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.

It's a paradox that this administration has bought some time by giving us so many and such a variety of scandals that we cannot possibly keep up with them. Critics take the measure of one scandal, only to be distracted or overwhelmed by another, and another, and another, seemingly without end.

Kelly's column serves to remind us that the Lewinski affair is only the latest in a series of scandals, and the White House attempt to change the subject merely the continuation of a pattern of dissembling.

Mr. Speaker, I believe our present policy of deferring to the independent counsel is the correct one. Should it ever be found that such dissembling took the form of obstructing justice, we will be faced with a serious decision. If only a fraction of the allegations catalogued by Kelly turn out to be true, the House will be obliged to act. It will do so with a collective feeling of sorrow, but it must not shrink from its responsibilities.

I include the Kelly column in today's RECORD.

I BELIEVE

I believe the president. I have always believed him. I believed him when he said he had never been drafted in the Vietnam War and I believed him when he said he had forgotten to mention that he had been drafted in the Vietnam War. I believed him when he said he hadn't had sex with Gennifer Flowers and I believe him now, when he reportedly says he did.

I believe the president did not rent out the Lincoln Bedroom, did not sell access to himself and the vice president to hundreds of well-heeled special pleaders and did not supervise the largest, most systematic money-laundering operation in campaign finance history, collecting more than $3 million in illegal and improper donations. I believe that Charlie Trie and James Riady were motivated by nothing but patriotism for their adopted country.

I believed Vice President Gore when he said that he had made dunning calls to political contributors ''on a few occasions'' from his White House office, and I believed him when he said that, actually, ''a few'' meant 46. I believe in no controlling legal authority.

I believe Bruce Babbitt when he says that the $286,000 contributed to the DNC by Indian tribes opposed to granting a casino license to rival tribes had nothing to do with his denial of the license. I believed the secretary when he said that he had not been instructed in this matter by then-White House deputy chief of staff Harold Ickes. I believed him when he said later that he had told lobbyist and friend Paul Eckstein that Ickes had told him to move on the casino decision, but that he had been lying to Eckstein. I agree with the secretary that it is an outrage that anyone would question his integrity.

I believe in the Clinton Standard of adherence to the nation's campaign finance and bribery laws, enunciated by the president on March 7, 1997: ''I don't believe you can find any evidence of the fact that I had changed government policy solely because of a contribution.'' I note with approval the use of the word ''evidence'' and also the use of the word ''solely.'' I believe that it is proper to change government policy to address the concerns of people who have given the president money, as long as nobody can find evidence of this being the sole reason.

I believe the president has lived up to his promise to preside over the most ethical administration in American history. I believe that indicted former agriculture secretary Mike Espy did not accept $35,000 in illegal favors from Tyson Foods and other regulated businesses. I believe that indicted former housing secretary Henry Cisneros did not lie to the FBI and tell others to lie cover up $250,000 in blackmail payments to his former mistress. I believe that convicted former associate attorney general Webster Hubbell was not involved in the obstruction of justice when the president's minions arranged for Hubbell to receive $400,000 in sweetheart consulting deals at a time when he was reneging on his promise to cooperate with Kenneth Starr's Whitewater investigation.

I believe Paula Jones is a cheap tramp who was asking for it. I believe Kathleen Willey is a cheap tramp who was asking for it. I believe Monica Lewinsky is a cheap tramp who was asking for it.

I believe Lewinsky was fantasizing in her 20 hours of taped conversation in which she reported detailed her sexual relationship with the president and begged Linda Tripp to join her in lying about the relationship. I believe that any gifts, correspondence, telephone calls and the 37 post-employment White House visits that may have passed between Lewinsky and the president are evidence only of a platonic relationship; such innocent intimate friendships are quite common between middle-aged married men and young single women, and also between presidents of the United States and White House interns.

I see nothing suspicious in the report that the president's intimate, Vernon Jordan, arranged a $40,000-per-year job for Lewinsky shortly after she signed but before she filed an affidavit saying she had not had sex with the president. Nor do I read anything into the fact that the ambassador to the United Nations, Bill Richardson, visited Lewinsky at the Watergate to offer her a job. I believe the instructions Lewinsky gave Tripp informing her on how to properly perjure herself in the Willey matter simply wrote themselves.

I believe that The Washington Post, the Los Angeles Times, The New York Times, Newsweek, Time, U.S. News & World Report, ABC, CBS, NBC, CNN, PBS and NPR are all part of a vast right-wing conspiracy. Especially NPR.

NATIONAL AFRICAN-AMERICAN PARENT INVOLVEMENT DAY

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 1998

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is often said that education is the key to our country's future. While so many individuals give mere lip service to this idea, I am proud to announce that several of my constituents have been working hard to bring education into the limelight it deserves. February 9th of this year will mark the third annual National African-American Parent Involvement Day, a program done in conjunction with the Miami-Dade County School Board. This effort is being chaired by Earl Davis from the Office of Multicultural Education of Miami-Dade County Public Schools and co-chaired by Eunice Davis from North Davis Middle School and Carlos Seales from the Miami-Dade PTA/PTSA Council.

As we all know, parents in our hectic times often do not have the time to take an active role in the education of their children. Quite frequently, they do not know what their children are learning or who is teaching them. The ''Take Your Child to School—Visit Your Child in School'' program is a concerted effort by principals, teachers, and other educators to encourage parents to change this disturbing trend. Parents will come into their children's schools to meet teachers, tour the buildings, and learn alongside their youngsters. Employers are also being contacted and encouraged to give interested parents ''release time'' so that they are able to be with their children on this important day.

I would like to personally commend my constituents who are organizing and participating in this vastly important program. When we consistently hear bad news about our nation's public schools, it is truly refreshing to see individual and community efforts such as these. I join my colleagues in South Florida in hoping that February 9th will initiate open communication between parents, children, and educators throughout the nation. Education truly is the key to the future, and it is programs such as this one that insure that it proceeds in the right direction.

A TRIBUTE TO LA SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE SHERMAN SMITH, JR.

HON. JULIAN C. DIXON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 1998

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to outstanding Los Angeles Superior Court Judge, the Honorable Sherman Smith, Jr. For nearly two decades, Judge Smith has presided over cases in a fair and forthright manner, earning him the respect of his judicial peers, as well as the admiration of the many members of the bar who have tried cases in his courtroom.

Judge Smith received his undergraduate and law degrees from Howard University in Washington, DC. Following his 1969 graduation from law school, he headed west to Los Angeles, landing a job with the public defender's office, where he helped the poor achieve justice through our legal system. He then spent a year at the L.A. City Attorney's office, working in the appellate department and then as one of the special counsels for then-City Attorney Burt Pines. He worked an additional year with the office as a prosecutor in West Los Angeles before being appointed to the Los Angeles Municipal Court in 1979 by then-Governor Jerry Brown, Jr. Judge Smith eventually reached the ranks of presiding judge, making substantial changes and working to modernize the court. He served on the Municipal Court bench for nine years.

In 1988 he was elected to a Superior Court seat and has served on the court's budget and personnel committee, chairing the education subcommittee of its access and fairness committee. During this period he was also active in judicial education, serving four years on the California Judicial Education and Research board and teaching for the program.

Judge Smith's commitment to the court and to a fair and equitable judicial system for every citizen honors our system of jurisprudence. I am honored to call him my friend and to have this opportunity to provide this brief retrospective of his exemplary career with my colleagues. I ask that you join me in paying tribute to him for his distinguished contributions to