

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

the sanctity of life. And I am not trying to reopen that debate, but I did find it interesting that, when they started cutting, they went after the Healthy Start Program and cut \$10 million from programs that provided prenatal care.

Madam Speaker, I wonder how, on the one hand, people can say they are pro-life, but take away funds that help expectant mothers take care of newborns. They took \$25 million from the Women, Infants, and Children's Program, another program designed to help expectant mothers and toddlers obtain the kind of nutrition that they need to survive. It seems to me to be a strange contradiction.

Next they said, Well, you know, we're the party that believes in work. Well, that is what the Republicans say. But the first thing they did was go after programs that move children, young people, from school to work. They cut a total of \$3 billion, including 600,000 positions in summer jobs.

□ 1945

Now we can talk all we want about how we can fight crime and we can talk all we want about people need to pull themselves up by the bootstraps and get out of the wagon and help everybody else pull, but when you take money out of the Summer Jobs Program, it seems to me you are party in contradiction. Then they said, Oh, yes, sir, we support the elderly. We asked them about protecting Social Security; they said, Oh, yes, we will do it. We won't touch Social Security. We said, If you won't touch Social Security, put it in the bill. They would not do it.

I think the contradiction is clear, but we go on and find that in the area of fuel assistance for the elderly the Republicans decided they would cut out the entire program. Two million elderly are engaged in the Fuel Assistance Program. That program is eliminated.

Then, you know, they are also the party that is big on patriotism and they always want to talk about a drop of American blood, but that is also the crowd that cut 50 million from medical equipment and facilities from the veterans program, even at a time when we are expecting an increase in the veterans population.

Now I just heard one of my distinguished colleagues say, Well, you don't understand. What we are doing is, we are not cutting these programs, we are slowing the growth. I am going to tell you in a minute what they are going to do with the funds that they claim that they are saving. But before I get to that, I want to talk about the School Lunch Program. Because once again they are robbing the poor to give to the rich.

Tomorrow morning I am going to have breakfast with young students at Bladensburg Elementary and next week I am going to have lunch with some more students at Green Valley Elementary School, and the reason I am going is to see what is going on. At Green Valley, for example, 61 percent of the students are in the free or re-

duced lunch program. And the teachers will tell you that this may be the only meal that these young people get.

So it seems to me that if the Republicans were really serious about giving people a chance in life, they would not be taking money out of the School Lunch Program.

Now, let's get back to economics. They say, Well, we are just slowing the growth of these programs; we are actually putting in more. What you find, ladies and gentlemen, is that when the Republicans are talking about defense spending, they always talk about funds adjusted for inflation. But when they talk about social spending, they talk about raw numbers, which means that the numbers essentially stay the same while inflation eats away at the purchasing power. So consequently, those programs that they claim they are increasing are scheduled to fail and cannot in fact keep pace with the cost of providing these services, cannot keep pace with the cost of food and other products to make these programs viable.

Now, I suppose some would say, You don't understand, Congressman, we have to make these cuts to reduce the deficits. If it were going for the deficit, that would be one thing, but they are giving it to the rich. The cuts that I described are not going for the deficit. In fact, they are going to provide tax cuts for the wealthy. Thirty percent of the tax cuts that come out of the programs that I just described will go to the richest 2 percent of Americans in this country. Thirty percent of the tax benefit to the richest 2 percent of Americans. And a full 50 percent of the tax breaks won't go to the average American citizen that the Speaker likes to talk about. The 50 percent goes to the people who make over \$100,000.

So, ladies and gentlemen, it seems to me that we are in a grave state of contradiction in that instead of assisting the poor and instead of helping them move out of poverty, we are taking resources from them.

And they say, Well, we are just giving it to the States so the States can do it better at less cost and we are just cutting bureaucratic costs.

Ladies and gentlemen, you have to have bureaucracy at the State level, so they are substituting State bureaucrats for Federal bureaucrats. The cost savings are not going to be there.

The other issue is this: If the States were inclined to do these programs, if the States were inclined to have fuel assistance and breakfast programs and lunch programs, why didn't the States do it? It was not done until the Federal Government stepped in and said giving people a healthy start in life is a national priority and it doesn't matter if they live in Oklahoma or Alaska, we want to make sure that you get these benefits.

So you see, Madam Speaker, in the final analysis we have a contradiction. We are not helping the poor, we are only helping the rich at the expense of the poor.

WE WILL BALANCE THE BUDGET

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

Mr. RAMSTAD. Madam Speaker, over the last 30 years the Federal Government has only balanced its budget one time: in 1969. One balanced budget in 30 years.

Madam Speaker, time and time again Congress has provided unwilling and unable to balance the budget. Time and time again, statutory scheme after statutory scheme has failed. That is why, Madam Speaker, we need the legal forces and the moral authority of a constitutional amendment. Unless we act now, the deficit is projected to be more than \$200 billion each and every year through the end of the century. This year alone more than 15 cents of every dollar in the Federal budget goes to pay interest on the Federal debt of \$4.8 trillion.

Madam Speaker, we are spending over \$235 billion this year alone to pay the interest on the debt. This insane deficit spending must stop now. It doesn't take a rocket scientist to figure out we are headed for financial disaster unless we balance the budget now.

Now, some politicians in this body are trying to scare people by playing fast and loose with the facts. They are claiming a budget amendment would require \$1 trillion in budget cuts by the year 2002. What these politicians don't tell you is that the Federal Government is currently projected to increase spending each year until then on the average of 5.4 percent per year. That is a \$3 trillion increase in Federal spending over the next 7 years.

Only in Washington, Madam Speaker, can a smaller increase in spending be called a cut. The budget can be balanced by simply holding the spending increase to 3 percent, to an average of 3 percent per year. In other words, if we increase spending 3 percent per year until 2002, we will have a balanced budget. Or put another way, if we halted the increase to 2 trillion instead of 3 trillion over the next 7 years, we will balance the budget.

It is high time the Federal Government lived within its means the way every family in my district in Minnesota must, the way every family in America must. We simply can't keep mortgaging our children's and grandchildren's futures. We can't keep promising more than we know we can deliver.

What is really mean-spirited, Madam Speaker, is to continue to promise people more than we can deliver, to promise, promise, promise to spend more than we bring in. That is why, Madam Speaker, we need the balanced budget amendment and the discipline that that provides. It is the only way to