EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

LET'S LOOK TO THE FUTURE

HON. CHARLES WILSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 25, 1995

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, from time to time a letter comes across my desk that speaks directly to the core of a problem. Recently we received just such a letter.

The debate over balancing the Federal budget and finding ways to also reduce taxes inspired an east Texan to write to my office. This letter is so in tune with both present reality and historic precedent that I wanted to share it with all of you:

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE WILSON: I would much prefer deficit reduction to a middle class tax cut. Although I would qualify, the tax cut would make very little difference in my well-being. But a reduction in the Federal deficit will improve my well-being and that of my child in the long run.

Please work to identify spending cuts that can be applied to deficit reduction rather than a tax cut.

Sincerely,

E.L. WRIGHT.

I expect this letter expresses the views of many people, especially those with children. It asks that we look to their future.

This means getting the Federal ledger in the black first. It means when we do turn to tax relief, the emphasis should be on deductions for education and career training, use of IRA's for college tuition, and other long-term investments.

Fourteen years ago I was one of a handful of Members who voted for President Reagan's spending cuts, and against his tax cuts. We took some flak and received bags of hate mail for this. But I felt then, as I know now, that any tax cuts must come after we achieve a balanced budget, not before. Trying to do both in the early 1980's snowballed us into the most rapid increase in deficit spending in history.

A strong, solvent America is in everyone's interest. Reaching a balanced budget should be our priority now, just as it should have been 14 years ago.

CONCERNING THE RULE TO HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 1

HON. BOB FRANKS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 25, 1995

Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in reluctant support of House Resolution 44, the rule for the balanced budget amendment. Although I will be voting for this rule, I am disappointed that the Franks-Condit-Gillmor substitute amendment adding unfunded mandates language to the balanced budget amendment was not made in order by the Rules Committee.

Mr. Speaker, our amendment was substantially similar to the Barton balanced budget amendment (H.J. Res. 1), but with two crucial differences. First, our amendment struck the three-fifths provision to raise taxes contained in section 2 of House Joint Resolution 1. While I am steadfastly opposed to raising taxes, the controversy surrounding this provision could hamper passage in the Senate and make it more difficult to achieve the requisite two-thirds vote in the House of Representatives.

Second, our amendment includes a provision prohibiting new unfunded Federal mandates. I strongly believe that a ban on unfunded mandates is essential to prevent a future Congress from balancing the Federal budget merely by shifting costs and responsibilities to State and local governments.

The supporters of other versions of the balanced budget amendment contend that there are only two ways to balance the budget—either by cutting spending or increasing taxes. But the truth is there's a third, more insidious option where the Congress would mandate expensive Federal programs onto State and local governments and require local taxpayers to pick up the tab. Judging from the past, it is clear that Congress will use any means available to avoid hard budget choices. I believe that closing the unfunded mandates loophole is imperative to preserve the integrity of the balanced budget amendment and ensure protection for local taxpayers.

Mr. Speaker, including an unfunded Federal mandates provision as part of the balanced budget amendment is the only ironclad way to protect local taxpayers. Although I welcome and support efforts to solve the unfunded mandates issue by passing a statute, the sorry fact is that Congress is adept at finding ways to circumvent statutory law in order to escape from fiscal accountability.

Additionally, it is important to note that Republican and Democratic Governors have rightly expressed their reluctance to encourage their State legislatures to ratify a balanced budget amendment without a provision specifically prohibiting new unfunded Federal mandates. The inclusion of a provision to ban unfunded Federal mandates would have, in my opinion, markedly improved the chance of ratification by the States.

Mr. Speaker, our substitute amendment has the support of the National League of Cities and the National Conference of State Legislatures [NCSL]. The support of NCSL is especially noteworthy, as it is their members who will ultimately be deciding the fate of the balanced budget amendment. And since this rule precludes me from offering my substitute amendment that would have protected the States, I am skeptical whether this version of the balanced budget amendment will ever be ratified by the requisite 38 States.

Mr. Speaker, consideration of the balanced budget amendment presents Congress with a unique and historic opportunity to permanently resolve the issue of unfunded Federal mandates. Our substitute amendment would have provided the assurance that Congress would not have met its obligations under the balanced budget amendment by imposing unfunded mandates on State and local governments. Although I am disheartened that Congress will not act on my amendment today, I expect that we will be revisiting this issue should the States refuse to ratify the balanced budget amendment because of an absence of a unfunded mandate provision.

CONGRATULATIONS TO THE PACIFIC DAILY NEWS: 25 YEARS OF EXCELLENCE

HON. ROBERT A. UNDERWOOD

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 25, 1995

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, 25 years ago, shortly after the gateways to Guam were opened to the world, the Guam Daily News published its first edition on my home district of Guam. The paper quickly evolved into a solid business entity, which is important to our island and to the Pacific region.

Now affiliated with the Gannett News Service, the Guam Daily News is better known as the Pacific Daily News. It is our only daily paper, and a tremendous source of current events.

Over the years, the P.D.N. has changed its format, its editors, its reporters, but not its high quality. The paper may not be as thick as the New York Times or the Washington Post, but ''all the news that's fit to print,'' manages to get on its pages.

Truly part of the Guam family, the P.D.N. currently reaches a wider audience than any other island media. It overcame obstacles and outlasted a competing paper. Throughout the years, in typhoons and other natural disasters, I have always found an edition of the P.D.N. at my doorstep. Yet, the paper means so much more to Guahan.

On important occasions, the managers and employees of the P.D.N. constantly prove their keen interest in civic matters. As a member of the Guam Chamber of Commerce, the Guam Olympic Committee, other nonprofit boards and commissions, President Lee Webber leads his staff by example. As the company grew, it shared its success with the island.

Happy 25th birthday, Pacific Daily News.

CONGRESSIONAL REFORM

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 25, 1995

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Washington Report for Wednesday, January 11, 1995, into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.