

**DEARBORN PRESS AND GUIDE
MARKS 75TH ANNIVERSARY**

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1993

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, it was 75 years ago today that the first edition of the Dearborn Press newspaper appeared on the streets of the village of Dearborn, MI, proclaiming its faith in the future growth and prosperity of the community.

That faith has proven well founded, and Dearborn today is a large and thriving city with good local government, and with a strong industrial base anchored by the Ford Motor Co. The newspaper has changed ownership over the years, and has merged, becoming the Press and Guide. Today's Press and Guide is proud to be one of the Heritage Newspapers.

Through its history the newspaper has reported on the people and events of the city, the growth and change at Ford; the emergence of the labor unions; war, peace, prosperity, and hard times.

I invite my colleagues to join me in saluting a fine example of community newspapering on its 75th anniversary.

KATE SARGENT, FRANCIS SCOTT KEY POETRY CONTEST REGIONAL WINNER

HON. DICK SWETT

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1993

Mr. SWETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize one of my constituents, Kate Sargent of Sunapee, NH, regional winner of the Francis Scott Key poetry contest. On this day set aside to honor our Nation's flag, it is appropriate to consider what the flag symbolizes to the young people of today.

Kate Sargent is one of eight sixth graders from across the country who is being honored as a regional winner of the poetry contest sponsored by the Francis Scott Key Foundation and the National Society of Daughters of the American Revolution. Over 3,000 entries were received for the contest, all lyrical poems set to music in the tradition of Francis Scott Key.

On September 13 and 14, 1814, Key was held on a British vessel after negotiating a prisoner exchange. The sight of the U.S. flag flying over Fort McHenry so inspired him that he began to write "The Defense of Fort McHenry." Set to music and renamed "The Star-Spangled Banner," it became our official national anthem in 1931.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to read Miss Sargent's poem, entitled "The American Flag." It is written to the tune of the song "Everything I Do, I Do It For You," by Bryan Adams.

Look up to the flag and you will see, how it came to be.

It's not just material, it flies within my loving soul.

Don't tell me I can't salute my flag.

Can't tell me what I can and cannot do. The flag is true.

Everything it does, it does it for you.

It is made with love, pure love, that no one can deny.

Love it while you can, heart and soul;
Cause you'll only have one chance, I know.
We know it will always wave to us.
All we have to do is love it.
Yes, I know it will always wave to us.
Red, white and blue will never fade.
They're our colors.
Yes, they soar round the country, all the time, everywhere.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate Kate Sargent on the recognition of her eloquent poem and ask my colleagues to consider what the flag of the United States of America means to all of us.

THE CLINTON TAX SURPRISE

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1993

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, ironically, the President is telling Americans that he is taxing them for their own good to reduce the deficit and boost economic growth. What he fails to tell us is that the poor will become poorer and Government entitlement programs will be inflated.

It is estimated that 20 million taxpayers making between \$10,000 and \$30,000 a year will be hit with some form of higher taxes. In addition, prices will go up for everybody on everything.

A recent column by Paul Craig Roberts which appeared in the Knoxville News-Sentinel and other newspapers around the Nation makes this very same point on President Clinton's tax plan.

Mr. Roberts says at one point:

Altogether, he wants to expand welfare programs by more than \$10 billion a year in order to offset the impact of the energy tax. Clinton's offset proposal is a striking admission that taxes make people poorer—and that he is willing to do so in order to grow the government.

I urge all my colleagues and other readers of the RECORD to thoughtfully consider this article.

[From the Knoxville News-Sentinel; May 30, 1993]

CLINTON TAX PLAN TO AMBUSH U.S. PUBLIC

(By Paul Craig Roberts)

New embarrassments are in store for President Clinton as his tax plan gets closer scrutiny. Originally, Clinton promised higher taxes only for the rich. But the Senate Finance Committee has discovered there are approximately 20 million taxpayers making between \$10,000 and \$30,000 a year who will be hit with higher energy taxes.

Clinton kept this fact secret from the tax-writing committee by using a bureaucratic construction known as Family Economic Income, which was designed by Treasury bureaucrats to deceive the public. Unlike Adjusted Gross Income, the measure of income used to calculate income tax, FEI is an expanded measure that includes many non-taxable items such as fringe benefits and the imputed rental value of owner-occupied housing.

For example, the way Clinton measures income, a taxpayer with an adjusted gross income of \$20,000 could be counted as earning \$30,000 if he lived in a home that could be rented for \$500 a month and had \$2,000 in employer-paid health benefits and a \$2,000 pension contribution.

Treasury Secretary Lloyd Bentsen is so embarrassed by how deeply Clinton's tax

proposals reach into lower-income pockets that he refuses to provide the Finance Committee with tables showing the impact of Clinton's tax proposals on an AGI basis.

Bentsen's refusal to come clean tells the Finance Committee all it needs to know: the committee cannot report the president's tax bill to the Senate floor for a vote without participating in the grand deception. Clinton can rant and rave all he wants about "special interests" ambushing his tax bill, but the senators know that it is the American people that Clinton is ambushing by pretending to tax only the rich.

Another shoe is about to drop. Clinton, who claims to be pro-family and pro-women, has an increase in the marriage penalty as a key feature of his tax increase plan. The tax increase on spousal income can rise as much as 10 percentage points—especially on professional women who tend to count themselves among the ranks of feminists.

These women, already harassed by demands of family and career, are being told by President Clinton that they should get less for their efforts.

Bill Clinton is pro-government. He believes that taxpayers have a moral obligation to solve the government's financial problems so that government can grow larger and spend more.

Clinton even uses the energy tax increase itself as an excuse to expand government spending programs. To protect the poor from the tax, he proposes to expand the food stamp program, the Low Income Energy Assistance program, and the Earned Income Tax Credit—a program that pays taxpayer dollars to people who don't earn enough to be taxpayers.

Altogether, he wants to expand welfare programs by more than \$10 billion a year in order to offset the impact of the energy tax. Clinton's offset proposal is a striking admission that taxes make people poorer—and that he is willing to do so in order to grow the government.

The bottom line is that Clinton represents no one but the government. He epitomizes the ideology of what George Will calls the new class of public sector lifers. He wants to smash the power of lobbyists and special interests not in order to give us back control over our government, but in order to remove the only impediments to Washington's unfettered exercise of control over our lives and pocketbooks.

Clinton has turned on moderate Democrats with fury, depicting Senator Boren from Oklahoma as a puppet for rich oil barons. But it is not the oil barons who will pay the energy tax. Clinton placed the tax on our electricity bills, our heating and air-conditioning bills, our transportation bills, and it will be added to the price of every good and service we use. If the oil barons were targeted by the tax, Clinton could not propose to expand the welfare state in order to protect the poor from the tax.

Clinton's concern with the poor is due to one fact only. It is the only class left that can be said to benefit from government and, therefore, the only class that can be used as an excuse for expanding the power of government. Clinton's economic program is designed to enlarge the ranks of the poor and, thus, to shore up the crumbling foundations of big government.