

A, 27th Armored Infantry Battalion. Cleaned out machine gun nest on bridge.

First Lieutenant Hugh B. Mott of Nashville, Tennessee, platoon leader in Company B, 9th Armored Engineer Battalion. Led engineers who ripped out demolition wires and cleared the bridge of explosives.

Sergeant Eugene Dorland of Manhattan, Kansas, Company B, 9th Armored Engineer Battalion. One of engineers who helped clear the bridge of explosives.

Sergeant John A. Reynolds of Lincolnton, North Carolina, Company B, 9th Armored Engineer Battalion. One of engineers who helped clear the bridge of explosives.

Captain George P. Soumas of Perry, Iowa, company commander of Company A, 14th Tank Battalion, the first tank company to cross the bridge.

First Lieutenant C. Windsor Miller of Silver Spring, Md., platoon leader in Company A, 14th Tank Battalion, the first tank platoon to cross the bridge.

Sergeant William J. Goodson of Pendleton, Indiana, Company A, 14th Tank Battalion. Tank commander of the first tank which crossed Remagen Bridge.

1st Lieutenant John Grimball of Columbia, South Carolina, platoon leader in Company A, 14th Tank Battalion. Head of first tank platoon to reach the bridge.

Sergeant Michael Chinchar of Saddle River Township, New Jersey, platoon leader of 1st platoon, Company A, 27th Armored Infantry Battalion. One of first group of infantrymen across the bridge.

Sergeant Joseph S. Petrencsik of Cleveland, Ohio, assistant squad leader in 3d platoon, Company A, 27th Armored Infantry Battalion. One of first group of infantrymen across the bridge.

Sergeant Anthony Samele of Bronx, New York, squad leader in 1st platoon, Company A, 27th Armored Infantry Battalion. Third man across the bridge.

The following is a sample of the citation for the Distinguished Service Cross:

NOT WITH MY VOTE

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

Mr. OLIVER. Madam Speaker, in just a couple of weeks we are going to start debate on one of the cornerstones of the Republican Contract on America. That cornerstone, the tax cut of \$200 billion over 5 years.

Never mind that the deficit is already \$200 billion per year, put aside that the tax cuts add to the deficit, never mind that these tax cuts make balancing the budget harder, and never mind that not a responsible economist agrees that cutting taxes is the right way to start on reducing the deficit and balancing the budget.

But putting those things aside, let us examine the proposal. First of all, on this chart we can see who gets the tax benefits from the tax reductions being proposed. If you would look at the first 2 columns down on the left-hand side, less than 20 percent of the tax reduction is given to some 71 million American families that are almost two-thirds of all the American families.

In the upper side there you find 50 percent of the tax reductions to less than 10 percent of the families, whose income is now over \$100,000 per year.

Well, if that graph is a little difficult to grasp quickly, look at the second one. Under this graph, in the same categories of income what this shows is that the Republican tax cut will provide \$5,000 to the average family, who presently make more than \$200,000 per year. That would be \$12 billion of tax cuts each year.

Down at the other end of the scale there are 49 million families that, together, get \$57 on average per family per year. That is about \$1 per week per family.

Now, the Republicans claim that they are not going to make the deficit larger. So, we will be debating the \$17 billion rescission bill next week. Under NEWT GINGRICH'S Contract on America, spending cuts which hurt children and elders and make it harder for youth and teenagers to get the education and skills and training so that they can get jobs, those spending cuts will be used to give tax breaks to the wealthiest of Americans.

In NEWT GINGRICH'S America, Republicans are going to cut infant mortality prevention, prenatal, children's foster care, safe and drug-free schools for children and education for disadvantaged children and domestic violence prevention and shelters for homeless families. But they will do it without my vote.

In NEWT GINGRICH'S America, these Republicans will cut vocational and technological education and Americorps, the National community service corps, school drop-out prevention, and college scholarships, summer jobs for teenagers who are at risk of dropping out of school, and school-to-work job training. But, again, they will do that without my vote.

In NEWT GINGRICH'S America, the Republican extremists will cut rental assistance to low-income families and public housing maintenance and safety and home heating assistance for 6 million families, every one of whom, every one of whom falls in that category of people with incomes under \$30,000 a year. But, again, they will do it without my vote.

In NEWT GINGRICH'S America, at least \$12 billion in tax cuts are going to be transferred, \$12 billion of wealth, will be transferred from people down in this area who now have under \$30,000 of income per year, and it will be transferred into tax cuts for the wealthiest 2 percent of Americans, giving them \$5,000 a year, on average, in tax cuts.

At least \$12 billion in services, in the services that I have mentioned, will be cut from these 48 million families down there at the lower end of the scale, who have under \$30,000 of income per year. That is over \$250, on average, per family that is going to be cut.

Madam Speaker, if people who are watching have not already guessed it, and probably many of them have, every Member of Congress, every Senator, every Member of the House falls in the upper categories on this graph, and not one Member of Congress will lose a

penny of the \$12 billion taken away from those 48 million families whose income is below \$30,000 per year.

□ 1930

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

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

FORT MCCLELLAN AND ANNISTON ARMY DEPOT

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

Mr. BROWDER. Madam Speaker, a few nights ago I spoke on this floor, and I said that the Secretary of Defense's recommendation to close Fort McClellan, AL, was a mistake with significant and dangerous consequences. To be specific tonight, Madam Speaker, I would like to talk about the mistake of this recommendation that breaks faith with hundreds of thousands of civilians in Alabama who live around a dangerous chemical stockpile which is slated to be destroyed by the United States as part of an agreement with Russia.

Let me tell my colleagues something about this stockpile. This chemical stockpile stored in this same community with Fort McClellan, has poisons such as sarin and VX. A small drop of sarin on a man's skin can be fatal. VX is several times more lethal than sarin, and a small drop of the liquid evenly distributed can kill many people. Among the weapons stored at the Anniston Army Depot, each M-23 land mine contains 10½ pounds of VX. Each 155 millimeter artillery projectile can hold either 6 pounds of VX or 6½ pounds of sarin. Each of the 78,000 M55 115-millimeter rockets; that is 78,000 of those, contains either 10 pounds of VX or 10.7 pounds of sarin. That is a pretty dangerous mixture.

That is why one newspaper had this headline, Madam Speaker, that said, "Army, An Army Study Leaking Nerve Rockets, Could Explode on Their Own." That is why another newspaper headline said, "Living with Chemical Weapons. Best Hope If There's an Accident: Run for Your Life."

The Army knew this in 1990 when it filed a permit request with the Alabama Department of Environmental Management called Resource Conservation and Recovery Act hazardous waste permit application for the Department of the Army, Anniston Army Depot chemical stockpile disposal system. This is in 1990. This is all of the contingency plans they have if there is an accident in this place.

Fort McClellan chemical response plan says,

This plan establishes a required organization, responsibilities and procedures in the event of an accident or incident at Anniston Army Depot. The purpose of this plan is to establish procedures and actions to be employed by Fort McClellan reaction teams in support of a chemical accident or incident occurring on the Anniston Army Depot and which is or will become a potential hazard to the depot and surrounding community.

Madam Speaker, several hundred thousand people are in that surrounding community of Anniston Army Depot, and Fort McClellan's resources have been committed by that permit request in case we have a problem there.

I had a meeting last year, almost a year ago, with Deputy Secretary of Defense John Deutsch. I would like to read a letter he wrote to me in August. He said:

DEAR MR. BROWDER: In our meeting on June 16, 1994, you and I discussed Department of Defense policy and intentions on several matters related to the Chemical Demilitarization Project scheduled for Anniston Army Depot. You requested that I provide assurances on these matters, and I am pleased to respond to this request. As you know, the Department is eager to conduct its business in a manner that is open and meets community concerns to the maximum extent possible. The "safeguard" assurances you request serve this purpose and therefore deserve the positive responses provided below.

Please rest assured that we share your concern for safe and environmentally sound destruction of chemical weapons at Anniston. Specifically . . .

Madam Speaker, under the heading of Fort McClellan Support Resources:

By separate correspondence I'm asking the Secretary of the Army to work closely with Alabama Department of Environmental Management to respond to the State requirement and to be fully responsible to their concerns.

He closed:

I assure you that the Department of Defense will continue to insure that the destruction of our chemical weapons stockpile is accomplished in full cognizance of the ongoing need to protect our people and our environment.

Then the Undersecretary of Defense that same month issued its memorandum for the Secretary of the Army. Subject: Chemical Weapons Demilitarization Facility at Anniston Army Depot:

Efforts are ongoing to ensure the successful start of chemical weapons demilitarization operations at Anniston Army Depot. In order to gain the requisite support for these operations, we must ensure the application of certain safeguards which will satisfy local concerns and enhance the safety of the demilitarization process.

Madam Speaker, this lists all the requirements, the decontamination team, the medical assistance team, says we need to be fully responsive to the Alabama Department of Environmental Management, and we must commit appropriate military resources such as the following which have been identified at the current location to support the demilitarization effort.

Madam Speaker, for 40 years the Army has dumped these dangerous chemicals on Alabama. They pledged Fort McClellan as our rescue squad. Now they want to close down the rescue squad and strike a match to that pile of dangerous chemicals. I will not allow that to happen. I will do everything I can to stop that from happening unless this dangerous mistake is reversed.

BY SLOWING GROWTH IN SPENDING FROM 7.6 TO 3 PERCENT WE CAN BALANCE THE BUDGET BY 2002

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

Mr. SAXTON. Madam Speaker, I would like to talk for just a few minutes about the rate of increase that we have seen in Federal spending and what some of us would like to do to stop that from happening.

Last summer House Republicans held a series of meetings and decided that someone had to step up to the plate and do something about this very serious fiscal problem. Without question, Madam Speaker, one of the most important issues we face today is our soaring national debt. I think both parties agree with that. Today it has reached epidemic proportions in that we have a national debt of almost \$5 trillion, \$4.8 trillion to be more exact.

Think about the magnitude of it. We are not talking about millions or billions that we throw around here daily. We are talking about trillions, almost \$5 trillion.

I realize that it is difficult for most people to think in terms of trillions. It is for me. But look at it this way. Five trillion is a 5 with 12 zeroes behind it.

Or look at it in terms of what \$5 trillion means if we divide it equally among the American citizens. In those terms \$5 trillion means \$18,000 for every man, woman and child in the United States, and, unless we deal with this problem now, by the turn of the century the United States will spend more on interest on the national debt than we spend on the defense of our country.

That is why Republicans, and I might say some Members of both parties, are offering a fresh approach.

If we simply slow the growth in spending from what it has averaged over the last 10 years, 7.6 percent; that is right, 7.6 percent every year increase over the last 10 years, if we slow it to about 3 percent, we can balance the budget by the year 2002. Programs that have been growing by leaps and bounds must be reined in.

Now if we are being honest with ourselves and with the American people, we and our critics must make it clear that the Republicans are simply limiting the rate of growth in a broad variety of programs.

I say to my colleagues, Yes, if you were told otherwise, you're not being told the truth. For example, Republicans want to reduce the rate of increase in the school lunch program. This year we're spending about \$4.5 billion on this program, and we're proposing a spending level of \$4.7 billion for fiscal year 1996. Now if that sounds to you like an increase, you have got it right.

My colleagues, only in Washington can an increase of \$200 million be considered a cut, and that is what our opponents are claiming.

Let us look next at the Child Nutrition Program. We are currently spending at a level of \$3.47 billion.

The American people need to know that Republicans want to slow the rate of growth in this program by proposing a 1996 spending level of \$3.68 billion, another \$200 million increase. It is an increase over present levels, but it is not the astronomical rate of increase that some of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle want.

What I am saying is that we are not decimating or gutting these programs. We are slowing the rate of growth for them from an average of 7.6 percent to about 3 percent.

Let us look at one more program. Let us go to veterans benefits as a final example where in 1995 we spent about \$17.73 billion. The spending level for veterans benefits under our Republican program for 1996 is \$17.78 billion, another increase this time of \$50 million, but a reduction in the rate of growth. By doing this we are doing something different to bring spending under control. We are doing something different because we recognize that there are limits to taxes Americans should be expected to pay, and there are limits to the debt we should create.

We need to get real. We need to be straight with the American people, particularly with those who are the beneficiaries of the worthy programs that we are talking about.

Join with us in bringing about a realistic, long range spending plan that will provide the level of benefits needed but will not bankrupt our children and our grandchildren.

REPUBLICAN PARTY, A PARTY OF CONTRADICTION

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

Mr. WYNN. Madam Speaker, now that the first 50 days are past, I think we are beginning to see the true colors of the Republican Party. Once again they are playing Robin Hood in reverse, taking from the poor to give to the rich. When I thought about some of the things that have occurred over the last couple of weeks, it appeared to me that what we have is a party of contradictions. This is a group that said, What we are is pro-life. We believe in