

they would not work alone, that they would exacerbate the problems, cause refugees, kill a lot of people. The United States would have to pay for a lot of it and unless we put ground troops in there the goals were not attainable. Yet, the President says no ground troops, which I am opposed to also.

Why is he opposed to it? Because the Germans balked, the Italians balked. In World War II, Germany had 700,000 troops in Kosovo. The Chechens, with one half the force that Milosevic has, killed those Germans. General Shelton just 2 days ago said that this is the easiest place to defend and the most difficult to attack in the world.

We do not belong there, Mr. Speaker. This is Clinton's war. Clinton ought to get out of it.

OUR POWS, WE WANT THEM SAFE, SOUND AND RETURNED

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to join in supporting H.R. 84, the resolution by the good and kind gentlewoman from California, to acknowledge and applaud the bravery of the POWs in Kosova. Two of those young men are members of the Texas family, Sergeant Stone and Mr. Gonzalez. We offer to that family or those families, along with the family of Sergeant Ramirez, our deepest sympathy and recognition of the bravery that these men have exhibited.

We say to Mr. Milosevic that we hope that he is listening very strongly to this resolution that has been offered. We want them safe and we want them sound and we want them returned. We also want, as the resolution has indicated, that the Red Cross can go in and determine that these individuals have been treated fairly and are safe. Most importantly, we acknowledge that they have been taken wrongly.

I hope that as this House has expressed itself in its support for these young men and the military efforts, that the families will know that we are paying attention to the safety of the POWs and we are also paying attention to their needs.

It is with great regret that I have to stand on the floor to acknowledge that today we have POWs, but it is with great joy and recognition of our unity that we say collectively today, as the resolution was passed, we stand behind those POWs, respecting them, honoring them and knowing that they will know that we will not rest until they are safely returned.

BILLIONS OF DOLLARS SPENT ON SALMON RESTORATION IN COLUMBIA RIVER BY FEDERAL GOVERNMENT, WITH MINIMAL RESULTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from Washington (Mr. METCALF) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, our Pacific Northwest salmon populations have been in decline for decades. Recently, nine new populations were listed as endangered or threatened under the Endangered Species Act. The Federal Government and the States are poised to provide substantial sums of money for habitat rehabilitation and restoration efforts but, beyond that, the Federal Government must be a helpful advisor only with the decisions made thoughtfully and judiciously at the State and local level. We must not allow, nor can we afford, another debacle such as occurred on the Columbia River in recent years.

Billions of dollars have been spent on salmon restoration in the Columbia River by the Federal Government over the last 20 years, with minimal results; largely because it has ignored available salmon technology.

Now that so many salmon populations have been listed under ESA, my concern is that the Federal agencies will try to exert control over more and more aspects of salmon recovery. Bureaucracies centered in Washington, D.C., however well intentioned, are incapable of solving the salmon problems of the Pacific Northwest. We all pay the price for the mistakes made by the Federal Government.

The most prized salmon specie are the king, coho and sockeye salmon. We have correctly focused our attention on them. However, it is more complicated than that. I believe we must look at the restoration of all five species, including chum and pink salmon. Historically, vast runs of chum and pink salmon fertilized the rivers with large numbers of decaying bodies of the adults after spawning.

□ 1715

Thus the newly-hatched chum and pink fry had an adequate food supply as they migrated downstream, and then the young king and coho fed on the myriads of young pinks and chums. The degradation and blocking of spawning habitat has been a major problem, so habitat restoration and removal of blockage which obstructs returning spawners must be high priorities for salmon restoration.

Again, my fear is that habitat restoration may be the singular objective of those making the endangered or threatened listing, which could weaken our rehabilitation effort, and thus subject our area to excessive Federal regulations and restrictions.

Habitat restoration and protection are critical elements, but the well-developed salmon technology presents us a wide range of additional options, such as:

No. 1, the use of culvert upgrading, reconfiguration and maintenance;

No. 2, predation control, very important;

No. 3, careful regulation of all commercial salmon fishing in saltwater,

and extremely careful supervision of any commercial fishing in spawning rivers;

No. 4, spawning channels and overwintering sloughs, to give maximum protection to the presently returning wild salmon.

We must keep our eyes on the objective and support those programs that will truly enhance our weakened salmon runs. We have neither time nor money for overzealous political correctness nor the control games that Federal agencies might seek to impose.

We must maximize the survival of offspring of the returning fish each year. As well as natural spawn, we must supply fertilized eggs to hatcheries for the following enhancement purposes: Remote egg boxes, net-pen rearing of fish to their optimal size, and small stream rehabilitation by planting fed fry into every small and medium stream and tributary that could provide a route to saltwater for outbound juveniles. In the old days, the small streams produced millions and millions of fish.

We should encourage Washington State in its programs that are already tracking towards these goals. Several tribes are on the cutting edge of salmon rehabilitation, and tend to have land and water areas available for their use. In addition, they have a cultural and historic head start moving in this critical direction.

Bringing the salmon back will not be an easy task, but it is an achievable goal. We need to make sure that our salmon dollars are delivered into the right hands, and that they are spent appropriately.

RESPONSIBLE BUDGETING AND THE BEST USE OF THE BUDGET SURPLUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, last year the House budget resolution was so controversial that House and Senate Republicans never even convened a conference. This year the budget resolution, as passed by the House, is as unrealistic as last year's plan, and even more irresponsible. Some in Congress, because of their fixation on exploding tax cuts, have presented unworkable appropriations bills, and they do nothing to extend the solvency of social security and Medicare.

As opposed to the fiscal responsibility demonstrated by Democrats, the budget passed by the majority party returns us to the unrealistic fiscal policies of the 1980s. Although it claims to shore up social security, to finance a large tax cut, to dramatically increase defense spending and keep government spending down, the truth is much different. The majority's budget, as in the resolution, simply cannot keep all the promises made.

Democrats, on the other hand, have aimed to produce future economic

growth through debt reduction and investments, exactly the mix of priorities that a successful business would adopt in good times.

Republicans have voted to reserve virtually the entire bounty of economic growth and fiscal discipline for tax cuts that will likely benefit only those who are already doing very well in the current economy. It is simple. The majority budget resolution may well burden future generations because of tax cuts and spending obligations made today, and they rely on surplus projections well into the future.

What does this mean for the people we represent? Little will be left for our urgent needs. Our national need to invest in social security and Medicare solvency, in education, in research and development, and in the environment will remain unmet.

The budget resolution that was passed by the House yesterday does not do enough for Americans when it comes to investing in education. It will not help hire more teachers, it will not help districts modernize their schools. It takes money away from higher education.

If we are going to prepare our children for the future, we have to do better. We have to make education a priority.

The problems go beyond education. Consider, for a moment, the implications of our budget resolution on the environment. America's public lands, wildlife, fish, and plants are assets that belong not just to us but to our children. We must allow for an increase in funding for protecting the environment and improving our communities. What will our children say if priceless resources disappear to suburban sprawl? Will future generations have the opportunity to see ancient forests or wildlife in their natural habitat?

Furthermore, we need to do more to support and encourage research and development. As a scientist, I understand the importance of increasing funding for both the National Science Foundation and for the National Institutes of Health. Today's research is at the threshold of major scientific advancement, which can dramatically improve the quality of life for the American people.

All of us have seen the benefits, the actual benefits and the potential benefits of research. Whether it is new discoveries to help fight AIDS and breast cancer, initiatives to improve our understanding of how ecosystems interact, or investing in teacher training to help students get the mathematics and science skills they need to succeed in today's and tomorrow's society, each action leads us to the doorstep of breakthroughs in improving the quality of life.

We need to make a stronger commitment to the future, and increasing funding for research and development should be part of that commitment. We simply need to make an investment now. It will benefit all of us and future

generations. Waiting until later only delays the improvements in quality of life.

The President has proposed that we use the surplus to strengthen social security and Medicare, and to extend the lives of those programs. I will continue to work with other Members of Congress to use the surplus to pay down our national debt, to strengthen social security and Medicare, to encourage investments in education, and to meet our other long-term needs for environmental protection and research and development.

AMERICA NEEDS TO SET BUDGET PRIORITIES AND FOCUS ON PAYING DOWN THE NATIONAL DEBT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, yesterday we took the first step on a long process of passing a budget this year, and a very important budget it will be as it will lay out priorities as we move into the next century. It will in fact be the last budget of the 20th century. As we move forward, we need to set our priorities.

This will be a long process as we go through the summer and into the fall in deciding what those priorities should be in passing a budget. I rise today to emphasize the importance of fiscal discipline, fiscal responsibility, and paying down our debt as we move through that process. I feel that should be the number one priority of this body in the budget process and for the future, as it is what can best help the people of this country.

We still have a significant financial problem. The news has gotten better in recent years. We have reduced the yearly size of the deficit, and we actually have the possibility of moving towards a surplus. All of that is good news, and many people on both sides of the aisle and many Congresses through the past 6 or 7 years can rightfully take credit for that, but the job is not done. I worry a great deal as I listen to the debate and listened to the debate this past week on the budget resolution that people have lost sight of that fact. We are talking about surplus politics, and I think we do so prematurely.

To begin with, we still incorrectly, from an economic standpoint, count the surplus in the social security trust fund as income to the Treasury, and use that surplus to claim an overall surplus when in fact we have an overall deficit.

Last year's numbers make this point clearly. We had a \$100 billion surplus in the social security trust fund. The rest of the budget actually ran a \$30 billion deficit, so presto, we have the \$70 billion surplus that everybody has been talking about, it does not really exist, but that surplus in the social security

trust fund is already obligated. We have to pay it back, plus interest to the Treasury, so that the trust fund can pay out the social security benefits that all of us, or all of us hopefully some day, that many of us, are due. So it is not money we can count as a surplus. To count it that way is to spend it twice. When we spend money twice, we wind up in debt as far as we are.

The second critical point in this is we still have an overall debt. That \$70 billion surplus, mythical though it may be, even within the grounds of that myth is only a 1-year surplus, with quotations around it. The overall debt continues to grow. It is approaching \$6 trillion.

On a yearly basis we pay \$215 billion to service that debt. That is 15 percent of the budget, 15 percent of our budget, and \$250 billion that basically goes simply to pay off past excess. It does nothing to meet our obligations at present or in the future, and it should be reduced.

Now is the time to do it. We have a very strong economy. We have unemployment at 4.2 percent. We have virtually nonexistent inflation, a booming stock market, with growth to match. If we cannot begin to pay down that debt now, we never will. We will never get there if we do not take that step right now. We need to step up to that as a priority.

I am concerned, as I look at the debate that we had on the budget resolution, that we are not heading in the right direction. I basically look at the budget resolution of this week that was passed in the House as a bad news-good news situation.

The bad news is, it is not a particularly good budget resolution, and the debate was even worse, from a fiscally responsible and economically accurate standpoint. But the good news is it borders on meaningless. What really is going to matter is the 13 appropriation bills that both bodies have to pass between now and October. There is no way that those 13 appropriation bills are even going to come close to matching what was in that budget resolution.

I say that is good news because the budget resolution overpromised in a number of different areas. Essentially by holding back key specifics, the budget resolution was able to promise in a number of interesting areas, promise more spending on defense, although they added another little trick in there that they promised budget authority but not necessarily outlays.

What is the difference between budget authority and outlays, we ask? It is the difference between promising to spend money and actually spending it. There is a big difference between those two things.

Beyond that, the pledges for increased spending in defense, in education, while at the same time including a massive back end tax cut, and by "back end" I mean it grows in the out years, in the first 5 years it is not too much, in the second 5 years it is more,