major commodities with declining annual cash payments which are not tied to crop prices. It would also increase borrowing costs for college students, and reduce spending on veterans' programs by $6.7 billion.

THE COALITION BUDGET

The conservative ''Coalition'' budget I voted for asks every American to do their fair share with more evenly distributed spending cuts. This plan would reduce spending by more than $850 billion over seven years. It reforms welfare, preserves Medicare and Medicaid for the future, cuts corporate subsidies, and makes farm programs more market-oriented. It also includes a line-item veto and tough enforcement measures.

The Coalition budget is a promising middle ground between the White House and the Speaker's budgets. It eliminates the federal budget deficit in seven years, as the Republicans want, uses realistic cost estimates, ensures that work pays more than welfare, and reduces the burden of the debt, while requiring less drastic cuts in social programs, such as Medicare and Medicaid, because it is without tax breaks. Furthermore, the Coalition budget reduces the deficit right away, while the Gingrich budget adds to the deficit (and the debt) in 1996 and 1997 because the tax breaks are front-loaded.

My position.—I opposed the Republican budget plan for four reasons.

First, the job of balancing the budget is made much more difficult by huge tax breaks. We cannot justify large tax cuts until the budget is balanced—especially when the tax breaks start early and most of the spending cuts are delayed. If and when a surplus does occur, then Congress should pass the tax cuts. It does not make sense to borrow more money to give ourselves a tax cut. My preference would be for a more balanced tax package. A good portion of the Gingrich tax breaks would favor wealthier Americans.

Second, my spending priorities are different. Half of the total savings come from health care and assistance to the poor and elderly. We should not ask the poor to bear more than their share of the burden. The cuts in Medicare and Medicaid are too steep. My preference is for fair, across-the-board cuts in most programs; deep cuts in ''corporate welfare;'' and more modest increases in defense spending. We should also preserve funding for long-term investments in education, research and infrastructure. These are necessary to continue economic growth, increase revenues, and reduce the deficit.

Third, the plan delays most of the tough spending cuts until 2001. Until then, we will have deficits in excess of $100 billion per year. My preference is to reduce spending gradually each year, rather than postponing action.

Fourth, the process for consideration of the bill was flawed. The bill is too large (it runs over two thousand pages) and covers too many important issues. Speaker Gingrich only allowed two hours of debate on the measure, without an opportunity for amendment. This process places too much power in the Speaker's hands and subverts the legislative process.

Conclusion.—I am encouraged by the recent agreement between the President and congressional leaders which establishes a basic framework for negotiations on the budget. The President agreed to support a seven year balanced budget plan and to use Congressional Budget Office assumptions to get there, provided the budget plan is balanced, fair and does not devastate key federal programs, particularly Medicare, Medicaid and education.

The budget clash taking place in Washington today is not just a squabble among politicians who have forgotten their manners. The policy debate reflects a nation at a crossroads and turns on fundamental questions about the size and role of the federal government and whether there should be any safety net for the poor and the elderly.

At the end of the year, if the Republicans refuse to moderate their more extreme demands and if the President's vetoes are sustained, then we will simply have to take the debate to the voters next fall. In the interim, we should not allow the country to be hurt by government shutdowns and high wire management of the national debt.

RETIREMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL COMMISSIONER MAURY HANNIGAN

HON. GARY A. CONDIT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 29, 1995

Mr. CONDIT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today together with my California colleagues NANCY PELOSI, CARLOS MOORHEAD, PETE STARK, FRANK RIGGS, LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD, LYNN WOOLSEY, HENRY WAXMAN, ZOE LOFGREN, WALLY HERGER, ROBERT MATSUI, ANDREA SEASTRAND, HOWARD BERMAN, GEORGE RADONOVICH, ROBERT DORNAN, JANE HARMAN, KEN CALVERT, STEPHEN HORN, ELTON GALLEGLY, JULIAN DIXON, RICHARD POMBO, MATTHEW G. MARTINEZ, CALVIN DOOLEY, HOWARD ''BUCK'' MCKEON, TOM LANTOS, and BOB FILNER to honor a man who has dedicated over 30 years of his life in service to the people of California. This month, Maurice J. (Maury) Hannigan will retire as the commissioner of the California Highway Patrol, a post which he has held meritoriously since 1989.

Commissioner Hannigan was appointed to the California Highway patrol November 30, 1964. He rose swiftly through the ranks of the department serving for 5 years as deputy commissioner before being appointed commissioner. Commissioner Hannigan's tenure has been one of accomplishment, courage, and conviction.

In a demanding job, Commissioner Hannigan has never settled for simply doing the minimum. After receiving his bachelor's degree from Golden Gate University, he continued to seek out further professional development and training becoming a graduate of the University of California Davis Executive Program, the Federal Bureau of Investigation National Academy, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation National Executive Institute. His dedication also extends to the many law enforcement and traffic safety committees on which he serves.

It is indeed an exemplary attitude which has made Commissioner Hannigan determined to make California a safer place to live. In recognition of this determination, Commissioner Hannigan has been the 1994 recipient of the National Safety Council Distinguished Service to Safety Award and the recipient of the J. Stannard Baker Award-Special Recognition/Lifetime Service to Public Safety bestowed by Northwestern University.

We are all sorry to see Commissioner Hannigan leave the California Highway Patrol and in particular the post he has so singularly held for the last 6 years. It is without doubt that his contributions to our California community are far from over. It is with sincere thanks and best wishes for the future that we honor his retirement.

TRIBUTE TO OKALOOSA COUNTY UNDERSHERIFF JERRY ALFORD

HON. JOE SCARBOROUGH

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 29, 1995

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, the citizens of Okaloosa County and the State of Florida will be losing a much beloved and highly respected law enforcement officer on December 31, 1995, when Okaloosa County Undersheriff Jerry Alford retires after four decades of service as a law enforcement officer and public servant. It is a great honor to recognize this dedicated police officer for his service in the field of criminal justice.

At a time when our Nation appears to lack confidence in our Government, and the men and women who fight to enforce the law of the land, it is fitting that today we honor a law enforcement professional who always went to extra mile to protect our citizens while striving to support and defend the Constitution of the United States. Undersheriff Alford has known, better than most, that while trying to protect our quality of life, we must respect the God given rights of freedom.

His overall attitude of public service has been a model in the lives of hundreds of law enforcement officers that he has trained, supervised, and encouraged. His legacy will remind new officers that when at all possible, police officers should go above and beyond the call of duty to assist the citizens with any problem when it's legal, moral, and ethical to do so.

During the past 40 years, Mr. Alford has proven himself a real patriot in the truest sense of the word. In many occasions, he placed his life and limb in jeopardy, in defense of lives and property of others. A man who has always had a vested interest in his country and community, Mr. Alford has served as a U.S. Marine, a Walton County deputy sheriff, a special agent with the State of Florida Beverage Department, and undersheriff with the Okaloosa County Sheriff's Office.

As Mr. Alford departs his active role in the law enforcement community, he can take pride in knowing that he influenced so many people in a positive way. Mr. Alford will always be remembered not only as a committed crime fighter, but a man of principle with a sincere desire to serve his community, State, and Nation.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 440, NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM DESIGNATION ACT OF 1995

SPEECH OF

HON. JAMES C. GREENWOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, November 18, 1995

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the conference report to accompany S. 440, the National Highway System Designation Act of 1995. Certain provisions in this report are of particular importance to my constituents and to all of the citizens of