But it is not necessary for the Committee to come to conclusions on these and other technical issues in order to go forward confidently to require the Secretary of Defense to tell you how he plans to carry out Title II's mandate to end the policy of deliberate vulnerability by developing theater and strategic ballistic missile defenses.

In developing his plans, the Secretary of Defense should consider that, insofar as the ABM Treaty is an obstacle to implementing Title II, he should recommend the ways in which the Treaty ought to be changed. There are, after all, provisions for amendment in the terms of the ABM Treaty. They were presumably placed there by men who realized that future circumstances might require new approaches. In this they were surely right. We should approach the Russians at the highest levels with a view to cooperatively amending the Treaty to take account of the strikingly different world in which we are now living.

But if the Russians, for whatever reason, should oppose reasonable revisions to the Treaty and insist on blocking us from defending ourselves against the North Koreas, Libyas, Iraqs and the like, we should make clear our readiness to withdraw from the Treaty under the appropriate article and after the appropriate notice. If we are prepared to withdraw, we should find it unnecessary to do so.

Mr. Chairman, the Congress has it within its power to force a reconsideration of the opposition to ballistic missile defense that prevailed during the last decades of the Cold War. It is a new Congress. I believe it is up to the task of new thinking about defense, and your hearing this morning encourages me to believe that antiquated ideas that cannot be made persuasive as we face the new millennium should be relegated to the history of the one we will leave behind.

PROPOSING A BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION

SPEECH OF

HON. RANDY "DUKE" CUNNINGHAM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 25, 1995

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 1) proposing a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the Barton three-fifths tax limitation balanced budget amendment. As an original cosponsor of the Barton amendment, I believe it is the best choice of the various options before the House today.

It is clear that Congress is utterly incapable of controlling the growth of spending. Solution after solution has failed to get the deficit under control. We have raised taxes and found that the deficit has increased.

I think the key to understanding why the three-fifths majority is essential is to examine the recent history of tax increases. Since 1977, there have been seven major tax increases that would have failed under Barton. Had the Barton amendment been in place over these years, a total of $558.9 billion in tax increases would have been blocked. That's half a trillion dollars that would have been spent by Americans on their priorities—new houses, new cars, college educations, and so forth. Instead, the American people got half a trillion in Federal spending, much of it on wasteful projects that benefit parochial interests.

One, the 1977 Social Security tax.—This $80.4 billion tax increase increased both tax rates and the taxable wage base for employers and employees. The conference report passed the House by a vote of 189 to 163. Had the Barton amendment been in place, this tax hike would have failed.

Two, the 1982 Tax Equity and Fiscal Responsibility Act.—TEFRA was the first of the series of packages that was going to take care of the deficit problem. The bill increased taxes by $99 billion and cut Medicare and Medicaid by $17 billion. It passed the Senate by a 50 to 47 margin. Had the Barton amendment been in place, this tax hike would have failed.

Three, the 1982 Transportation Assistance Act.—This bill increased gasoline and highway taxes by $22 billion. The House adopted the conference report by a 180 to 87 vote. Had the Barton amendment been in place, this tax hike would have failed.

Four, the 1987 Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act.—This bill contained a variety of tax changes and user fee increases totaling $11.9 billion. It passed the House by a one-vote margin. Had the Barton amendment been in place, this tax hike would have failed.

Five, the 1992 Tax Fairness and Economic Growth Act.—This bill increased taxes by a total of $77.5 billion, including a permanent increase of the top tax rate, surtaxes on incomes above $250,000, and other tax and fee increases. It passed the House by a 211 to 189 margin. Had the Barton amendment been in place, this tax hike would have failed.

Six, 1992 urban aid tax bill.—A variety of tax changes totaling $27 billion. The conference report was adopted by the House by a 208 to 202 vote. Had the Barton amendment been in place, this tax hike would have failed.

Seven, 1993 Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act.—President Clinton's tax bill increased tax rates, the gas tax, taxes on Social Security benefits, and many user fees. This $241 billion tax increase was the largest in history. It passed the Senate by a margin of 50 to 49. Had the Barton amendment been in place, this tax hike would have failed.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I support the Stenholm-Solomon amendment. It is solid legislation and will make a genuine difference in the way we deal with the budget. It will force Government to live within its means and insure that we will no longer allow deficits to spiral out of control.

However, the Barton amendment is better because it takes this debate in a new direction. Not only are we going to balance the Federal budget, but we are also going to insure that there will be no more one-vote margins for tax increases. If we truly want to restrain the power of Government, I believe the Barton amendment is essential.

Over the years, the Government has shown that it lacks the discipline needed. We have been far too eager to see the people's money as the answer to our spending problem. For that reason, I believe the Barton amendment is the best alternative before the House today.

RECOGNITION OF FRED JACKSON, SR.

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 27, 1995

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I stand today to recognize Mr. Fred Jackson, Sr. of Jackson, MS. Mr. Jackson reached the age of 115 in January 1995. Thus, he is one of the oldest persons in the United States. He was born in the Cauldville community near Canton, MS in 1880. He was married to Mrs. Fronie Jackson who is now deceased and is the father of one son, Mr. Fred Jackson, Jr.

Mr. Jackson worked as a farmer and carpenter for many years. He has been a devoted member of the Pleasant Grove Baptist Church where he served as a deacon and Sunday school teacher. He enjoys fishing, hunting and helping people. Mr. Jackson also enjoys reading the Bible. He attributes his long life to his strong religious beliefs and treating every person with respect.

I congratulate Mr. Jackson on a long and fruitful life and his important contributions to the Jackson community.

INTRODUCTION OF THE OLD FAITHFUL PROTECTION ACT OF 1995

HON. PAT WILLIAMS

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 27, 1995

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the Old Faithful Protection Act of 1995. This will be the third Congress that I have introduced legislation seeking to protect Yellowstone National Park's natural wonders.

The legislation I present today is essentially the bill that passed the House Of Representatives last Congress by overwhelming margins. There are just two notable exceptions, both improvements that should provide even more support for the bill.

This legislation now provides for a land trade with the only private geothermal-rights holder adjacent to Yellowstone and it incorporates the changes suggested by the Idaho and Wyoming Governors. These changes remove any questions regarding private property rights or State acceptance issues raised each Congress by the Senate.

With, to my knowledge, all questions answered I have high hopes that this Congress we will demonstrate the legislative will to finally protect the crown jewels of our national treasure—Yellowstone National Park. Twice before the House of Representatives has passed protection for Yellowstone, and twice now the tiniest minority of antienvironmental Senators have blocked its consideration in the Senate. Twice now a few Senators have refused to allow legislation to even be heard unless everyone involved will agree with them up front.

There is no question that this Congress will be wrestling with a wide variety of environmental issues. Many believe that the Republican contract is really open warfare on this Nation's environmental law. I believe that the verdict is still out but, one thing I know for certain, failure to pass this legislation will be a