

the City of Alexandria have gone on record as firmly opposing this renaming bill.

The Greater Washington Board of Trade, which is the equivalent of our regional Chamber of Commerce, opposes this legislation. These local organizations reflect strong public sentiment against H.R. 2526. So rather than respect the conservative principles of Ronald Reagan, this Congress is diminishing the history of the airport and the President for which it was named to glorify another President.

Our local airport was named Washington National Airport for a very good reason. George Washington lived less than 10 miles away from it, on the very same route. He lived at the end of the street where Washington National Airport is located, Mount Vernon. When it was built, President Roosevelt and airport architects wanted the original terminal to bear a resemblance to Mount Vernon, which it does.

Virginia is a State which is proud to have produced so many Presidents and Founding Fathers for this Nation. We do not want to have the name of our first President taken off the busiest airport in our State. Rather than honor President Reagan's belief in limited and preferably local government, this Congress is about to enact a bill that will saddle the Washington Metropolitan Airport Authority and hundreds of local businesses in and around Washington National Airport with great and unnecessary expenses.

The most ironic, and some would say saddest, part of this entire debate is that we are trying to overturn one of President Reagan's accomplishments. It was, after all, President Ronald Reagan who in 1986 signed legislation that ceded Federal control over Washington National and Dulles Airports to the State and regional authorities. That 1986 law granted to the Washington Metropolitan Airport Authority control over these airports. They were not even consulted.

This is wrong. It is an outrageous abuse of power. It should not be done. Do not do it.

By signing that legislation, President Reagan assured that the federal government would get out of the business of running regional airports. He was correct in doing so. He was acting in a manner that was consistent with this core philosophy, which was to devolve power to the state and local governments.

Now, twelve years later, my Republican colleagues want to ignore completely the spirit and purpose of that law and force this name change on unwilling local authorities.

Lest anyone think that this is just a partisan concern, or that we are acting in a petty manner, I ask them to consider not my comments but the comments of former Virginia Governor Linwood Holton, who was also a former chairman of the Washington Airports Authority.

In a letter to me last week, the Governor stated his strong opposition to H.R. 2526. He expressed the concern that this bill defeats the purpose of the 1986 airports law and the underlying lease for the airports between the fed-

eral government and the airports authority. That lease grants to the authority—and not to this Congress—the control over all operational issues relating to the airport. And that includes its name!

Governor Holton goes on to articulate the concerns that many of us have about the cost of this name change and its impact on the traveling public.

These are not the concerns of some partisan Democrat, but of the first Republican elected to statewide office in modern Virginia history.

Mr. Speaker, President Reagan has been and will continue to be honored by the American people. His name will be on the Navy's next *Nimitz*-class aircraft carrier. The new international trade center downtown will be dedicated in April as the Ronald Reagan Building. And there is a courthouse in California named after President Reagan.

These honors are appropriate and enjoy bipartisan support.

Let's not subject the President and his family to a divisive debate over renaming Washington National Airport. H.R. 2526 is a bill that is opposed by our local governments in Virginia. It is opposed by the business community. It runs counter to the spirit and purpose of existing law. It diminishes Virginia history and the legacy of George Washington. And it establishes a bad precedent for this House.

I urge the Republican leadership to withdraw this ill-advised and hastily drawn measure.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the following:

MCLEAN, VA, January 29, 1998.

DEAR JIM: I am writing to you in regards to the pending legislation to change the name of the Washington National Airport to "Ronald Reagan National Airport." I had the honor of working closely with the Congress and Secretary of Transportation Elizabeth Dole in advancing the Metropolitan Washington Airports Act of 1986 to transfer Washington National Airport out of the Federal Government to the Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority. This legislation of course was signed into law by President Reagan. The Airports Authority was created by the Commonwealth of Virginia and the District of Columbia. The Federal Government leased Washington National Airport and Washington Dulles International Airport to the Authority for fifty years beginning on June 7, 1987. I was privileged to serve as Chairman of the Authority at that time and I signed that lease on behalf of the Authority.

The purpose of the transfer, as recited in the lease itself, was to achieve "local control, management, operation and development" of the airports. I am very concerned that after ten years of this lease arrangement, the Congress now proposed to take unilateral action to change the name of the airport. This is not at all consistent with either the literal terms or the purpose of that lease agreement. Further, the change to the name as proposed, while honoring a president for whom I have the greatest respect, would be detrimental to the airport and its users and affect the traveling public in ways certainly not intended by the drafters of this legislation.

The lease grants the Authority complete control, power, and dominion over the airports. The intent of Congress, Virginia and the District of Columbia in this arrangement is clear. Even though the Federal Government continues to own the underlying land, the airport is to be treated as any other air-

port, not as a federal facility. In the past, there have been changes made to the lease at the request of Congress and the changes have been brought about by a mutually agreed upon amendment to the lease to secure the consent of the Airports Authority. The proposed name change legislation does not acknowledge the need to obtain the consent of the Authority and this is inconsistent with the intended relationship between the Federal Government and the Authority.

As for the consequences, the removal of "Washington" from the airport name removed the location and market identifier that is obviously very important to travelers and shippers at points distant from the Washington area. It is worth noting that well over half of those who travel through National are not residents of the Washington region. The word "Washington" provides immediate market and location information. Without it, there will be confusion that does not exist today about where the airport is and what market it serves. The cost of such loss of identity and confusion may not be readily quantified, but I believe that it would be substantial. There also are other costs such as the costs to local businesses who have associated their identities with Washington National Airport.

In conclusion, the legislation which transferred Washington National Airport to the Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority granted to the Authority the control and oversight of the airport. Unilateral action by the Congress to take the drastic action of changing the name of the airport is inconsistent with both the spirit and the intent of the transfer.

Very truly yours,

LINWOOD HOLTON.

#### LEGISLATION TO KEEP SOCIAL SECURITY SOLVENT

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

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, thank you very much. As you well know, Mr. Speaker, the Committee on the Budget for the last 3 hours has been meeting, talking to Mr. Raines, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget. My concern and what I noted to Mr. Raines was the fact that Social Security is in jeopardy.

I have introduced the only bill in this U.S. House of Representatives that has now been scored by the Social Security Administration to keep Social Security solvent, so I applauded the President when he suggested that we put Social Security first. However, as I said to Mr. Raines, in examining the budget that was delivered yesterday, Social Security was not put first. Social Security was put ninth, not first.

And I explained the problem of the expanded spending in this budget, where ahead of Social Security was an expanded Medicare program; ahead of Social Security was the high cost of this global warming agreement; ahead of Social Security was \$37 billion expanded role for government in education, where Washington is going to decide more of the decisions and pass more regulations as they pass through that money back to local communities; ahead of Social Security was new penalties for moms who stay at home to

take care of their kids with a \$21 billion program of government getting into the baby-sitting business; expanded welfare programs were there; infusing \$18 billion into the International Monetary Fund, the IMF; the budget created or expanded \$39 billion worth of new or expanded entitlement programs. Social Security was definitely not put first.

In the budget was roughly \$102 billion of increased taxes, another \$23 billion of increased fees, which one could almost consider taxes because eventually they are going to be passed on to the consumer. My question to Mr. Raines was, would he consider taking whatever increased revenues was projected and not spending it on these new expanded "make government bigger and more powerful" programs and put all that surplus into Social Security? And he reacted that, no, they thought they had the correct balance.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that we should change the definition of what a balanced budget is. We are hoodwinking the American people in pretending there is a balanced budget, because there is not. If you look in this book of part of the budget, the historical tables, on page 111, we talk about what happens to the national debt of this country, the Federal debt of this country. The Federal debt in this budget is going up between \$100 billion and \$200 billion every year for the next 5 years. I personally think that a reasonable definition for a balanced budget is when we stop increasing the national debt.

And the justification is, and it is not just the President, it has been Congress, too, that says, look, we are defining a balanced budget as everything that comes into budget. But everybody should understand what government is doing is overtaxing workers today because there is more money coming in in the Social Security tax than is needed to pay out immediately for benefits. And the Federal Government is taking that money, not only spending it for other social programs but they are taking that money and considering it is balancing the budget.

That should not be the way, Mr. Speaker. We need to start being more honest with the American people. In this budget we should be looking at how we reduce the overall size of government and not, as suggested in this government, in this budget, that we have another \$102 billion of taxes, or a total of \$129 billion of taxes if you include the fee increases that are going to be put on the American people. We should not increase those taxes to expand government.

We should put Social Security first. I agree with the President. Let us not expand government at a time that we have these huge challenges of saving Social Security and saving Medicare.

#### SCHOOL OVERCROWDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentle-

woman from California (Ms. SANCHEZ) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. SANCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, many of you know that my major legislative focus this past year has been to alleviate California's and the Nation's overcrowded schools. I have introduced a bill, the Expand & Rebuild America's Schools Act, to ensure that schools with high growth rates have a Federal incentive to pass local bond initiatives to help build new schools and new classrooms.

To highlight this legislation, I held a forum this past month in my hometown of Anaheim, California, a forum on school overcrowding, and it was attended by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), our Democratic leader, and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. JUANITA MILLENDER-MCDONALD). She herself is a former teacher in California.

We held it and we had witnesses to talk to us about how they are affected by the overcrowding crisis. Students and teachers, administrators, education experts from my district, Sacramento and Washington, D.C. gave valuable testimony that shed light on what is going right, what is wrong, and what has to be done to help our kids.

And, yes, I did hear a 6th grade student talk about how she no longer has playground space because portable classrooms were needed to be placed on the school's blacktop; or the teacher's frustration who said she was using a coat closet as a workroom; or even the knowledge that I have of having returned to my elementary school there in Anaheim and to see the janitor's mop room now being used as a classroom for special education children. And I know that we need to solve this problem of school overcrowding.

The forum produced many good ideas about what must be done locally and in our State to build more schools, but what remains clear is through this we still need Federal help. I applaud the President for stepping up to the plate and offering two major bond programs to encourage renovation of schools and new school construction. His bond program could be, in my view, more focused on alleviating the crowding of our most impacted schools, and I look forward to working with the administration to ensure that some exception or preference can be given to schools suffering from both high growth rates and little space. For example, the elementary schools in Anaheim were built for 500 students, yet each of them has almost 1100 students attending. And, of course, they are now on year-round schedule.

My legislation, which offers a similar bond financing program, is a good example of getting local people to take on the responsibility of financing their schools with an incentive that if they do this, we will help them, not by creating more Federal bureaucracy or a new spending program, but by offering interest free rates on bonds because the Federal Government will provide a tax

credit to the lenders in the amount of the interest. Therefore, these local agencies will only have to repay the principal. Only schools which are highly impacted by overcrowding can qualify for these bonds.

School overcrowding is not only just a problem in Orange County or in California, but States such as Nevada and Arizona, Florida, and Pennsylvania are experiencing the same challenges. If my colleagues would like additional information about the forum and the information we have received there, please contact me. And I hope that we can work together to ensure that our children can get all the space that they need.

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2:00 p.m.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 14 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 2:00 p.m.

□ 1400

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. GOODLATTE) at 2 p.m.

#### PRAYER

The Chaplain, Rev. James David FORD, D.D., offered the following prayer:

We admit, O gracious God, that we strive to know Your love, but we realize in our hearts that we miss the mark; we confess that we seek to do Your will in our lives, but we know in our hearts that we often fail; we acknowledge that we aspire to obey Your commandments, but in our hearts we can follow a selfish path. O God of Gods and Creator of all the world, breath into us a new spirit of faith and hope and love that we will be the people You would have us be and do those good works that honor You and serve people in their need. In Your name, we pray. Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

#### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. NORWOOD) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. NORWOOD led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.