

THE REPUBLICAN BUDGET

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, we finally got an outline of the proposed Republican budget. It is in violation of the Budget Act, a bit late, but better late than never.

I have got to say there is one thing I find I have in common, which is I share their objective to get deficit spending under control and to bring the Federal Government's budget into balance by the year 2002. But past that point, I find we have tremendous differences, and they revolve around the basic approach taken by the Republican Party on this matter.

□ 2200

That is, Mr. Speaker, their first assumption is that we will not reduce military spending. That is the largest discretionary item from the Federal budget. The Pentagon will take no reductions. The Pentagon, which will have a budget in fact increased above the President's requests in this budget, a budget which is equivalent to the last budget of the great cold war with the Soviet Union, we will still fund 100,000 troops in Europe waiting for the invasion of the Soviet Union into West Germany, unified Germany anyhow, somewhere into that region.

We will still spend \$60 billion a year in defense of Japan against the Soviet Union. We will still produce stealth bombers with no objective, at the cost of \$1 billion each. We will produce a myriad of other weapons systems that we no longer need that would not have worked in any case against our principal adversary of 10 years ago. However, we cannot ask for a penny of cuts at the Pentagon. We know they are spending every dollar wisely. That is off the table.

Then we come to the revenue side. On the revenue side, actually what we are going to do is reduce revenues in order to reach a balanced budget. That does not make sense to most Americans, Mr. Speaker. Most Americans who are having a little trouble making their car payment, house payment, utility payment, and buying clothes for their kids would not think they could reduce their income and get their home budget in balance.

No, indeed, through the miracles in budgeting here in the U.S. Congress, that is exactly what we are going to do. According to the Republican budget proposal, we will reduce income by \$340 billion, not decrease the military by a penny, and we will get to a balanced budget. One might ask "How are we to do that, given that the largest single discretionary expenditure will not be reduced, the military; given the fact that we will reduce our incomes by \$350 billion?" We are going to do it by gutting virtually everything else in the Federal budget that is important to average and working American families.

Mr. Speaker, we will eliminate the Women, Infants, and Children Program. We will cut back on the School Lunch Program. We will reduce student loans, dramatically. After all, who needs a student loan program? Certainly not the wealthy, who are going to get very generous tax cuts under this proposal. In fact, they will have so much discretionary income they will be buying another BMW. They are not worried about sending their kids to college.

Middle-income families, average folks, those struggling to find a way for their kids to go to college, sorry, the Federal Government has to balance its budget, and it has to give tax cuts to the wealthy, and it has to give tax cuts to the largest corporations, repeal the alternative minimum tax, and it cannot find a penny of reductions in the military budget.

This is all laid out here in a rather brutal reality by the Republican majority in this House. I do not believe that these are the priorities of the American people. They are certainly not my priorities. We have just received these documents, so, as I stand here, I am paging through to look for some of the more interesting portions.

We can find places to cut back in natural resources and environmental protection. We can find places to cut back in energy development, particularly in renewable energy resources and clean-up of hazardous waste sites. We cannot find much to cut in agriculture, \$13 billion a year in subsidies. Sam Donaldson getting \$75,000 a year to not raise sheep on the ranch that he does not live on, we cannot cut that. We could not cut Sam Donaldson. He might give some negative press to the majority party. Business as usual. When the Democrats were in charge, we could not cut Sam Donaldson. Now the Republicans are in charge, they cannot cut the Sam Donaldsons in the world. He should get the \$75,000 on the ranch on which he does not live, he is going to live there some day. This is not the bare bones budget we need, and it does not make cuts in the proper priorities.

COMMENDING UNSUNG HEROES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NORWOOD). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER] will be recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, let me just briefly answer my friends who just spoke about the defense budget numbers. From my calculations the President's defense budget cuts \$127 billion below the Bush baseline. In practical terms, that means that under this President, we have reduced the Army from 18 divisions to 12 divisions. We have reduced our air wing equivalents from about 24 to 13. We have reduced the Navy from about 540 ships to about 340, almost a 40 percent cut. We are going down radically.

However, Mr. Speaker, I would like to talk about something else tonight, because the gentleman mentioned defense, and this happens to be the anniversary, May 10, 1972, of our colleague, the gentleman from California, DUKE CUNNINGHAM, being shot down in the skies over Vietnam, having shot down five MiG aircraft, and I understand at least three of them were in the air, and being nominated for the Congressional Medal of Honor for flying into a pack of MiG aircraft that were on his wingman's tail, and probably would have killed his wingman, had DUKE not flown his aircraft into that enemy air formation.

DUKE, we commend you.

While we are at it, I thought I might talk about a few other unsung heroes. Those are people who have been taking a lot of hits lately from the President. They are called talk show hosts. We have a few of them in San Diego. One of them, Roger Hedgecock, is a leader of talk radio in KSDO in San Diego. The President apparently does not like him. He criticizes the President a lot. He led a group of citizens back here a few weeks ago, when we had the balanced budget vote in the House of Representatives, and Roger Hedgecock staged his talk show, his talk radio show, from the Halls of the U.S. Capitol. He brought back in excess of 100 U.S. citizens, people from all walks of life, who walked door to door, not professional lobbyists, but people who went door to door and talked to their Congressmen and other Congressmen about voting for, of all things, a balanced budget.

We have another talk show host, Peter Weisbach, in San Diego, KOGO radio, who thought that perhaps the Mexican bailout, the \$20 billion of taxpayers' money that we sent to Mexico, was not a good idea; obviously, somebody else who disagreed with the President's policies. The President apparently does not like that.

Mike Reagan is another talk show host who appears on KOGO, and many times I have been on Mike's show talking about American foreign policy. He has educated our listeners in areas in which most Americans do not pay a great deal of attention. I can remember listening to Stacy Taylor of KFMB, my neighbor up in Alpine, CA. Stacy is a talk show host that you might classify as liberal or moderate, except for his strong belief in the second amendment. I do not know exactly how you would classify him, but I think that the way he conducts his show is provocative. I think it is informative. He takes me on a lot, takes on a lot of the political figures, takes on the President now and then, and that is not bad.

Lastly, we have Hudson and Bauer of KFMB in San Diego. They were invited by President Clinton when he thought maybe he could get talk radio on his side to come back and have their talk show located on the White House grounds.

I can remember walking there through the talk radio, through all the talk show hosts who were located on the White House grounds, at President Clinton's invitation, giving their commentary on American politics, and this President's performance. When the President thought that he could bring these people to his side and swing opinion in his direction, he lobbied the talk show hosts. He thought they were great people. However, they listened to people, and most Americans are fairly conservative. Apparently, he has not appreciated the heat that he has taken from these people.

In a couple of weeks, Mr. Speaker, we are going to celebrate and commemorate the Americans who lost their lives in battles in this country and outside of this country, from Bunker Hill to Belleau Wood to Inchon in Korea, to Khe Sanh, to the Persian Gulf, and those Americans who lost their lives fought, of course, for that broad array of freedoms that we generally describe as liberty in this great land. One of those greatest freedoms is the right to criticize your elected officials.

Therefore, Mr. President, when you listen to talk show hosts and you do not like to the fact that they are criticizing you or taking you on, do not worry. Do not complain. It is the sound of freedom.

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

[Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts 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 Tennessee [Mr. BRYANT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

REPUBLICANS WANT TO BALANCE THE BUDGET ON THE BACKS OF AMERICANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Speaker, I think it is important that we are facing up to a very important decision, albeit late, and that is the budget for the people of the United States of America. I stand here this evening because a couple of weeks ago the State Comptroller for the State of Texas announced that through the rescission cuts, the State of Texas and its people will lose \$1.5 billion.

Yet, now, we have a budget proposal that takes those dollars on the backs of Texans and eliminates some 283 pro-

grams, as proposed by Republicans, and agrees to give the full measure of tax cuts already denied and rejected by the Senate Committee and the Budget chairman, Senator DOMENICI. This is the tax cut that will give those individuals making \$30,000 or less a mere \$124 a year, and the tax cut that gives the real working Americans, along with those Americans making \$30,000 or less, some \$760; that is, those making between \$30,000 and \$75,000.

In the course of this budget proposal, which is focused particularly on the backs of young people, on teachers, on students, and on the elderly, we first come full force to cut the Department of Energy, at the same time that the Secretary of Energy is reforming and reinventing her own department.

Here, now, we are a country which indicates a great interest in technological discoveries, a great need for a renewed energy policy, and many of the environmental efforts that have been made by the Department of Energy. Now we want to eliminate that department, just as we are addressing the focus of that department, which is to develop a real domestic energy policy, one that will address the needs of business, create jobs, and yes, open up opportunities internationally.

That department has been targeted for elimination, not improvement, not downsizing, but elimination, so I guess we will throw technology to the winds, the environment to the winds, and certainly, we will throw the opportunities for bringing the energy industry to the table to discuss important issues of developing a domestic energy policy that many could agree with, we will throw that to the winds, too, by eliminating the department.

The Department of Commerce, which over the last couple of years has generated more business for Americans than any other department, rather than downsizing and effectively making it work for the American people, this budget proposal targeting the backs of Americans wants to eliminate the Department of Commerce.

We go further. Many of us have had the opportunity, particularly in the city of Houston, to see the Americorps students working, the domestic Peace Corps. We have seen them working to help communities, but as much as them working to help communities, we have seen them build opportunities for themselves by providing for themselves to go to college.

What are we trying to do with this new budget proposed by the Republicans? Shut down departments that are effective and working, rather than creating opportunities for downsizing, and over a measured period of time bringing down the deficit, as all of us could agree with, now we are attacking Americorps and totally eliminating it, a program that has gone into the trenches of America and worked with communities to improve housing, to clean up neighborhoods, to work with

underprivileged children, to work with seniors, to build buildings, if you will, and to help those particular areas to cut down on their costs. We are eliminating it.

Then we are so generous-spirited and generous-hearted, along with the \$280 billion cut from Medicare, which our seniors have vigorously indicated "What more do you want from us," we now want to cut from the Republican budget now being discussed, as we speak, housing for the elderly; individuals who have worked all their lives, but possibly worked in jobs that would not allow them to have the kinds of savings that you need, and they are provided for in these group retirement homes that are assisted by our housing authorities throughout this country. Yet, we wish to cut that. No alternatives could be offered, other than to cut housing for the elderly, along with Medicare.

The State Bar of Texas, which I have had the great pride of serving as a member of the legal profession on the board of directors on that organization, comprised of law firms and sole practitioners and attorneys who understand what it is to serve the public, they pleaded in my office for us to preserve the Legal Services Corporation; not a group that goes out and instigates litigations, as would be accused by Republicans who are apparently cutting it out, but those who would help individuals who do not have the ability to secure their own lawyers; the Legal Services Corporation, helping mothers get child support payments, working with the elderly, working with those legal immigrants who come in and need services. Yet, they are totally cutting out Legal Services.

We do not have a budget, we have a joke. We have something that is going to hurt the citizens of Texas, hurt the citizens of Houston. We need to get down to the business of working for America. Mr. Speaker, we need a real budget to work for Americans.

□ 2215

THE FLAT TAX

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NORWOOD). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to address the House on an important issue. Now that the House has completed work on the Contract with America is a good time to begin looking past the first 100 days to future legislative goals.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that a flat tax is in America's future. It is an idea which is catching fire across the Nation. What is it about the flat tax that Americans find so attractive? I believe the answer can be summarized in three words: trust, simplicity, and fairness.