

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT HAS BEEN LESS THAN TRUSTWORTHY IN SOCIAL SECURITY FUNDS

(Mr. PENNY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PENNY. Mr. Speaker, every pay period, working Americans faithfully make their contributions through the payroll tax to finance Social Security benefits. They pay now, trusting that the U.S. Government will guarantee that money will be there when it is their turn to retire. As we know, the Federal Government has been less than trustworthy in its caretaking of the surplus funds now building in the Social Security system. Instead of saving these funds, the Government is spending them. In this year alone, \$65 billion in extra Social Security receipts will pay for nonsocial security spending. Next year, that will grow to \$75 billion, and the year after, it will be \$86 billion.

Congress' resident scholar, Senator MOYNIHAN, calls that practice thievery. Others have called it embezzlement, looting, or safecracking. By any definition, it is wrong and an abuse of the public trust.

The payroll tax burden on working families has grown more dramatically in the Reagan-Bush years than at any time since its creation in the mid-1930's. The Social Security tax rate has been raised seven times—five times in the last 6 years alone—while the income level subject to the payroll tax also doubled. From 1980-88, Social Security tax revenues as a percentage of total Federal revenues rose by 23 percent. By comparison, corporate income tax revenue as a percentage of total Federal revenues declined by 23 percent.

That means the Federal Government is becoming more and more reliant on a regressive tax—paid at the same rate by the rich and the poor alike—to finance its operations. That's not fair. If we are collecting the tax for Social Security, then let us use it for Social Security. If not, then let us cut the tax and return the system to pay-as-you go.

PRESIDENT REAGAN AND THE BERLIN WALL

(Mr. ROHRABACHER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, it was 1,000 days ago today that Ronald Reagan was in Berlin challenging Mr. Gorbachev to tear down this wall.

I worked in the White House at the time and I remember well the controversy of that speech in the days before President Reagan delivered it. The entire foreign policy establishment of the United States descended upon the White House to try to pressure Presi-

dent Reagan into not saying, "Tear down the Wall." They suggested it was too confrontational, too belligerent.

President Reagan's own advisers tried to pressure him into deleting that from his speech, but President Reagan stood firm. Not only did he stand firm and say, "Tear down the Wall," but he stood firm in developing the SDI, rebuilding America's military strength and in supporting those people who were fighting for freedom around the world.

Now, today we hear the voices of those who opposed Ronald Reagan suggesting that all the progress we have had toward peace and freedom is nothing more than a cycle of history. I say it was the result of strong leadership and right ideas.

MAJORITY LEADER'S SPEECH SHOWED UP PRESIDENT'S LACK OF LEADERSHIP ON FOREIGN POLICY

(Mr. SCHUMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the majority leader of the House came out with a program to aid the Soviet Union. Whatever one thinks of that program, and there were many opinions on one side or the other, everyone agreed about one thing. It showed up the President's decisive lack of leadership on foreign policy.

Today as the President announces his transportation policy, again we see a total lack of leadership. With our infrastructure crumbling, with the need to build the Nation's roads and highways so that we can compete against Germany and Japan, what does the President do? He says, "Localities, you pay for it."

Well, the President could have saved 108 pages. He simply could have written a letter to the Governors and Mayors and said, "Dear Local Communities, from now on you pay for the Nation's highways, and by the way, that money we collected for fixing roads, we are using it to hide the deficit."

Under the President's plan, toll booths will be as common as arches across the Nation's highways. Under the President's plan, poor communities that cannot fix their own highways will suffer.

Mr. Speaker, is this leadership?

DEMOCRACY DAY IN VERMONT

(Mr. SMITH of Vermont asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, yesterday was town meeting day in my home State of Vermont. Some call it "Democracy Day," because it remains one of the last exercises in pure democracy in this democratic nation.

Through these once-a-year meetings we get the rare opportunity to really know what the people think. Not from polls or interviews, but from the actual source. What they said yesterday should interest us all.

One of the things they said in near unison was that we need to take a close look at our defense budget this year. Almost 90 percent of the towns voted to call for a 5-percent cut in defense spending, with the money redirected toward new priorities: education, environment, housing, drug abuse, farming, and many others.

□ 1130

Mr. Speaker, we should listen to the people of Vermont, because they represent the leading edge of a vast wave of public opinion coming from across the Nation. There are many problems that need our attention and the Federal Government's money. People see that every day. What they do not see is the continued need for defense budgets which claim such a huge share of our limited National Treasury.

This year, let us get serious about streamlining our defense needs, eliminating waste, fraud, and coverups, reevaluating our force structure and our burden-sharing commitments and our weapons systems. Let us listen to the people of Vermont and send the American people's money where they want it to go: people programs and deficit reduction.

IN SUPPORT OF SANCTIONS

(Mr. DYMALLY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DYMALLY. Mr. Speaker, the recent release of Mr. Mandela and certain moves by Mr. de Klerk have inspired some, like Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher, to call for lifting of sanctions against South Africa.

Mr. Speaker, this is not the time to lift sanctions against South Africa. Sanctions have proven to be quite effective in gaining the release of Mr. Mandela, and in pointing the South African regime in the direction of negotiations. If anything we should support the South Africa Financial Sanctions Act (H.R. 3458) sponsored by our colleague Mr. FAUNTROY and coauthored by me. I call on my colleagues to join me and the rest of the Congressional Black Caucus in cosponsoring H.R. 21, the Anti-Apartheid Act Amendments of 1989, introduced by Representative DELLUMS, and House Concurrent Resolution 270, introduced by our colleague Representative CONYERS. This resolution expresses the sense of Congress that the United States sanctions against South Africa should not be lifted until all conditions under the Anti-Apartheid Act are met.

