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 the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Existing regulations implementing the Clean Air Act would force Pennsylvania to accept a centralized, test-only auto emissions inspection and maintenance program in order to be deemed in compliance with that act. The test-only program would require citizens to bounce back and forth between test centers and auto repair garages and would leave auto technicians guessing about whether their work was successful in addressing their customer's problems. The citizens of Pennsylvania voiced their extreme dissatisfaction with such a program when it was proposed by our previous Governor, and the State legislature repealed the statute which provided for that program.

Provisions in this conference report eliminate the arbitrary automatic 50 percent penalty in emissions reductions credit that the regulations would impose on States that preferred a decentralized approach. While I was not a Member of Congress when the 1990 Clean Air Act amendments were enacted, I do not believe that Congress intended to require the one-size-fits all program that these regulations force on the States. The elimination of this penalty would restore to the States the flexibility that Congress intended that they have in creating programs that will make the most sense in their States. Additionally, under the provisions, States like Pennsylvania whose legislature has not yet passed enabling legislation will have 120 days to do so, as well as, to propose accompanying regulations. The Congress is aware of the burden imposed upon Pennsylvania by this timetable since it coincides with the time in which the Pennsylvania legislature must also develop a budget that must be enacted by June 30. The parties to the agreement are aware of Pennsylvania's concerns with the small window and intend to work with them. We also hope that EPA will be flexible in working with Pennsylvania as it develops its plan.

Pennsylvania's current Governor, Tom Ridge, has proposed a decentralized test-and-repair program that he believes can meet the goals of the Clean Air Act without visiting undue hardship and inconvenience on the motorists and auto repair businesses of Pennsylvania. The inspection and maintenance provisions in this conference report would allow Pennsylvania to complete the design and implementation of a program on this decentralized basis and would allow that program to be judged on its actual performance over an 18-month period, rather than by an arbitrary rule.

I believe that reducing ozone pollution and improving the quality of the air that we breathe is of great importance to my constituents and to the rest of the citizens of Pennsylvania. I also believe that the States know what will best work to achieve the goal and should have the latitude to design programs that make sense for their citizens. I believe that these provisions give that needed latitude to Pennsylvania and to other States that are currently wrestling with this problem, and I urge the adoption of the conference report.

SOCIAL SECURITY IS FAR FROM BROKEN

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 29, 1995

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to enter into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article by Mr. Gus Tyler celebrating the 60th anniversary of the Social Security trust fund and decrying the false prediction that Social Security is on the verge of bankruptcy, Mr. Tyler makes clear that the Social Security trust fund is not running out of money, as many of my colleagues have argued.

The trust fund is strong and will remain strong as long as the American economy is strong. What threatens the trust fund is what threatens the economy: unemployment and a stagnant economy. We need to strengthen the economy not to dismantle Social Security. Moreover, the Social Security system strengthens the American economy by generating buying power and increasing savings. I would like to enter into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this statement by Gus Tyler which clearly outlines why we don't need to dismantle Social Security.

TRUST FUND DOESN'T NEED TO BE ''FIXED''

(By Gus Tyler)

The Social Security Trust Fund, which celebrates its 60th birthday this month, will go bust sometime between the year 2020 and 2030. That forecast has been heard so often and from so many authentic voices that the statement is now taken to be a fact. Which it is not.

To head off the imagined disaster, the following remedies are presented: a) raise the payroll tax that funds the system; b) reduce the benefits to retirees; c) do not adjust the benefits to meet the cost of living; d) tax benefits to help balance the budget.

If these cures are applied, they will kill the patient who is not sick.

The Social Security Trust Fund will not run out of funds by 2020 or 2030 unless the United States runs into what amounts to a depression that will continue for a protracted period. And the remedies currently proposed will hasten the coming of precisely such a depression that will not only destroy the Social Security program, but will destroy the country.

Here is the truth about Social Security as set forth simply by an extremely authoritative governmental body known as the Board of Trustees of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance and Disability Insurance Trust Fund.

The facts that follow are drawn from the 1995 report of this official body to the appropriate persons and agencies in accordance with Section 201(c)(2) of the Social Security Act as amended.

The Report (page 181) submits three scenarios on the future of the Social Security system. One scenario assumes virtually no growth in the economy in the first 75 years of the next century. Another scenario assumes slow growth; a third scenario assumes something between no movement and a slow crawl.

The first scenario—the worst possible case—assumes that the country is in the economic doldrums for about 70 years. By 1996 (next year), the economy will be effectively stagnant, with a growth rate of minus 0.7 percent. That means recession bordering on depression.

The same scenario projects little hope for the future. Growth will be near zilch. And, as a consequence, the Social Security Trust Fund will be facing early bankruptcy. In fact, says the footnote on page 181, ''estimates for later years (after 2030) are not shown because the Funds are estimated to become exhausted in 2030.''

But—and this is a big ''but''—this is only one of three scenarios submitted by the Board of Trustees.

A second scenario assumes an annual growth rate of between 2 and 3 percent a year. That is a very slow growth rate when compared with growth in the years from 1960 to 1964 (4.4 percent) or with growth in the years 1970 to 1974 (3.1 percent) or with 1984 (6.2 percent). A growth rate in the next century—from the year 2000 to 2070—of a mere 2 to 2.5 percent is sluggish.

Yet, according to the report of the trustees, if such a growth rate, albeit slow, continues, by the year 2070, the Social Security Trust Fund will have an income of $22.74 trillion dollars and will have accumulated assets of $98.7 trillion. Yes, ''trillion,'' not billion!

The $98 trillion (roughly $100 trillion) is not as outlandishly huge as it seems. The report for this scenario assumes an annual 3 percent rate of inflation. Over 75 years (from 1995 to 2070), a dollar will lose much of its value, ending up worth about 10 cents in 1995 currency.

Allowing for that factor, the $98 trillion dollar reserve projected for 2070 would only be worth one-tenth that sum—about $10 trillion—in 1995 dollars.

Ten trillion dollars in 1995 currency is, however, no mean sum to have as a reserve in the Social Security Trust Fund. It is twenty times as large as the present reserve of about half a trillion. It is twice as large as the total federal debt this year. It will, as noted above, be replenished in 2070 by an additional $22 trillion and by annual contributions in that dimension in the years to follow.

One of the problems that some insiders were posing a few years ago when this scenario began to unfold was—what to do with all that money? One of the possible answers would be to allocate some of the money in the Old Age and Survivors Fund to the Medicare Fund.

The sums that are projected by this scenario are not the outer limits of what can be realized. The assumption of the ''optimistic'' forecast is that the economy will grow, between now and 2070, at an average rate of about 2.5 percent a year. That is no great shakes. Between 1960 and 1994, it grew at 2.8 percent. And it could have grown faster if the Federal Reserve Board had not been repeatedly checking growth by raising interest rates and limiting the money supply.

Should the economy grow at 3 and 4 percent a year, added trillions would pour into the Social Security and Medicare funds, as well as into the U.S. Treasury.

But, would not such growth beyond, let's say, 3 percent, be inflationary? The report of the Fund trustees says, ''No.'' In 1984, the economy grew at the swift speed of 6.2 percent, but the inflation rate (consumer price index) was only 3.5 percent. Again, in 1994, the economy grew at a lively 4 percent, but the inflation rate was only 2.5 percent.

Perversely, in some of the years of slowest growth, prices rose wildly. In 1990, the economy grew by a feeble 1.2 percent, but prices rose by 5.2 percent. And in 1980, the economy actually shrunk by 0.5 percent, but prices skyrocketed by 13.4 percent.

The reasons for this seemingly contrary behavior are several and make a fitting subject for another article. But the fact remains that rapid growth does not mean inflation and that low or negative growth does not mean lower prices. (All these data are drawn from the above mentioned report, page 56).