peace, the United States should be the country to propose such a resolution. The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization constitution itself reads, ''since wars begin in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men that the defenses of peace must be constructed.''

His own words most eloquently express his intentions. According to Dr. Lenzo, who recently retired from teaching elementary school and from his position as a colonel in the Army Reserves, peace is still a possibility: ''With the entire world, together with its political and religious leaders, all praying for peace at the same time, marked with parades, speeches, dinners, fireworks, and whatever else is necessary to make this the most important event of the year, it has to have impact on everyone and further the cause of peace.'' Dr. Lenzo continues, ''It will be a thankful day when we can once again live in peace * * * peace in the world, peace within our nations, peace in our neighborhoods, peace on our streets.'' He dismisses claims that this is impossible: ''Years ago it was said that it was impossible to find a cure for polio, but we did; impossible to find a cure for smallpox, but we did; impossible for the Berlin Wall to come down, but it did; impossible to overcome Russian communism, but we did! The endless list of accomplishments that were once thought to be impossible are now realities. Peace in the world can also become a reality.''

During the course of his campaign, Dr. Lenzo has met with great success. Between 1992 and 1994, he received responses from 30 states, 9 of whom instated a weekend of prayer for peace at his request. He has received responses from Boutros Boutros-Ghali, the Pope, and Elizabeth Taylor. Nearly all who hear Dr. Lenzo's plea to champion peace commend his campaign.

The last time I called your attention to Dr. Lenzo's initiative, in January 1991, we were just four days away from the United Nations' deadline for Saddam Hussein to remove his troops from Kuwait. Five days after I spoke of Dr. Lenzo's project, we deployed military forces in Kuwait. Now, again, we are nearing a stand-off with Iraq. And again, Dr. Lenzo works to remind us of the gravity of the actions we contemplate. As we negotiate and strategize and consider all our options, Dr. Lenzo tells us to keep in sight the end we all seek. His suggestion that we step back and remember to whom we are accountable is vitally relevant at this time.

In the words of John Milton, ''Peace hath her victories, no less renowned than War,'' and Dr. Lenzo's work is surely one of those victories. I admire Dr. Lenzo's insight and encourage all my colleagues in the House of Representatives to seriously contemplate his ''Weekend of Prayer, Meditation and Thought.''

PRESIDENT'S BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 1999

HON. GEORGE P. RADANOVICH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 1998

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as a member of the Budget Committee, to analyze the President's budget for FY 1999.

The federal budget isn't just an accounting tool. It's a vision of the kind of America we want for our families. Our vision is for an America where families are restored to their central role in society, the entrepreneurial spirit is unleashed in every community, and religious and civic organizations are released to solve local problems.

Unfortunately the President's vision, as outlined in his latest budget, is limited to an ever expanding Federal government.

The President claims that his spending plan achieves a $9.5 billion surplus in fiscal year 1999 thereby reaching, an even surpassing, the goal of a balanced budget three years sooner than expected.

But even is that assertion is correct, his budget submission misses the real point: balancing the federal budget is not just a bookkeeping exercise. Balancing the budget is about moving power out of Washington, having more decisions made by families and communities, and putting more faith in people rather than Washington ''experts.''

Balancing the budget is about restraining the size of the federal government so that other fundamental institutions—families, religious and civic organizations and business enterprises—begin to play their appropriate roles in the nation. When government grows, it invades the proper roles of these other institutions. The reverse is also true, so that when government is restrained, the other institutions grow. That is why Congress insisted that last year's budget agreement should not only balance the budget, but should also cut taxes at the same time. Only by coupling both strategies would the growth of federal bureaucracies stay in check. Only in this way could balancing the budget achieve the far more important goal of restoring balance among the nation's fundamental institutions.

One example of this restored balanced is the economic growth of the past several years, which has contributed significantly to today's favorable budget outlook. Critics have long predicted that too much deficit reduction, undertaken too fast, would cause the economy to contract. Instead, the reverse has happened. As the 104th and 105th Congresses held fast to their pledge to restrain spending and reform government, the engines of economic growth took over. The economy grew faster than projected. Interest rates fell, which in effect gave everyone a tax cut. Employment climbed. This growth, coupled with Congress's spending restraint, fueled our ability to quickly reach a balanced budget.

Another example of how rebuilding fundamental institutions helps all Americans is the decline in welfare dependency. This has occurred partly because the welfare reform law adopted in 1996—a reform the President vetoed twice before finally accepting public demand for it—devolved responsibilities and control to states and communities, which always were better suited to address the problems of poverty. Welfare reform gave Governors the flexibility to experiment, and tailor programs to their own unique populations. More importantly, it showed real compassion for those who received public assistance by encouraging taking responsibility for their lives, by making them accountable, and by moving them off the welfare rolls and onto payrolls. Since welfare reform was enacted, the welfare rolls have declined by 2.2 million people.

Mr. Speaker, the President seems not to have noticed. His budget reflects a typical return to expanding government whenever and wherever possible. For him, every problem (real or imagined) has a government solution—one that puts trust in Washington bureaucrats rather than individuals and families.

The President's budget contains 85 new spending programs, including 39 new entitlements. In all, these entitlements add nearly $150 billion to federal spending over the next five years. Meanwhile, he fails to pursue any further reduction in the tax burden on the American family—who notwithstanding last year's reduction—are still overtaxed. In fact, he slams the family budget by gobbling-up over $129 billion more of American income in new taxes and fees.

The President, who speaks of building bridges to the future, is actually taking the discredited road of the past—the past that brought on the era of big government. His zeal for more spending is disturbing. The government should be doing all it can to foster growth of economic resources, to provide for long-term prosperity, and to assure that the nation can meet its obligations to future generations. The government should not look for every way possible to spend these resources.

Nowhere is this more important than in Social Security—and nowhere does the President present a more staggering contradiction. To his credit, the President has acknowledged the need to prepare this unique program for the coming retirement of 76 million ''baby boomers.'' In his State of the Union address, he urged that any budget surpluses that appear should be preserved for Social Security's needs. But right now, in this budget, he proposes to spend any surpluses and then increase taxes and pour those funds into more government programs. All this increased spending could, alternatively, be preserved for saving Social Security. But the President's actions say more than his words. He would rather spend the money on special interest giveaways than provide for a safe and secure Social Security system.

The soul of last year's budget agreement was a commitment to restrain the growth of government and to help restore the vitality of America's communities, neighborhoods, and families. By contrast, the President's budget harkens back to the era of big government. While Americans have come to recognize the limits of Washington's ability to solve problems, President Clinton continues trying to draw more of American life under the control of Washington.

America is hungry for a positive vision of society, a society that values hard work, honesty, and a commitment to family faith and freedom. But the President only serves up a vision of more government in a budget that is balanced in numbers, not in spirit.

MICHAEL KELLY COLUMN ON PRESIDENTIAL SCANDAL

HON. GERALD B.H. SOLOMON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 1998

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, if any members are keeping a file of administration scandals, I would suggest including the February 4 ''I Believe'' Op Ed column in the Washington Post by Michael Kelly, senior writer for the National Journal.