eliminate funding for $400 million in low-priority highway demonstration projects. My amendment, which would have cut real pork, was not made in order. Instead the Republicans chose to cut funding for programs such as Healthy Start, which is aimed at improving the health of unborn children, and to eliminate over 50,000 pregnant mothers and infants from the WIC program.

Remember this bill only provides an $11 billion down payment. The Republican tax cuts will cost over $700 billion. The majority felt compelled to cut programs for children and the elderly first. It scares me, as it should any parent, to consider where they will get the remaining $690 billion.

Why are we doing this? So that big industry and the rich can be given a tax break that I doubt they want. I can not imagine any businessman that wants to see the next generation of high school graduates turn out to be an illiterate workforce of dropouts. I know I don't and my constituents don't.

I do not support the rescissions contained in this bill and I urge my colleagues to vote against it. I believe that it cuts the wrong programs—programs that hurt children, low-income Americans, and the elderly—for the wrong reasons.

HONORING MOLLY BROWN, 1995 REFUGE VOLUNTEER OF THE YEAR

HON. OWEN B. PICKETT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1995

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to extend my sincerest congratulations to Ms. Molly P. Brown, a constituent of mine from Virginia Beach, VA, on being awarded the 1995 National Wildlife Refuge Volunteer of the Year Award.

The National Wildlife Refuge Association and the National Audubon Society have jointly established this annual award. Its purpose is to recognize the volunteer who best achieves the goals and objectives of the National Wildlife Refuge System [NWRS], which are superior organizational skills, innovation in handling refuge assignments, effectiveness in dealing with the public, and dependability. Ms. Brown's extensive service and long-standing commitment to the Back Bay National Wildlife Refuge located in Virginia Beach, VA, clearly are above and beyond the criteria that merit national recognition.

As an advocate of environmental consciousness, Ms. Brown has appeared regularly before the Virginia Beach City Council and the zoning board to testify on city and State proposals affecting the Refuge. As a member of the Mayor's Growth Management Advisory Committee, Ms. Brown has frequently provided valuable citizen comments and observations on the city's land use, transportation, and infrastructure plans and programs.

Realizing the need to promote an awareness not only of the Refuge's mission but of other conservation activities within the region as well, Ms. Brown worked to establish both the Southeastern Association for Virginia's Environment [SAVE], and the Friends of Back Bay/Save Our Sandbridge organization of which she currently serves as president. Offering her time and talent at local events such as Earth Day and the Environmental Awareness Fair for Students, Molly Brown serves as a true emissary of the conservation movement.

During the 103rd Congress, Molly Brown traveled to Washington, DC, to testify before the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Interior concerning the need for additional funding for Back Bay. Ms. Brown provided the Subcommittee with extensive information regarding the Refuge's plans to expand its boundaries and improve its natural habitat. The Back Bay land acquisition was one of only 33 projects funded nationwide in the Department of Interior Appropriations Act of 1994, attesting to the value of Ms. Brown's knowledgeable and articulate testimony.

It is with pleasure and honor that I join the other citizens of the Second Congressional District of Virginia in thanking and commending Molly Brown for her successful efforts in promoting awareness and appreciation of our area's natural resources, for her continuing efforts to obtain essential funding and Congressional support for Back Bay National Wildlife Refuge, and for her boundless enthusiasm for the Refuge system as a whole. She is a most deserving recipient of the 1995 National Wildlife Refuge Volunteer of the Year Award.

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR ADDITIONAL DISASTER ASSISTANCE AND RESCISSIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1995

SPEECH OF

HON. BILL ORTON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1995

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1158) making emergency supplemental appropriations for additional disaster assistance and making rescissions for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1995, and for other purposes:

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Chairman, I am taking this opportunity to explain my vote against the rescissions and supplemental spending bill which passed the House last week.

On Wednesday night, I was pleased to vote for the ''lockbox'' amendment offered by Representative BREWSTER. I have been involved from the beginning in the development of this provision, which ensures that spending reductions are strictly dedicated to deficit reduction, and not simply reallocated to other spending programs or used to finance tax cuts. The lockbox amendment, approved by a 418 to 5 vote of the House, clearly stated that spending would be reduced by some $55 billion over the next 5 years, and that all of these cuts could only be used to reduce the deficit.

Based on this amendment, and the resulting deficit reduction, I was prepared to vote for final passage of this bill. However, just prior to a final vote on the rescissions bill, the Budget Committee held a markup of legislation to lower spending caps for the next 5 years. At this markup, the Budget Committee chairman announced that he planned to use all of the savings in fiscal years 1996 through 2000 from the rescissions bill to finance the Republican tax cuts. He also announced that the lockbox provisions which would prevent this maneuver would be stripped from the bill prior to a conference report.

Without ascribing motivations or analyzing negotiations that took place, the effect was that the approximately $55 billion in outyear savings in the rescissions bill would not end up reducing the deficit by even a single dollar.

This made the bill unacceptable to me. Many of the cuts in this bill will be painful, especially in the areas of education, elderly housing, and children's programs. I could not in good conscience vote for these cuts, without assurance from leadership that they would honor the provisions of the lockbox amendment. So, reluctantly, I voted against final passage.

In addition, I must say that this decision was not made any easier by the unfair, highly restrictive way in which the bill was brought to the floor. Last week I explained in detail how this rule effectively protected 80 percent of the discretionary budget from budget cuts.

I also explained how the rule made it almost impossible to restore funds for good programs through cuts in bad or wasteful programs. I was prepared to support additional spending cuts in other parts of the budget to restore cuts that I believe were unfair or unwarranted. I would like to take this opportunity to identify those cuts I opposed.

The rescissions bill makes significant and unwise cuts in programs that promote opportunities. Cuts in impact aid and national service will hurt our education efforts. Cuts in foster care and grants for drug-free schools will have a negative effect on our children. And, cuts in information infrastructure grants will slow our efforts to develop and expand opportunities on the Information Superhighway. All of these are high priority areas.

I also oppose the excessive level of cuts for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. While I could support modest cuts in the CPB, the bill makes 30 percent cuts in fiscal year 1997 funding, on a path to terminating Federal support. These cuts will have a significant negative effect on public broadcasting, especially for rural areas.

Finally, the bill makes excessive cuts in housing and community development programs. Cuts which I believe should have been rejected or scaled back include public housing modernization, community development block grants [CDBG's] drug elimination funds, and public housing operating subsidies.

Especially unfair is the cut of $404 million in operating subsidies for public housing authorities. It is fundamentally unfair to have agencies plan on receiving certain funding levels, and then make significant cuts in the middle of the year. Furthermore, the way these cuts are being implemented is especially unfair. PHA's with a fiscal year starting in July 1 will bear a disproportionate portion of the cuts, while those with an earlier fiscal year will be largely spared. I could not support this.

Again, I want to make it clear that I was prepared to support offsetting cuts to restore these important programs. I was also prepared to vote for additional cuts beyond those proposed by the committee—if the rule hadn't prevented this.

For example, I planned on offering an amendment with Rep. KLUG to zero out funding for the Appalachian Regional Commission. However, because of the short time limits placed on debate of this bill, we did not have

the opportunity to vote on terminating this program. As a result, the chance to cut the deficit by another $100 million was ruled out by this arbitrary rule.

There are many other areas where we could look to make cuts. For example, I am a strong defender of national defense, and especially readiness. However, the rule precluded amendments to cut unneeded and expensive weapons systems. We should also do more to consolidate programs and eliminate redundancies. For example, we should abolish the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Finally, there are programs where I feel we are simply spending too much. For example, in foreign aid, we should cut back on some of the AID programs, eliminate redundant broadcast programs, and reexamine our foreign military and economic assistance programs. In agriculture, we should cut back on programs which provide excessive crop subsidies. And we can do more to cut spending in the legislative branch.

Last week, the House Budget Committee voted to extend and lower the discretionary spending caps for the next 5 fiscal years. Spending bills for fiscal years 1996 and beyond will have even greater levels of cuts than those made in the rescissions bill. Like many other members of the House, I am ready to support such cuts.

However, I hope that the process to consider such cuts will be more fair and more rational than the one we used last week. We must have unlimited opportunities to make further spending cuts, and to change spending priorities, within predetermined spending limits. This can only be done through open rules on appropriations bills.

Therefore, within the next few weeks, I will be introducing a House resolution calling for open rules for all spending bills brought to the House floor in the 104th Congress. I urge my colleagues to join me in cosponsoring this resolution, and in voting against any restrictive rules in the consideration of future spending bills.

NATIONAL RIGHT TO WORK ACT

HON. BOB GOODLATTE

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1995

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to proudly introduce the National Right to Work Act.

This act reduces Federal power over the American workplace by removing those provisions of Federal law authorizing the collection of forced union dues as a part of a collective bargaining contract.

Since the Wagner Act of 1935 made forced union dues a keystone of Federal labor law, millions of American workers have been forced to pay for union representation that they neither choose nor desire.

The primary beneficiaries of right to work are America's workers—even those who voluntarily choose to pay union dues, because when union officials are deprived of the forced dues power granted them under current Federal law they'll be more responsive to the workers' needs and concerns.

Mr. Speaker, this act is proworker, proeconomic growth, and profreedom.

The 21 States with right to work laws, including my own State of Virginia, have a nearly three-to-one advantage over non-right to work States in terms of job creation.

And, according to U.S. News & World Report, 7 of the strongest 10 State economies in the Nation have right to work laws.

Workers who have the freedom to choose whether or not to join a union have a higher standard of living than their counterparts in non-right to work States. According to Dr. James Bennett, an economist with the highly respected Economics Department at George Mason University, on average, urban families in right to work States have approximately $2,852 more annual purchasing power than urban families in non-right to work States when the lower taxes, housing and food costs of right to work States are taken into consideration.

The National Right to Work Act would make the economic benefits of voluntary unionism a reality for all Americans.

But this bill is about more than economics, it's about freedom.

Compelling a man or woman to pay fees to a union in order to work violates the very principle of individual liberty upon which this Nation was founded.

Oftentimes forced dues are used to support causes the worker does not wish to support with his or her hard-earned wage.

Thomas Jefferson said it best:

> . . . to compel a man to furnish contributions of money for the propagation of opinions which he disbelieves is sinful and tyrannical.

By passing the National Right to Work Act, this Congress will take a major step towards restoring the freedom of America's workers to choose the form of workplace representation that best suits their needs.

In a free society, the decision of whether or not to join or support a union should be made by a worker, not a union official, not an employer, and certainly not the U.S. Congress.

The National Right to Work Act reduces Federal power over America's labor markets, promotes economic growth and a higher standard of living, and enhances freedom.

No wonder, according to a poll by the respected Marketing Research Institute, 77 percent of Americans support right to work, and over 50 percent of union households believe workers should have the right to choose whether or not to join or pay dues to a labor union.

No other piece of legislation before this Congress will benefit this Nation as much as the National Right to Work Act.

I urge my colleagues to quickly pass the National Right to Work Act and free millions of American from forced dues tyranny.

PROF. HERBERT BISHOP KELLER, 70TH BIRTHDAY CELEBRATION

HON. CARLOS J. MOORHEAD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1995

Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. Speaker, on June 19 of this year, Dr. Herbert Bishop Keller will be 70 years old. Dr. Keller is professor of applied mathematics at the California Institute of Technology. His fundamental contributions to the field of numerical analysis have played a crucial role in the advancement of science and engineering in this century.

For example, Dr. Keller developed many of the methods which scientists and engineers have used for years to solve complex problems with computers. These include the box scheme for solving boundary layer problems in the aircraft industry; the method of multiple shooting, to solve ordinary differential equations; and the path-following methods, for solving bifurcation problems in all fields of science.

He is the coauthor, with Eugene Isaacson, of the text ''Analysis of Numerical Methods,'' which is a classic in the field and has been studied by generations of students. He is also the author of two monographs on the solution of two-point boundary-value problems, and of hundreds of research articles.

Dr. Keller was born in Paterson, NJ. He served in the U.S. Navy during World War II as a lieutenant junior grade. He obtained a bachelor's degree in electronics from the Georgia Institute of Technology in 1945. He received an M.S. in mathematics from New York University in 1948 and his Ph.D. from the same institution in 1954. Concurrently, he was in charge of the math department at Sarah Lawrence College.

In 1961 after a rapid ascent through the ranks, Dr. Keller became professor of applied mathematics at the Courant Institute of Mathematical Sciences at New York University. During this time, he also served as associate director of the Atomic Energy Commission Computing and Applied Mathematics Center, which was located at New York University.

In 1967, Dr. Keller joined the finest institution of higher learning in the world when he became a professor of applied mathematics at the California Institute of Technology, a position he holds to this day. Currently, he is director of the Caltech branch of the Center for Research on Parallel Computing, an endeavor sponsored by the National Science Foundation.

Professor Keller was extraordinarily active as a member of many scientific societies. In 1975–76, he served as president of the Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, the world's leading society of applied mathematicians. He also served on 6 national committees and held editorial positions on 12 leading scientific journals.

The scientific community has expressed its admiration for Professor Keller by bestowing upon him some of its most prestigious awards. He is a Fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, a fellow of the American Association for Arts and Sciences, and he was a Guggenheim fellow. Recently, he was the distinguished visiting fellow at Christ's College, University of Cambridge, United Kingdom. The Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics awarded him the von Karman prize in 1994.

Mr. Speaker, the scientific legacy of Professor Keller is ensured through his own work, through the work of the 28 students who earned their Ph.D. degrees under his supervision, as well as through the hundreds of graduate and undergraduate students whom he has taught throughout the years.

Today, I would like my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives to join with me and the scientific community in expressing our thanks and gratitude to Professor Keller for his