

tests that we should all ask ourselves. First of all, is this a Federal responsibility? Second of all, does it work? And, third of all, can we afford it?

If we do not ask those three simple questions about every program that comes forward in our budget process, we simply are not doing our job. If we could afford the luxury of endless spending, perhaps we would not have to do that. We cannot afford that anymore, and, besides, it is just good practical business, taking care of the American taxpayers' dollars, to ask those simple questions: Is this something Government should do, can we afford it, and does this thing work, is it on target? That is pretty simple. I think we can even get that message here.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following nine-step program for fiscal responsibility for the RECORD.

A NINE STEP PROGRAM FOR FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY

All savings are over a five year period, calculated in millions of dollars and based on best official estimates.

LEADING BY EXAMPLE: CONGRESSIONAL AND EXECUTIVE BRANCH REFORM

Savings and description

- 2,200—Reduce the Legislative Branch Appropriations by 20 percent
- 284—Reduce the Executive Office of the President Appropriation by 20 percent
- 85—Reduce the "franking" allocation to Members of Congress by 50 percent
- 118—Roll back the Congressional Pay Raise to \$89,500
- 2.5—Reduce the Attending Physician's Office by 33 percent
- 1.1—Privatize the House and Senate Gymnasiums

FREE MARKET AGRICULTURAL REFORM

Savings and description

- 12,700—Abolish the Cotton Price Support and Loan Programs
- 11,000—Lower target prices for subsidized crops 3 percent annually
- 5,000—Eliminate the Dairy Subsidy Program
- 3,950—Merge the Agricultural Research Service, the Cooperative Research Service and the Agricultural Extension Service; cut funding by 50 percent
- 1,660—End the Federal Crop Insurance Program and replace with standing authority for disaster assistance
- 660—Reduce Commodity Credit Corporation Subsidies to those with off-farm incomes over \$100,000
- 200—End the Peanut Subsidy Program
- 100—Eliminate the Tobacco Price Support Program

GOVERNMENT FOR THE PEOPLE, NOT THE BUREAUCRATS

Savings and Description

- 64,000—Lower by 10% per annum the projected growth rate of non-postal, civilian agencies overhead (excluding travel)
- 14,740—Eliminate DOD payments for indirect Research & Development; substitute direct R&D
- 8,850—Continue the partial civilian hiring freeze at DOD
- 6,000—Defense Acquisition Reform
- 3,080—Repeal the Davis-Bacon Act
- 2,550—Reduce DOE energy technology spending
- 1,900—Fully implement H.R. 2452 (102nd) to provide additional conservation measures for federal agencies
- 1,500—Strengthen and restructure NASA (NPR proposal)

- 1,000—Reduce overhead in federally-sponsored university research

- 900—Service Contract Act reform

- 858—Lower the travel budgets of all non-postal civilian agencies by 15 percent

- 540—Reform vacation and overtime for the Senior Executive Service

PRIVATIZING AND DOWNSIZING GOVERNMENT

Savings and description

- 9,000—corporateize the Air Traffic Control System
- 4,170—Facilitate contracting out and privatization of military commissaries
- 2,000—Privatize the Government National Mortgage Association
- 1,900—Eliminate the Legal Services Corporation
- 1,522—Eliminate the Economic Development Administration
- 913—Eliminate Rural Economic and Community Development (RCED) duplication with the Small Business Administration
- 690—Eliminate the Appalachian Regional Commission
- 580—End funding for all non-energy Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA) activities
- 174—Eliminate the Rural Utilities Service (formerly the Rural Electric Administration)
- 140—Close the Bureau of Mines and merge its data gathering activities with other Interior research agencies
- 56—Eliminate the Arms Control Disarmament Agency
- 10—Phase out the U.S. Fire Administration

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE THAT PUTS AMERICAN TAXPAYERS FIRST

Savings and description

- 13,125—Cut the foreign aid budget (150 Account) by 15 percent and make all earmarks in that account subject to a two-thirds vote for passage
- 8,100—Eliminate the Agency for International Development
- 1,510—Eliminate Public Law 480 International Assistance Program
- 150—Phase out the Foreign Agricultural Service Cooperation Funding

ATTACKING CORPORATE WELFARE

Savings and description

- 3,388—Eliminate Export Enhancement Program
- 3,372—Sell the Power Marketing Administrations
- 2,660—Phase out subsidies for AMTRAK
- 2,000—End postal subsidies to not-for-profit organizations (excluding blind and handicapped individuals)
- 1,002—Eliminate Travel, Tourism and Export Promotion Administration (as a taxpayer supported entity)
- 692—Sell the National Helium Reserves
- 660—Phase out ACTION (umbrella organization for domestic volunteer activities) as a tax supported program
- 500—Eliminate the Market Promotion Program
- 195—Eliminate Essential Air Service subsidies
- 121—Terminate Dairy Export Incentive Program

PRIORITIZING OUR SOCIAL SPENDING

Savings and description

- 27,000—Prohibit direct federal benefits and unemployment benefits to illegal aliens
- 6,300—Consolidate the administrative costs of the AFDC, Food Stamps and Medicaid programs
- 5,700—Freeze the number of rental assistance commitments
- 5,400—Increase Medicare safeguard funding by \$540 million over 5 years
- 4,900—Reduce NIH funding by 10 percent, concentrating on overhead
- 3,850—Eliminate "impact aid" to school districts with military bases

- 3,400—Eliminate non-targeted vocational state funding

- 3,060—Eliminate AmeriCorps

- 2,930—Eliminate the William D. Ford program (direct student lending)

- 2,600—Cut the National Endowment for Arts by 50 percent

- 2,060—Eliminate the Goals 2000 program

- 1,400—Scale back Rural Rental Housing Assistance program

- 1,400—Eliminate Office of the Surgeon General

- 1,000—Consolidate social services programs

- 990—Eliminate HUD special-purpose grants

- 883—Cut funding for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting by 50 percent

- 610—Replace new public housing construction with vouchers

- 144—Streamline HUD

ENDING TAXPAYER SUBSIDIES THAT DEGRADE OUR ENVIRONMENT

Savings and description

- 7,400—End all new Bureau of Water Reclamation water projects
- 2,200—End Irrigation Subsidies
- 1,100—Privatize the U.S. Enrichment Corporation
- 1,000—Reduce the fill rate for the Strategic Petroleum Reserve
- 1,000—1872 Mining Law Reform
- 880—End the "Corridor H" program
- 912—Eliminate the Clean Coal Program
- 250—Grazing Reform
- 235—Eliminate below-cost timber sales from national forests
- 80—End the Boll Weevil Eradication Program

CUTTING OUT THE PORK

Savings and description

- 8,850—Limit federal highway spending to the amount brought in by motor vehicle fuel taxes
- 6,250—Reduce mass transit grants; eliminate operating subsidies
- 5,150—Scale back Low Income Home Energy Assistance Grants
- 2,590—Terminate all highway demonstration projects
- 1,380—Eliminate Rural Development Association loans and guarantees
- 250—Eliminate redundant polar satellite programs
- 0.3—Close under-utilized black lung offices

THE DIRTY LITTLE SECRET OF AFFIRMATIVE ACTION FOES: THEY GET BY WITH A LITTLE HELP FROM THEIR FRIENDS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NETHERCUTT). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I have the great honor of serving on the House Committee on the Judiciary, and this has been a very, very difficult year, because we have had incoming missiles from every which way attacking affirmative action. I for one have been a believer in affirmative action, because I remember I could not get into a lot of schools I wanted to get into as a young woman, because even though I passed all the tests, they would say "Whoops, wrong chromosomes; have a nice day," and you went right out the door. So I have been very interested in this debate on affirmative action.

Well, I am going to do today what one of the ex-mayors of New York used to do. Mayor LaGuardia used to read the newspaper to people, and I think it is time to start reading the newspaper to people, because one of these incoming missiles against affirmative action came in the form of a vote by the University of California regents. That distinguished panel voted aggressively to back off of affirmative action. To end affirmative action as we know it, and now we know why that group wanted to.

They believe in the old Beatles song, "You get by with a little help from your friends." Remember that? "I get by with a little help from my friends." Well, this is what they are all singing.

This Saturday's Los Angeles Times did a wonderful job of exposing these regents, who are so pure and want a level playing field and all of this other stuff that you have heard about affirmative action. And what you really find as you read this newspaper, which is absolutely fascinating, because they go further and document all of the politicians, from Governor Pete Wilson, who led the antiaffirmative action charge in his now historic run for President, and he is no longer there, but from Governor Pete Wilson to many of the regents who voted for this, all the different people that they insisted that the University of California put at the front of the line, even though their grades happened to be lower than many others that they shut the door on because of this, their scores turned out to be lower. It is very interesting reading, and I hope people will look at this.

When some of these young students who got moved to the front of the line because their dad or mom knew the regent or they were business associates or whatever, when they would interview some of these young students, some them said very clearly, "But, of course, that is what is going on. This is America. It is who you know, not what you know."

Now, most minorities and women knew that. They knew that if they did not know somebody big, they were not going to get in. Actually some of them, they did not even need bother apply, because they were not going to get through the barrier. People could not look beyond their skin color, religion or sex.

So we are working hard to try and have a wakeup call to people, to say look, affirmative action is not perfect, but we ought to fix it, and we ought to be working on what you know, not who you know. But when you look at these regents, it is so clear by this record that special privilege is something that they want to continue. They want to continue with it, and they see affirmative action challenging that.

One of the regents who aggressively, aggressively fought affirmative action, was a man named Leo Kolligan. Now, this guy got in over 35 different young people, according to the L.A. Times, that were not as qualified. One score

was lower than 6,000 other young people who were turned away, but he got in. It is who you know, not what you know.

When you look at all of the others, they all happen to be sons and daughters of very prominent folks in the community that these different regents knew, or relatives, it is amazing how thick blood can run, or prominent politicians or relatives of prominent politicians or large fund raisers or whatever.

But that is not what we have said the American dream is about. So as you listen to this raging debate about affirmative action, we really ought to put it into some kind of context. What we really want to make sure is that the dream is attainable for everyone, no matter what their background, and it is really honest-to-goodness attainable. And if we go back to this who you know, it is not. You cannot say it is one thing, and then have it operating in an entirely different way.

The young people of America know that, and they know how fraudulent it is. You have so many students protesting in California on the campuses on this. I hope everybody pays serious attention to this, and we do not get caught up in undoing something so important.

GOOD NEWS AND BAD NEWS ON THE BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, there is good news and bad news in the President's budget that we received today. Let me go with some of the bad news first. Some of the bad news is that he has greater tax increases and that he has more spending for the Federal Government. In other words, some of the same old policy of tax and spend. In fact, on taxes, even though he has a temporary tax cut, the tax cut is done away with by the year 2002, and he has actually a tax increase of over \$10 billion by the time he gets to 2002.

Now, I think that old tax and spend and borrow philosophy is the bad news. Here is the good news. It is the Republicans, by hanging tough, have now changed the frame of the debate in Washington, so the President's budget still says through their figuring that this budget balances by the year 2002. And that is good news.

Let me point out why I think it is such good news. It is because borrowing has obscured the true size of Federal Government. If the American people had to pay the taxes that are required for this huge overbloated, over-regulating Government that we have now, they would not stand for it. They would say, "Wait a minute. Get rid of that fraud and abuse. Get rid of some of these programs, because we do not like you talking 50 percent of every dollar we earn for taxes at the local, State, and national level."

Let me display this chart a little bit that shows the pie of the way we divide up Federal expenditures. Now, for this current fiscal year, it is a little over \$1.5 trillion. The blue portion of this pie that now represents about 50 percent of total government spending is in the so-called welfare entitlement spending. That means if you achieve a certain criteria of age or poverty, the money is automatically going to be there. The Congress does not appropriate that money every year. The only way we can reduce the cost of these welfare entitlement programs is having the President sign a bill, or override his veto.

So if we are going to achieve a balanced budget, that means that we are going to have to achieve some changes in the welfare and entitlement programs. Some of the welfare recipients are going to have to start working. Our welfare programs have been successful in transferring wealth, but, too often in the process, we have taken away their self-respect. We have taken away their drive to get up every morning, even when they do not feel like it, and go to work and contribute to the economy of the United States. So they have been recipients of other taxpayer spending.

That has to be changed. We have sent one bill to the President. He has vetoed it. We sent another welfare reform bill to the President, and he has vetoed it. What we have got to start doing is having cooperation, or the kind of a President that is going to say yes, some of these changes need to be made.

Let me just briefly go around the rest of this pie chart. We have got interest on the Federal debt. The Federal debt is now about \$5 trillion. That interest is also on automatic pilot. We have got the defense in green. The defense programs now, even the hawks and the doves, the Republicans and Democrats, the liberals and conservatives, only disagree on about plus or minus 8 percent deviation. In other words, everybody agrees we need a certain amount of defense in this country, so there is very little flexibility.

What is left? What is left for Congress, what they have control of, is the 12 appropriation bills that represent the discretionary spending outside of defense.

In this little red pie chart area, we have been successful in the last 14 months of cutting \$40 billion out of spending. That is a good start. And the reason we have accomplished this, the reason the President and the Democrats and the liberals are now at least saying we need a balanced budget, is because we have changed the frame of the debate by saying look, we are not going to pass this kind of increase. Even if you veto it, Mr. President, even if you shut down Government. And are not going to give you a clean debt ceiling increase, because we are concerned with the debt of this country going over \$5 trillion, unless we make some of those changes.