

established in 1950, Al leaves behind a lifetime legacy that will never be forgotten.

THE BUDGET RESOLUTION

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1995

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Washington Report for Wednesday, May 31, 1995 into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

BALANCED BUDGET PLANS

The House of Representatives recently completed action on the budget resolution, which sets broad dollar targets for federal spending and revenues for the next seven years. Each of the four versions considered by the House would, in theory, balance the federal budget by the year 2002. Some would even produce a surplus and begin reducing the national debt.

The House leadership deserves credit for bringing balanced budget resolutions to the floor. The deficit this year is projected to be just under \$200 billion. The deficit has been significantly reduced—from 4.9% of the total economy three years ago to 2.5% today—but much more needs to be done. The cuts necessary to erase the deficit will be felt by all Americans. Congress' challenge is to make sure that the burden of cuts is distributed fairly.

A Moderate Plan: I support a balanced budget. The budget resolution I voted for would balance the budget by 2002, begin to reduce the national debt, stabilize the Medicare trust fund, and invest in our children through student loans, Head Start, and childhood immunization. It would make tough but fair cutbacks in almost every part of the budget: foreign aid, welfare, agriculture, transportation, housing, and many others. It did not raise tax rates. The gradual reductions would cut the deficit in half by 1999, provide a surplus in 2002, and reduce the national debt (the sum of yearly deficits) by \$160 billion more than the majority's budget. This budget received the most bipartisan support. Unfortunately, it was defeated.

The Majority Plan: The majority leadership's resolution passed the House. While I disagreed with several of its priorities, the majority's budget has some positive features. It is a serious attempt to break the pattern of government overspending with hard targets and a final date to balance the budget. It forces the nation to confront fiscal decisions avoided for too long.

The majority's budget would cut spending for virtually all federal programs except defense, which would increase significantly. It also assumes cuts in tax revenue by \$280 billion reduction over seven years and an additional \$350 billion in the following three years.

The largest savings in the majority budget come from a \$288 billion in Medicare services, compared to spending levels required under current law. The plan would eliminate 284 programs, reduce student loans, cut major agricultural programs, and make significant cuts in child nutrition services. Heating assistance to low-income families would be abolished, and only 50 percent of housing assistance vouchers for older persons would be renewed. The majority's budget would also eliminate small business assistance, community development funds, and assistance to rural communities for wastewater treatment.

Reservations: I did not support the majority budget resolution for several reasons:

First, the majority delayed most of the tough spending cuts until 2001. Until then, we will have deficits in excess of \$100 billion per year. My preference is to reduce spending gradually each year, rather than postponing action.

Second, the job of balancing the budget is made much more difficult by huge tax cuts. I do not think we can justify large tax breaks until the budget is balanced—especially when the tax cuts start early and the bulk of the spending cuts are delayed for six years. If and when a surplus occurs, then Congress should pass tax cuts. It does not make sense to borrow more money to give ourselves a tax cut.

Third, my spending priorities are different. Half of the total savings come from health care and assistance to the poor. We should not ask the poor to bear more than their share of the burden. The curbs on Medicare and Medicaid are too steep. I prefer fair, across-the-board cuts in most programs, and deep cuts in "corporate welfare"—wasteful subsidies to business. We should also preserve funding for long-term investments such as health and science research, infrastructure, and education. These are necessary to continue economic growth, increase revenues, and reduce the deficit.

Fourth, the majority budget devolves a great deal of responsibility to state and local governments in a short period of time. This may be a good idea in many cases, but we need more information on the ability of these governments to handle new duties. Balancing the federal budget will be a hollow victory if state and local governments fail to run programs well or raise taxes to meet exploding costs.

Fifth, I am not convinced the majority plan would achieve a balanced budget. The plan makes optimistic economic assumptions that it could lower interest rates almost two percentage points and boost economic growth. That might occur, but the hope of \$170 billion in savings from this should not be assumed in advance.

Conclusion: The House action on the budget was a significant step toward restoring fiscal responsibility to the federal government. The Senate has also passed a budget resolution, with no immediate tax cut. The House and Senate resolutions must be reconciled in what will be a contentious conference committee, with tax cuts at the center of debate. The budget resolution itself is not subject to a Presidential veto, but the measures to implement it must be approved by the President.

The toughest choices lie ahead, when Congress debates these specific spending cuts. It is one thing to say that Medicare services must be reduced by \$288 billion over seven years, but quite another to decide exactly how these savings will be accomplished. The real budget decisions are just beginning.

The popular promise of 1994, that the budget could be balanced painlessly, will not be kept. The strongest evidence of that is the deep cuts in Medicare and Medicaid services. The right way to reduce the deficit is to distribute the burden of spending cuts fairly. The challenge is to balance the need for austerity with critical investments in long-term growth. We should reduce unnecessary and marginal programs, but also invest in programs that will help working families build a more prosperous future.

TRIBUTE TO LORNA M. HART

HON. JULIAN C. DIXON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1995

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay special tribute to Mrs. Lorna M. Hart for her 30 years of outstanding service as a teacher in the Los Angeles Unified School District. In recognition of her dedication to the children of Los Angeles, Mrs. Hart will be honored by her friends and family at an appreciation dinner on June 10, 1995. It is a pleasure to share with my colleagues just a few of her many accomplishments.

A dedicated student, Mrs. Hart received her bachelor of arts degree from the University of California at Los Angeles [UCLA] in 1960. By 1965, Mrs. Hart received her general elementary teaching credentials and began her 30 year career with the Los Angeles Unified School District. Later, she returned to school, and in 1975 she earned her masters of arts in education from California State University, Los Angeles, as well as a media education credential.

From 1964 until her retirement in September of last year, Mrs. Hart taught elementary and special education, touching the lives of many young students. As a special education teacher to students with physical disabilities, Mrs. Hart worked closely with administrators, school support staff, teachers, and parents to enrich the educational experience of disabled youth. Mrs. Hart was also responsible for implementing "Career Week" for young children and served on the Ethnic Heritage Committee for the Los Angeles Unified School District.

In addition to her teaching, Mrs. Hart has contributed greatly to the Los Angeles Christian community. Mrs. Hart was ordained to preach the gospel and is the former assistant pastor of the People's United Community Church of Christ, Inc. Mrs. Hart is currently affiliated with the Emmanuel Independent Community Church where she is an associate pastor and minister of christian education. She serves on the board of directors for Christian Women in Action, is president of the Community Alliance of Pastors and Ministers, and treasurer of the West Adams Christian Athletics.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join me in saluting Mrs. Lorna M. Hart on her many years of dedicated service to her students and the Los Angeles Unified School District. It is a pleasure to join her family, friends, and colleagues in recognizing her distinguished teaching career and wishing Mrs. Hart well on the occasion of her retirement.

FIFTIETH WEDDING ANNIVERSARY OF EDWIN AND CHARLOTTE WENTA

HON. WILLIAM O. LIPINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1995

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to bring to the attention of my colleagues an exemplary couple from the Third Congressional District of Illinois, Mr. and

Mrs. Edwin Wenta. On Sunday, June 11, 1995, Edwin and Charlotte will celebrate their 50th wedding anniversary with their family and friends at the sky room of the Martinique Restaurant in Evergreen Park.

On June 9, 1945, Edwin and Charlotte were married at the San Buena Mission in Ventura, CA. It was near the end of World War II and Ed was on leave from the U.S. Navy.

Edwin and Charlotte have two children, son Terry and daughter Diane, and five grandchildren, Lisa, Nick, Deanna, Dierdra, and Gerald. The entire Wenta family joins me in saluting Edwin and Charlotte on this special occasion.

The Wentas are a role model of the family strength and integrity that has made America great. Their commitment to each other and their family is impressive and deserving of special recognition and honor. I am sure that my colleagues join me in congratulating Edwin and Charlotte on their many years of love and commitment. May their life together continue to be an adventure and offer them many more pleasant memories.

TRIBUTE TO NEW LOS ANGELES MARKETING PARTNERSHIP

HON. HOWARD L. BERMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1995

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to pay tribute to my good friend Larry Fisher and others for launching the New Los Angeles Marketing Partnership, a much-needed effort to counter the negative image of Los Angeles in the media. With a riot, an earthquake, fires and a sensational murder trial having dominated the news from Los Angeles in the past 3 years, the New Los Angeles Marketing Partnership could not be arriving at a better time. I wish them all the luck in the world.

Seeing the outline of the program, which will officially kick off on June 7, I am confident it will achieve its goals. The participants truly love Los Angeles, and have a keen sense of what it is that makes this a great city, including climate, extraordinary ethnic diversity and a thriving entertainment industry. The chosen theme, Together we're the best, Los Angeles conveys the spirit of optimism guiding this project.

For the first 5 years, New Los Angeles Marketing Partnership will be reminding the people of Los Angeles County about the exciting place in which they live. This effort will be specifically targeted at all 88 cities in Los Angeles County.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in saluting Larry Fisher and the other members of the New Los Angeles Marketing Partnership, whose faith in the city of Los Angeles and dedication to improving its image is an inspiration to all of us who live and work there.

MEDICARE CUTS ARE A BAD IDEA

HON. SHERROD BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1995

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, there is an old country and western song that goes,

"She got the gold mine, and I got the shaft." The Republican budget would give the gold mine to wealthy special interests and give the shaft to America's elderly—\$300 billion in tax breaks, \$300 billion in Medicare cuts.

The Republicans indignantly cry that these are not really cuts, they are only slowing the growth of Medicare. Tell that to the literally millions of people who depend on Medicare in Ohio, and Pennsylvania, and California, and all over this country, who will have \$3,500 more taken out of their pocket over the next 7 years in higher premiums, deductibles, and copayments. Tell those people that these are not really cuts.

The cuts in services which will pay for tax breaks for the wealthiest Americans, tax breaks for special interests, tax breaks for people who do not need these kinds of tax breaks—to people with the highest income in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I support Medicare and ensuring that older Americans have access to health care services when they need them from the doctor of their choice. As Republicans move to make these cuts in Medicare, they are talking about rationing health care and limiting seniors' ability to choose their doctor.

We should reject that, Mr. Speaker. We should reject this kind of thinking. It is not good for America's elderly. It is not good for the American people.

RETIREMENT OF JOHN ADDEO: AP- PRECIATION FOR A GREAT CA- REER

HON. FRANK PALLONE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1995

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, June 9, 1995, Mr. John Addeo, Jr., of Ocean, NJ, will be honored with a retirement dinner at Squire Pub in West Long Branch, NJ. It is a great honor for me to pay tribute to Mr. Addeo on this occasion.

Mr. Addeo has served as the principal of the Woodmere School in Eatontown, NJ, since 1968. In total, Mr. Addeo has dedicated 34 years of his life to education. A 1957 graduate of Long Branch High School and a 1961 graduate of Monmouth University, Mr. Addeo began his teaching career in Asbury Park. He received his master's degree from Newark State College in 1968 and became principal at Woodmere later that year. He also was an instructor at Brookdale Community College and serves as a member of the Elementary Principals and Supervisors Association and the New Jersey Education Association.

John and Theresa Addeo are the parents of John Addeo III and Melissa Addeo Ardito. The list of Mr. Addeo's current and former community affiliations is a long one. He is a former member of the Italian-American Association and the Eatontown Lion's Club. He is a charter member and first vice president of the Eatontown/Tinton Falls Kiwanis Club, former Little League baseball and softball coach in Ocean Township, a former member of the Ocean Township Zoning Board of Adjustment and the organizer of Boy Scout Troop 376.

Mr. Speaker, throughout his career, John Addeo has exemplified the very best qualities

of America's proud tradition of public education. Generations of students who have passed through the Woodmere School—many of them fully grownup and now in important positions of responsibility, some of them now parents themselves—have benefited from his dedication and leadership. As his friends, colleagues, and students pay tribute on the occasion of his retirement, I am proud to add my voice in recognition of the fine job that John Addeo has done for nearly a quarter of a century in one of the most important jobs I know of: the education of our young people.

AN AGENDA FOR THE NATION

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1995

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Washington Report for Wednesday, June 7, 1995, into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

AN AGENDA FOR THE NATION

Hoosiers continue to express to me their widespread discontent in the country, their unease with government, and anger at those who conduct its business. They understand changes are being made in government—that federal jobs are being eliminated, budgets are being trimmed, agencies are being eliminated—but believe more can and should be done to make government more responsive to the needs and demands of the average American.

The challenge facing Congress and the President is to make the changes that will restore the public's faith and confidence in government. Hoosiers mention the following reforms most often in my recent public meetings, and I think their views reflect the concerns of most Americans.

Deficit reduction: Deficit reduction should be a top priority. Congress acted last session to cut \$600 billion from the projected deficits. The House and Senate recently approved budget plans to eliminate the deficit over the next seven years, but the budget resolution only provides a rough outline for how deficit reduction will be achieved. The tough decisions on specific spending cuts lie ahead. I agree that the deficit must be reduced.

Investment: Americans favor steps to reduce the budget deficit that are fair and balanced. It makes no sense to try to balance the budget by slashing federal investment programs. The private sector is the engine for economic growth, but government can play a role by supporting training and education of our workers as well as investing in our infrastructure and our technology. Such investments are critical to economic growth, and without growth, balancing the budget becomes immensely more difficult. Most of the investment trends over the past several years have been in the wrong direction. We need a shift in federal priorities away from consumption and toward investment, and we need to emphasize both public and private investment.

Reinventing government: The federal government is bloated and should be downsized. Congress and the Executive Branch adopted significant measures last session to make government work better and cost less, from streamlining Pentagon procurement policies to eliminating outdated government agencies. These efforts can and should be expanded this year. Americans want bold changes in government today, and Congress and the President should support that.