

they are passing away by a rate of roughly 1,500 a day.

If we are to truly honor our veterans, then I think this Nation needs to make every conceivable effort to try to preserve their memory.

I am struck by the number of people who I have encountered who have regrets today because they did not take out the family video camera and videotape their grandmother or grandparent or father or mother and talk to them about their years of serving our country and some of the great conflicts that we went through as a Nation during the course of the 20th century.

I envision now, with this project, with the cooperation of a lot of people across the country, including family members, friends, neighbors, the VFW and American Legion halls, school students, class projects, who could go out and interview these veterans on videotape, I envision that a child in the 21st or 22nd century will be able to call up on the Internet the testimony of their great, great, great, grandfather or grandmother and in their own words listen to their experience during the Second World War or Korea or Vietnam or the Gulf War, for instance.

This is something that we can do with relative ease. The Library of Congress is already involved in a similar type of project with the American Folk Life Center where they are videotaping community leaders around the country as to how they would like their communities to be remembered 100 or 200 years from now. They are also engaged on a comprehensive project to digitize the information that they are collecting; and what this project would call for is for the Library of Congress and the talent and expertise that they have there to index the videotape and digitize that and make it available to families and to anyone who wants access to this very important piece of our Nation's history.

When I have been working on this project, I have had a chance to think of many of the veterans who I have encountered back home, people like Glenn Averbek, from my congressional district who served in Korea and was part of the occupation force in Japan after the Second World War. I think of Don Bruns, a former POW during the Second World War. One story Don likes to tell is when he bailed out of a shrapnel-ridden B17 over the skies of Germany and he landed in a patch of kohlrabi. To this day, he cannot stand the sight or smell of that vegetable; but there is more to Don's story as he tells of the days of hunger in the stagg, days of boredom, days of anxiety and days when his captured comrades drifted towards insanity waiting for the day when they would be liberated or the day when they would escape.

These are the stories that we need to capture, in Don's words, and preserve for history's sake.

When I talk about the Veterans Oral History Project, I think of William Ehernman, a World War II vet shot

down in the Pacific. William tells of flying cover for PT boats in the Pacific, including flying cover for one young commander, a Naval officer by the name of John F. Kennedy. I also think of Golden Barritt, a World War I veteran from my district who died just last summer. It is a shame that we did not get Golden's oral history from the Great War. He almost reached his 100 birthday, and just last year he received a medal from the government of France for his participation in the First World War.

I also think of my father, who I did get a chance to videotape who served in the Army; my uncle who served during the Second World War; and also my younger brother who recently served during the Gulf War.

So I am encouraged by the bipartisan support that many of my colleagues have given for this legislation, and I would encourage this House to move the legislation quickly since time is of the essence.

THE HIGH PRICE OF GASOLINE DUE TO TAXATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Speaker, the top headline in the Washington Post late last week said: "Oil Prices Hit Ten Year High." Yet, as I drove into work this morning, the CBS Radio National News reported that oil prices had gone up another 90 cents a barrel.

In last Friday's Washington Times, a column in the editorial commentary pages carried the headline, "Gassed and Going Up."

This column, written by two economists, said taxes take 43 cents of every gallon and that Federal regulations add great additional costs and have prevented any new refinery from being built for 25 years. They wrote, quote, "The economy will suffer if the price of oil remains high. Our analysis shows that high oil prices will cost the average family of four more than \$1,300; decrease consumer spending by nearly \$80 billion and cost almost 500,000 jobs," unquote.

Last Friday night on the CNN Moneyline program, one leading stock analyst said higher oil prices are leading us into a recession and much lower stock prices. The stock market fell 278 points Friday and Monday, mainly due to fears about higher oil prices.

One of the things I do in the House is chair the Subcommittee on Aviation. A few months ago, the Air Transport Association told me that each one penny increase in jet fuel costs the airlines \$200 million.

Last week, the Christian Science Monitor newspaper had a front page story about protests and some near riots in Britain and throughout Europe over high gas prices.

Sometimes we are told that we are lucky because we are paying much less

for gas than the Europeans. Well, the reason is that our socialism is not as far along as theirs is. In Europe, taxes make up as much as 80 percent of the cost of gas. They pay the same world oil price as we do. They simply have more big government than we do, and we have too much.

Other segments of our economy will be hurt badly besides aviation if these oil prices go up even more, as is being predicted. Truckers are already feeling the pinch and are leading the protests in Europe. Agriculture and tourism and those who heat their homes with home heating oil will be greatly affected.

Who do we have to thank for this situation? Well, in this country those who like higher gas prices should write the White House and thank the President. The President vetoed legislation in 1995 which would have allowed production of oil in one tiny 2,000 to 3,000-acre part of the coastal plain of Alaska. The U.S. Geologic Survey has said there is approximately 16 to 19 billion barrels of oil there, equal to 30 years of Saudi oil. The President also signed an executive order placing 80 percent of the U.S. outercontinental shelf off-limits for oil production, and this is billions more barrels.

I heard on the radio last week that oil is the most plentiful liquid in the world after saltwater. Even with increased usage, we have hundreds of years worth of oil available. Yet because this administration is controlled by wealthy environmental extremists, we cannot produce more oil in this country. The environmentalists even want gas to go much higher so everyone but them will have to drive less.

They do not seem to care that the people they hurt the most are lower-income and working families. Most environmental extremists seem to come from wealthy families who are not hurt when prices go up and jobs are destroyed. Then, too, some of these environmental groups probably receive big contributions from the oil companies, the shipping companies, the OPEC countries and others who get rich if we do not produce more U.S. oil.

Due to EPA and other Federal regulations, I am told that 36 U.S. oil refineries have closed just since 1980. Because this administration is held captive by environmental extremists, our present oil policy consists of nothing more than to beg the OPEC countries.

Well, we need to do more than beg. We endanger not only our own economy but also our national security by being too dependent on foreign oil. The price of oil could be reduced dramatically if the President would tell OPEC that we are going to produce more oil domestically and really mean it. He needs also to tell the OPEC countries that their foreign aid will be ended if they continue to gouge us on oil prices. I have co-sponsored the bill of the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON) to cut off IMF loans to OPEC countries which raise their oil prices, but the liberals in Congress will probably not let us pass this bill.

Begging OPEC will get us nowhere. We need strong leadership, Madam Speaker, from the White House; but we will not get it. We also need to wake up and realize that the Sierra Club and some of these other environmental groups have now gone so far to the left that they make even socialists look conservative.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

HOW MUCH IS ENOUGH?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Madam Speaker, how much is enough? The buzz in Washington is that the President is spoiling for one last fight with Congress over the budget. In fact, White House aides have practically encouraged suspicion that they would like a government shutdown to embarrass Republicans and boost Democratic prospects in the upcoming elections. Rumors of a government shutdown are greatly exaggerated. Congressional leaders are working in good faith to ensure principled compromise with the President on a budget that serves the national interest.

Under our proposal, over \$600 billion of publicly held debt would be paid down by the end of next year. It would be eliminated by the year 2013. Of course, reduced debt means lower interest rates on credit cards and home mortgages for millions of American families.

The GOP debt reduction plan would also save an average of \$4,064 for every American household in lower interest rates over the next 10 years. Since early last year, Congress has made its spending priorities very clear. As a member of the House Committee on the Budget, I helped craft a budget for next year in which Federal spending would grow at a rate slower than the average family budget. This budget passed the House and Senate. It serves as the blueprint for congressional spending bills this year.

The President, on the other hand, will not say just how many billions of dollars he wants to spend. He submitted one plan in January, which was soundly rejected even by members of his own party. Speaking for congressional Democrats during the debate on the President's proposal earlier this year, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY), a Democratic, confessed on the House floor, and I quote, "We did not propose the President's budget. We do not want any part

of the President's budget," closed quote.

□ 1900

Indeed. The House Democrats offered four substitute budget plans this year. Not one of them was the President's budget plan. It never even got a vote.

Since that time, the President's spending plans have been a moving target. He is currently asking for between \$20 billion and \$30 billion more than he asked for in January, though he cannot say how much or exactly what he needs it for. If we cannot move forward on lowering and simplifying taxes, let us at least not go backwards on spending. A balanced budget with the surplus devoted largely to paying down debt would make perfect sense under these circumstances.

Last week, in an effort to reach agreement on total spending, congressional leaders went to the White House to propose reserving 90 percent of next year's surplus for reducing the national debt. This compromise would provide some limited room for additional spending, while paying down billions more dollars of the Federal debt and keeping a lid on Federal spending.

This should have been an attractive idea to the President. He claimed in the last few weeks that fidelity to the national debt caused him to veto the bills eliminating the marriage tax penalty and the death tax which Congress sent to the White House. But, the President seems decidedly cool toward the 90 percent debt reduction plan. Quote: "Whether we can do it," that is, use 90 percent of the surplus to pay down debt "depends on what the various spending commitments are," the President said earlier to the New York Times.

So let us be clear. When presented with a choice of more spending or paying down the national debt, the President chose more spending.

Ultimately, the budget debate comes down to a very simple question: how much is enough? I believe that \$1.68 trillion should be more than enough to fund the legitimate needs of the Federal Government. Unfortunately, it is still not clear how much more the President thinks is necessary. Congress is committed to working in good faith with the President to reach a reasonable budget compromise. The question is, is he?

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR LAUTENBERG

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. WILSON). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOLT. Madam Speaker, it is an honor to rise today to join the New Jersey congressional delegation and my colleagues in paying tribute to Senator FRANK LAUTENBERG. This legislation which we passed earlier in the day to name the post office and courthouse at Federal Square in Newark after the

Senator is just one small way to honor a man who has done so much for New Jersey and the Nation. I will be delighted to support it and I am pleased to see the House take it up.

FRANK LAUTENBERG, born into an immigrant family residing in Paterson, New Jersey, FRANK and his family dealt with numerous obstacles and struggles that were common experiences for many Americans during the 1920s. After moving from city to city, the LAUTENBERGS and LAUTENBERG's father found work at the renowned silk mills in Paterson. His father was soon able to eke out a living to support his family. Sadly, just as FRANK was on the brink of manhood, he lost his father to cancer.

Upon his graduation from Nutley High School, FRANK LAUTENBERG enlisted and served in the Army's Signal Corps in Europe during World War II. After serving his country, he attended the prestigious Columbia University on the GI Bill where he studied economics.

With his eyes set on the innovations of the future, LAUTENBERG, accompanied by two childhood friends, founded Automatic Data Processing, a payroll services company. ADP quickly rose up the ladder of business and emerged as one of the world's largest computing service companies with over 33,000 people on its payroll.

Since his election to the Senate in 1982, FRANK LAUTENBERG has given back to the State of New Jersey and our Nation throughout his senatorial career. By writing laws that established age 21 as the national drinking age, by banning smoking on airplanes and forbidding domestic violence abusers from owning guns, LAUTENBERG insured the health and security of our families.

As a strong environmental leader, FRANK LAUTENBERG sought to protect all aspects of our beautiful environment, mainly through the Superfund program to clean up toxic waste sites, the clean air and safe drinking water acts, and the Pets on Planes acts. With the best interests of New Jersey and New Jersey's beaches in mind, FRANK LAUTENBERG wrote legislation that would ban ocean dumping of sewage, rid our beaches of garbage, control medical waste, and stop oil drilling off our famed Jersey shore.

Standing as an example of an American success story, FRANK LAUTENBERG has dedicated 18 years of his career to public service here in the United States Capitol and in New Jersey. And, despite his retirement, Senator LAUTENBERG will always be remembered for his many contributions made to better the lives of millions of Americans. I am sure he will continue to dedicate himself to improving lives, to healing the world.

On a more personal note, no one has done more to help me as a new member of the New Jersey congressional delegation than Senator FRANK LAUTENBERG. His advice, guidance and assistance are things that I will always remember with gratitude.