Clearly, this project is a prime example of a local community exercising its own rural development plan for local expansion and job creation. In these times of reduced Federal support for rural community-based economic enterprises, the city of Rolla is a shining example and model of both involvement and initiative that other communities around the country can clearly emulate.

For over a year now, the city of Rolla has been collecting a 3-percent tax on local hotels in the attempt to finance this project independent of any assistance from the Federal Government. Indeed, this land transfer arrangement is a very unique partnership for both Rolla and the Mark Twain National Forest. Several of Missouri's proud historical landmarks, which are an important element of this site, will be maintained and preserved for current and future generations through the efforts of the city of Rolla—at a substantially reduced cost to local taxpayers. This is particularly important to bear in mind since this facility would have no further commercial viability without the direct involvement of the city of Rolla. So now, two worthy goals can be achieved—economic development and historical preservation.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the leadership efforts of the Mark Twain National Forest and the city of Rolla and I urge the expeditious approval of this measure in order that the citizens of Rolla can get on with the business of economic development and job creation.

## TRIBUTE TO DR. REYNOLD BURCH

### HON. DONALD M. PAYNE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 26, 1995*

Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the memory of Dr. Reynold Burch, a man of enormous generosity and kindness whose contributions to our community will be long remembered. Dr. Burch, known by friends and family as Buster, died Wednesday, January 18, 1995.

Dr. Burch practiced medicine in Newark, N.J. in private practice from 1956 to 1981 in gynecology and obstetrics, delivering thousands of babies to two generations of Newark residents. During an era when professional opportunities for African Americans were very limited, young people looked to this extraordinary role model with pride, admiration, and hope.

I had the opportunity to know Dr. Burch personally in his capacity as a philanthropist. Along with his wife, Mary, Dr. Burch founded the Leaguers, Inc., a youth development program in Newark. To the young people in our neighborhood, Dr. and Mrs. Burch opened up both their hearts and their home, where the Leaguers regularly held their meetings. The program was directed by Mrs. Burch, a former teacher, who found that the young people in the neighborhood needed more direction and opportunity to expand their horizons and become upwardly mobile. Dr. and Mrs. Burch were truly ahead of their time and made a profound difference in our community.

As the program progressed, the Burches planned weekly meetings, provided outings to the theater, museums, legislative sessions, and cultural events for the young people. The Leaguers gave the young people an opportunity to participate in programs we would never otherwise have had the chance to experience and enjoy. In 1949, we attended the swearing-in ceremony for Mayor Ralph A. Villani, mayor of the City of Newark at Newark City Hall. We visited New Jersey State Assemblyman Bowser in his office in the State capital, Trenton, in 1950. In 1951 we visited Philadelphia for a weekend and met with youth from a similar organization in an attempt to expand our experiences.

The Leaguers program gave me and many of my contemporaries an opportunity to grow and develop as teenagers. The program helped us make a positive contribution to our community and to society. As the program grew, the organization moved into a school and then finally built a structure at 750 Clinton Ave., Newark, NJ to house the group. Dr. and Mrs. Burch encouraged and assisted us in attaining higher education and molded us into young adults. My interest in improving my community was sparked by my involvement with the Burches.

Mr. Speaker, I know that my colleagues will join me in extending condolences to Dr. Burch's wife, Mary, on the loss of her devoted husband, and to his many friends who will feel his absence deeply. He was a wonderful man who truly set an example of a life well lived.

## PROPOSING A BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION

### HON. RODNEY P. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, January 25, 1995*

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 1) proposing a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the balanced budget amendment, H.J. Res. 1. This amendment to the U.S. Constitution to require a balanced Federal budget is not a new idea. Balanced budget amendment proposals have been introduced since the 1930's and, in recent years, have fallen just short of passage in Congress on several occasions. In 49 States, there is some form of balanced budget requirement—including the State of New Jersey.

In Congress, this balanced budget amendment is only the beginning of the process of amending the U.S. Constitution. It is a big step for Americans to amend the U.S. Constitution, and that is as it should be. Of the several thousand proposed amendments in 206 years, only 27 amendments have been ratified by Congress and by the States—and one of those, the 21st amendment, repeals the ban on alcohol proscribed by one other, the 18th.

Amending the U.S. Constitution requires a two-thirds majority in the U.S. House, 290 votes, and in the Senate, 67 votes; and ratification by three-fourths of the States, 38 of the 50 States. The drafters of the Constitution placed a great deal of weight on the powers delegated to the Federal Government and those that remain with the States, giving the States the ultimate decisionmaking powers regarding amendments.

They also saw a limited role for the Federal Government in taxation and borrowing—a role which has been greatly expanded during the current century. The Framers of the Constitution clearly saw Federal debt as an emergency matter at times of national or international crisis, not as a means of normal operations. Likewise, taxation was for specific and justifiable purposes. It is the breakdown of both of these principles that has led to our current budget problems.

I believe Congress has an obligation to send this question to the States, so that we can engage in a much-needed and lively debate on the broader question—what is the role of the Federal Government and at what cost?

Our experiences with State budget balancing requirements have provided several positive outcomes from this important fiscal discipline. It imposes discipline on legislators and executive branch. It, therefore, requires a closer working relationship between these two branches of Government. And, the requirement ultimately will force all parties to sit down and work out their differences to maintain the required balance.

Having worked under the balanced budget requirement, I believe it will promote better communication and governance—at least that's been my experience as a State legislator in New Jersey. It has been 25 years since the last time the Federal Government's books were balanced. Of every dollar collected in Federal taxes, 15 cents goes to pay interest on the national debt—more than $200 billion a year, further drawing down the amount available for other Government programs.

Clearly, our current situation is not due to under-taxation, but to over-spending. The Federal Government collects $5 in taxes today for every $1 it collected 25 years ago. The problem is that Government spending today is up $6 for every $1 spent in 1968.

some may claim that the balanced budget amendment is a gimmick. Rather, I believe it will finally provide the discipline to the Federal budget process that has failed, to date, to control Federal spending—even with the best efforts of individual Members committed to deficit reduction and despite the demands of the American taxpayers.

## THE HOMEMAKER IRA ACT OF 1995

### HON. NANCY L. JOHNSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 26, 1995*

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, women who do not work outside the home contribute as much as their working spouses to the care and support of their families and they deserve equal retirement security. Unfortunately, the Tax Code prevents women who work at home from providing for their own retirement to the same extent as women who work outside the home.

The problem is rooted in the rules governing Individual Retirement Accounts [IRA's]. If both spouses in a household bring home a paycheck, each is permitted to contribute and deduct up to $2,000 to an IRA—$4,000 in total, subject to income limits. If only one spouse works, however, a married couple is limited to contributing a total of $2,250 to an IRA. In other words, a one-income married couple