows homemakers to make the same deductible IRA contribution as their working spouses.

The purpose of this legislation is to increase our national savings rate. IRA's are a proven tool to boost our savings rate. This legislation increases the amount that can be deductible in an IRA. Taxes are just deferred. The focus of this proposal is savings for retirement. A new analysis commissioned by Merrill Lynch on the financial wealth of American families shows that half of American families currently have below \$1,000 in net financial assets. Action needs to be taken to improve this statistic.

Allowing homemakers to contribute the full amount to an IRA corrects an inequity and creates an incentive for savings. Increased retirement savings will result in economic growth and help retirees become financially independent. We have to encourage individuals to save for their retirement. This legislation is a step in the right direction. I urge you to support this legislation.

#### THE EXPORT ADMINISTRATION ACT OF 1995

**HON. TOBY ROTH**

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, January 4, 1995*

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced the Export Administration Act of 1995. The text of this bill generally reflects the provisions reported to the House last year by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, together with certain of the modifications recommended to the House last year by other committees. Title I of this bill originated with legislation that I introduced in the 103d Congress as H.R. 3412.

As the chairman of the Subcommittee on International Economic Policy and Trade of the Committee on International Relations, I intend to renew the effort to reform our export control system and see it through to completion, with enactment of reform legislation.

The legislation I have introduced today is the starting point for this final push to enactment. In essence, we are picking up where our committee left off last year. Prior to acting on this legislation, our subcommittee will consult with other members of our committee, with other committees and interested Members and with representatives of the President as well as other interested parties. Refinements and modifications will be made and reflected in a measure which will be presented to the subcommittee for its consideration and approval as soon as possible.

My goal is simple: To reform our outdated export control system, help our high technology industries and create new American jobs.

The last time Congress reformed the Export Administration Act was in 1979, some 15 years ago. The last time it was amended in any significant way was in 1988. Therefore, the current law simply does not reflect the profound changes which have occurred during the past 5 years alone: the end of the Cold War and COCOM; the new challenge of proliferation; the breakup of the Soviet empire;

the beginnings of a market economy in China; the diffusion worldwide of advanced computer and communications technology; and the advent of a new global trade agreement.

Yet our export control system still operates under an old statute, needlessly impeding many high technology exports while not adequately focusing on proliferation threats. Testimony last year to our subcommittee indicated that some \$30 billion in American exports are affected by this outmoded system, together with the thousands of jobs which would otherwise be created by reforming the system.

In introducing this legislation, I welcome recommendations from my colleagues on how this bill can be further strengthened.

I intend to continue our subcommittee's tradition of approaching legislation in an effective bi-partisan manner and to bring to the House a bill that every Member can vote for and that the President can sign into law.

#### BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT LEGISLATION

**HON. BOB STUMP**

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, January 4, 1995*

Mr. STUMP. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to reintroduce a balanced budget amendment. This amendment, if ratified by three-fourths of the States, will mandate that the President submit and Congress pass a balanced Federal budget.

The last budget Congress balanced was in 1969. Since then, both deficits and the national debt have soared to astronomical levels. We must put an end to this obscene accumulation of debt or face the prospect of a national bankruptcy.

Mr. Speaker, there are many in this body who will say that the balanced budget amendment is not needed, or that to balance the budget we will have to cut vital and important programs to the bone. Nothing could be further from the truth.

While it is true that Congress has always possessed the ability to balance the budget, the fact that it hasn't done so in 26 years indicates that a balanced budget has not been among Congress' top priorities. And while it is also true that things have changed around here, what has not changed is the threat our national debt poses to the economic futures of our children and grandchildren. We must assure them that we will do everything in our power to allow them to live in a debt-free nation.

I am sensitive to the concerns expressed by those who fear a wholesale slaughter of vital and important Federal programs. To be sure, balancing the budget will not be without a certain degree of pain and sacrifice. However, it would not require the wholesale dismantling of vital programs, such as Social Security, that its critics allege. Indeed, balancing the Federal budget could only strengthen Social Security and other programs whose trust funds are invested in Government securities.

Mr. Speaker, the people of this country voted for change—for a different approach to government. We should give it to them. I can think of no better starting point than to pass a balanced budget amendment.

#### INVESTMENT IN AMERICA ACT

**HON. JAMES A. TRAFICANT, JR.**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, January 4, 1995*

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, every session since coming to Congress in 1985, I have introduced a bill to reinstate a 10-percent domestic investment tax credit [ITC] for the purchase of domestic durable goods. I am reintroducing this bill today, and I invite all Members to become cosponsors.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, the Ways and Means Committee intends to overhaul tax policy in the upcoming 104th session. I believe my 10-percent investment tax credit bill should be considered as a part of that new tax plan.

The way this bill works could not be simpler. If an American consumer buys a domestic product like a new machine or computer to improve their business, the consumer can take a 10-percent tax credit if that product was made in America. If the consumer purchases a new American-made automobile or truck, they can take a 10-percent tax credit. The tax credit would be worth up to \$1,000.

Investment tax credits are not new, but mine incorporates Buy American language to assist economic enhancement. I believe that repealing the investment tax credit in 1986 was one of the major reasons for the downfall in investment. As a result, American companies are competing with one hand tied behind their backs. Under my bill, at least 60 percent of the basis of the product must be attributable to value within the United States to take advantage of the credit. In other words, language the Commerce Department already uses to define an American-made product.

The purpose of the Investment in America tax credit is to stimulate the economy by spurring consumers and businesses to purchase American-made goods to enhance our long-term competitiveness. I don't know of a simpler way to change our complex tax policy for the better. I have always argued that the social problems this country faces can be linked to the unfair and harmful trade and tax policies enacted by the Congress. The 104th Congress offers us a unique opportunity to make a difference in the direction this country is headed.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to cosponsor my bill. As a Congress, we need to show the American people that we are sincere about making America a strong nation once again.

#### THE NEW CONGRESS

**HON. LEE H. HAMILTON**

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, January 4, 1995*

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Washington Report for Wednesday, November 16, 1994, into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

#### THE NEW CONGRESS

The 104th Congress that convenes in January will have both the House and Senate under Republican control for the first time since 1955. That changed makeup as well as the current mood of the country say a lot

about the congressional agenda and about how the President will have to deal with Congress.

#### THE NEW MAKEUP OF CONGRESS

The shift of Congress to Republican control will have a major impact on the legislative agenda.

I hope that one lesson for the new Congress is that both parties recognize they have to treat each other with greater respect. Power imposes responsibility, and it is much tougher to govern than make calls from the bleachers. I hope one result of the election is to make politicians think about Congress as an institution and what needs to be done to improve it.

Members of Congress also need to get a firmer grasp on the difference between doing what is right for tomorrow and what is politically popular for today. We have to get a longer-term perspective into our politics. We must ask what our country is going to be like when we reach the twenty-first century, how we can keep the economy strong and prosperous, and how we can assure that our children have jobs and opportunity for personal fulfillment.

#### THE MOOD OF THE COUNTRY

The current mood of the country also shapes what issues will be tackled by the 104th Congress.

The mood of the country is often described as anti-government. My own judgement is that Americans primarily oppose wasteful, duplicative, and corrupt government. They are prepared to support government that delivers services efficiently. They are saying that the growth of government needs to be curbed and that the performance of government needs to be improved. In a broader sense, Americans think the country is losing its moral roots and that politicians are not doing anything about it. They want more attention to traditional values as well as an improved level of government performance.

Americans are alienated from government, their elected representatives, and the political process. They feel a deepening powerlessness and pessimism over the future of the nation. As one Hoosier put it to me, "I don't really feel that the people of this country have any control over what is going on." There is a feeling that the country has become too big, too complicated, too diverse.

Again and again, Americans say they are uneasy about their future and feel that they are not getting ahead. One principal reason for this is that the job market is changing in swift and unpredictable ways. People are no longer sure that even with two incomes in the family they can maintain their standard of living. Their feeling that things might get worse and their deep sense of insecurity are very difficult for a politician to deal with.

I find Americans distressed about many aspects of society today: the amount of violence and vulgarity, the rise of illegitimacy, the decay of responsibility, the loss of traditional values. The real message is their fear of the future. They are deeply concerned about crime, job security, retirement income, and adequate health care. They express a feeling that something is eating away at the security of their lives.

Americans certainly support welfare reform and tax cuts. They have a strong view that the tax burden on middle-class families has risen steadily in recent decades and that there has been a decline in real income. Americans are turned inward and they worry about their own financial difficulties. They have become less interested in foreign affairs and the problems of the poor and the minorities in this country.

Congress has been dealing with many of the problems people want addressed—the deficit, jobs, welfare reform, making govern-

ment leaner and more effective. We are not dealing with those problems satisfactorily from their standpoint. Often they are not aware of what has been done.

Americans have become much more interested in local concerns. Many of them feel the federal government is no longer as important as it once was. They have redefined what is really important to them. The closer politics is to their home and their family, the more important it is to them. In many communities, I find that infrastructure improvements and personal security for their families are the dominant concerns.

It is clear that policymakers need to sort out which roles should be played by federal, state, and local governments and which should be shared with the private sector. There is certainly a strong feeling among the voters that the federal government is simply trying to do too much.

#### THE PRESIDENT'S APPROACH TO CONGRESS

With the changes in the 104th Congress, the President confronts two approaches about how to deal with his legislative agenda. He can push ahead with comprehensive changes in health care and welfare. He knows he will not succeed, but he could put the blame on Congress for refusing to pass his programs. The other approach is to try to work out agreements with the Republicans.

I would urge the President to proceed on a path of compromise. He will have to work to develop a spirit of bi-partisanship. That will not be easy. In effect, he will have to govern from the middle. But, of course, it takes two to make a deal and the Republicans will want their agenda to be given priority. If the President tries bi-partisanship and it fails, he will have little choice but to go on the offensive.

My advice to the President is that he has to broaden his political base by governing from the center out, not from the left in. He needs to forge an alliance with the new members of Congress who are very close to their constituents and in tune with the new politics of the country.

#### INTRODUCING LEGISLATION CONCERNING KENAI NATIVES ASSOCIATION, INC.

#### HON. DON YOUNG

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, January 4, 1995*

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation today to correct a significant inequity in Federal law with respect to land uses of property conveyed to the Kenai Natives Association, Inc. [KNA]. The legislation, which will mark the final outcome of a process begun nearly 14 years ago and which was the subject of a congressional hearing last Congress and the enactment of one interim law, would correct the land entitlement inequities of KNA by authorizing and directing the completion of a land exchange and acquisition package. The legislation will allow KNA for the first time to make economic use of the majority of lands conveyed to the corporation under the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act of 1971.

We began the final stage in this process by directing, through enactment of Public Law 102-458, an expedited negotiation of a land acquisition package between the Fish and Wildlife Service and KNA. Over the past year, negotiations were completed, resulting in a package which is identical to the elements of the legislation I am introducing today.

KNA has waited since 1982 to resolve its land selection problem with property which is within the boundaries of the Kenai National Wildlife Refuge. KNA has reached a tentative agreement with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service with an exchange agreement on lands within the refuge. I believe that they have waited long enough for ratification of the agreement and believe they deserve to have this behind them. This legislation will authorize and direct the Secretary to make an offer to KNA to complete an exchange and acquisition of lands owned by KNA.

This legislation represents an agreement reached during the 103d Congress. It is my intention to move this legislation quickly and get it behind us. I urge my colleagues support so that KNA can move forward with their agenda.

I am pleased with the efforts by KNA, its former president, the late Katherine Boling, and board of directors as well as the Fish and Wildlife Service to finalize this acquisition. KNA and the Fish and Wildlife Service have set aside past differences and have resolved the land use disagreement which has prevented KNA from using most of its lands conveyed under ANCSA. At the same time, another purpose of Public Law 102-458 and, a Federal goal, was acquiring for public ownership land along the Kenai River. These missions would be accomplished by the legislation I am introducing today.

The Service has completed all the necessary negotiations on land acquisitions and exchange components and completed the necessary public review and legal reviews required for exchanges in Alaska. I commend the Service for their efforts to acquire a key parcel of land along the Kenai River, inside the boundaries of the Kenai National Wildlife Refuge, for public use. This acquisition is the crucial component of this legislation. Just as crucial is the need to allow KNA to make economic use of lands conveyed to the corporation to settle native land claims. It is wrong under any sense of fairness or the law to convey lands to native corporations in settlement of recognized land claims yet at the same time prohibit the use of those lands.

Mr. Speaker, we need innovative measures to resolve land use conflicts in Alaska. Secretary Babbitt has noted the need for innovative exchanges throughout the Nation to properly manage Federal lands. This legislation represents a fine example of an exchange which resolves a longstanding land dispute on a voluntary basis.

I believe we can and should resolve this dispute on a voluntary basis. If we fail to do so, the result will only be ill-will, an extreme inequity to the Alaska Natives of KNA, litigation and the loss of an important opportunity to acquire public, riverfront lands, along the Kenai River. Further, there will remain a significant doubt that any land use conflict involving Federal lands in Alaska can be resolved in a cooperative fashion.

Mr. Speaker, I have worked closely with the former chairman of the Natural Resources Committee, Mr. MILLER, on this matter for many years. I believe we have an opportunity to correct an inequity, acquire valuable habitat, and show that innovative answers to land use problems will work in Alaska. I am anxious to move forward on this legislation which resolves this matter on a voluntary, willing seller