

Royce	Smith (OR)	Torkildsen
Santorum	Smith (TX)	Upton
Saxton	Snowe	Vacavovich
Schaefer	Solomon	Walker
Schiff	Spence	Walsh
Schroeder	Stearns	Weldon
Sensenbrenner	Stump	Wolf
Shaw	Sundquist	Young (AK)
Shays	Talent	Young (FL)
Shuster	Taylor (MS)	Zahlf
Skeen	Taylor (NC)	Zimmer
Smith (MI)	Thomas (OA)	
Smith (NJ)	Thomas (WY)	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Ewing

NOT VOTING—27

Brown (CA)	Henry	Rose
Buyer	Inalee	Sabo
Clayton	Kopetaki	Sanders
Clyburn	Lambert	Shepherd
Crane	Leach	Synar
Dallums	Livingston	Thompson
Engel	Martinez	Wheat
Fingerhut	Neal (NC)	Whitten
Hall (OH)	Rangel	Williams

□ 1124

Mr. TEJEDA changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY). Will the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BONILLA] kindly come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance to our flag.

Mr. BONILLA 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.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Hallen, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 1723. An act to authorize the establishment of a program under which employees of the Central Intelligence Agency may be offered separation pay to separate from service voluntarily to avoid or minimize the need for involuntary separations due to downsizing, reorganization, transfer of function, or other similar action, and for other purposes.

TOUGH CHOICES

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

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, leadership is about making tough choices. The eyes of the Nation are on the House of Representatives today to see if the change that people demanded last fall is actually going to take place. When the President came to office just 4 months ago the deficit had been out of control for 12 long years. In less than a month the President presented this Congress and the American people with a \$500 billion deficit reduction plan, the

largest of its kind in the history of our country.

The President's plan has over 200 specific spending cuts, including \$100 billion reduction in entitlements. The Congress has added an additional \$63 billion in spending cuts. Three out of four new tax dollars come from the richest 6 percent of our Nation's people.

It is time for us to give this new President a chance to get our country out of the ditch and back on the road to a recovery that promises new jobs and economic growth.

Give our new President the opportunity to lead this country back from the deficits of the last decade. He deserves our help.

HOLLYWOOD MAKEUP JOB CANNOT HIDE TAX INCREASE

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

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Speaker, apparently President Clinton's handlers have finally located their makeup person.

Once again, President Clinton has tried to change the face of the largest tax increase in American history with something called voluntary spending caps. In other words, instead of this Congress acting, we are going to simply ask the bureaucrats to please not spend as much of our money. Good luck.

Mr. Speaker, for President Clinton to tell the American people he is getting our financial house in order when his budget plan would add more than \$2 trillion to the national debt should be enough to make him blush, even through the best Hollywood makeup job.

A MOMENT OF TRUTH

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

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Speaker, for a decade we have talked about the Federal deficit, we have debated the Federal deficit, we have done everything but deal with the Federal deficit. Today is a moment of truth for this institution, for this Congress, for this country, because courage is not measured in words. It is a question of deeds.

Either all those speeches and all those press releases about the deficit meant something, or they did not. Today we are going to find out. We are about to discover whether the profligate 1980's were simply an aberration, a time of loss of fiscal discipline, or a permanent change in the ability of this country and this Congress to govern ourselves.

□ 1130

The only means of restoring confidence in this Congress, giving discipline again to our fiscal affairs, and

giving meaning to all those speeches about dealing with the deficit, and confidence in this institution is to deal with the President's plan and to vote for it, and once again bring discipline to our fiscal affairs.

FEAR OF DAWN

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

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, most Americans thought the days of smoke-filled rooms and closed-door, backroom deals were a part of our political history. We were to be living in a time of political openness and inclusion—an end to gridlock. This was to be the new covenant by which all our politicians would live.

Unfortunately, that is not the case. The Democrats still remain in darkness, striking bargains and making deals behind the closed doors of the Ways and Means Committee.

Fearing the certain storm of protest from hard-working taxpayers, Democrats turned out the lights on the ugly process of raising taxes when the shut out Republicans by voting against every Republican proposal with a party line vote.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to help Bill Clinton keep his campaign promises by substituting his tax increases on the working poor with more spending cuts. To do this, we needed an open rule on reconciliation. To do this, we needed some sunshine allowed in on the process.

The losers of Bill Clinton's broken covenant, Mr. Speaker, will be hard-working taxpayers. And, I think those taxpayers will remember who voted for higher taxes and who voted against the largest tax increase in this Nation's history.

BILL CLINTON MADE THE TOUGH CHOICES

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

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, when Ronald Reagan was sworn into office, the national debt was \$908 billion. When George Bush left office the national debt had exploded to \$4 trillion. Bill Clinton was elected to change this Republican policy of let the kids pay.

President Clinton has met the challenge and has presented the House with a historic opportunity to attack the deficit through reduced spending.

That is why those who produce milk will be paid \$320 million less during the next 5 years.

That is why tobacco growers will be assessed more in the future.

That is why military retirees will have their COLA's delayed by 4 months.

That is why hospitals and physicians will have their payments under Medicare frozen for the next 2 years.

And that is why the Treasury Postal Subcommittee on Appropriations yesterday voted to eliminate all funding for two agencies of Government.

The decisions about these spending cuts weren't easy. These spending cuts aren't popular. But these spending cuts need to be made.

Bill Clinton has made the tough spending choices. Today we must join him.

#### LARGEST TAX INCREASE IN AMERICAN HISTORY

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

Mr. KIM. Mr. Speaker, I will be voting today against the budget bill, because it is the largest tax increase in American history.

Every sector of society is hit and hit hard.

This new tax will cost about \$226 per month for millions of retirees on fixed incomes. This is a tremendous burden.

Rather than enjoy their retirement, these senior citizens are being forced into the poorhouse. Under this bill, 85 percent of Social Security benefits will be taxed to raise \$32 billion to pay for waste and gross fiscal mismanagement by this Government.

This is outrageous. Our senior citizens did not create this financial mess. They have been working hard all their lives contributing revenue.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this dangerous tax bill.

#### TODAY IS THE DAY THE RUBBER MEETS THE ROAD

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

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, today is the day where the rubber meets the road. It decides whether or not this country has an economic plan or continues economic drift. It is about deficit reduction, real deficit reduction and real economic growth, a bill that, after you strip all of the hoopla out of it, has \$250 billion in cuts, more dollars in cuts than tax increases.

It is a bill, yes, about tax increases and two-thirds of those falling on those making over \$200,000. And yes, there is a Btu tax, and if you are making somewhere around \$30,000 to \$40,000, it will amount, after 3 years, to about 50 cents a day, about the price of a cup of coffee. And yes, there are taxes that affect our industries, but, for instance, in aluminum and coal and natural gas and the barge fees, we were able to get those significantly adjusted.

Real spending cuts, Mr. Speaker, a fair tax burden basically on the upper incomes, a deficit reduction account

that guarantees tax increases go for deficit reduction, not for new spending.

It is time, Mr. Speaker, to get this economy moving and to pass this bill.

#### NEED FOR STRONGER TRUCKLOAD RESTRAINT REGULATIONS

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

Mr. QUINN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today not to talk about taxes or spending, although these are very important issues.

Instead, I rise to speak about issues that are even more important, the issues of life and death.

There is a dangerous problem on our Nation's highways, a problem that risks peoples' lives, a problem that cost four people their lives in Buffalo, NY, last year.

On October 5, 1992, during the morning rush hour, a flatbed trailer truck, traveling on the New York State Thruway, struck the median divider, snapping the chains which secured its load of four giant coils of steel.

The steel coils—weighing 20 tons each—flew off the trailer, crushing three cars, killing four people.

Since that tragedy last October, 7 months ago, heavy metal coils have fallen off trucks on three other occasions in western New York, and statistics indicate similar problems are occurring across the country.

Luckily, no one else has been hurt or killed.

But will we be so lucky next time?

Before another person is killed, we need to improve the way truckers are required to secure their loads; we need to protect motorists on our highways.

I will go to the Federal Highway Administration to ask for stronger load restraint regulations.

Mr. SHUSTER, the ranking member on the Public Works and Transportation Committee, has offered to help.

And, Mr. Speaker, I ask for the help of all my colleagues, so that we can avoid another deadly tragedy on our highways.

#### IT'S SHOWTIME

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

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, as they said in the movie, "Chorus Line," it's showtime. It is showtime for the Congress of the United States, for the President of the United States, and for the people of the United States.

Today we will determine whether or not we fully understand what the American people said to us in November, and that is that they no longer wanted a President who talked about balanced budgets and then sent phony budgets to the Hill. No longer did they want a Congress that cooked the num-

bers and moved spending from one fiscal year to another, one gimmick after another, and the deficit got larger and larger.

People in this country said what they wanted was a change. And President Clinton has presented us with an economic plan to provide for that change.

That change since the election has brought about the lowest interest rates in the last 20 years in this country. Those low interest rates for the first time have allowed people to buy a home, to refinance an existing home, to better be able to afford their children's education, to buy an automobile and put an autoworker back to work. That is real change, not symbolic change, not the rhetoric that we have had over the last 12 years as the Republicans have continued to talk about lower deficits but only sent us larger and larger deficits.

Today the numbers are real. The deficit reduction is real and the benefit to the American people is real.

It's showtime.

□ 1140

#### HANG TOGETHER?

(Ms. PRYCE of Ohio asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, President Clinton is urging his Democratic colleagues to unite in voting for the largest tax increase in history.

He uses the old Ben Franklin adage: We must hang together, or we will all hang separately.

Actually, Mr. Speaker, if your Democrat colleagues hang together to pass the largest tax increase in history, they will certainly hang separately in the next election.

Face it, my friends. The American people do not want to pay any more taxes. They feel they pay enough taxes, and they are right. We need to cut spending first.

The votes we take today will not be soon forgotten by the American voters. Both votes on the rule and on final passage will lead to more taxes, higher inflation, and slower economic growth.

Mr. Speaker, there is no reason to hang with the President. He is dead wrong. Cut spending first.

#### LISTEN TO THE PEOPLE, NOT THE LOBBYISTS

(Mrs. MEEK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MEEK. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, the results of the latest consumer confidence poll were released, and I was not surprised. The American people see the gridlock in Washington and know that the economy is in trouble.

The economic mess was created over the last 12 years and it will not be corrected without causing some pain.

There are games being played with the lives of the people we were sent to represent. It is the vain hope of some to destroy President Clinton so that they can regain the White House.

They are willing to destroy the economic lives of millions of Americans in their lust for power.

Americans thought that the decade of greed had been ended last November, but they were wrong. The purveyors of greed have counterattacked and are willing to bring down the American economy to preserve their ill gotten gains.

We will never know how many tens of millions of dollars are being spent to defeat the President's program. We have heard that advertisements have been prepared to flow from Washington to certain congressional districts. The names of the front groups will sound like ice cream and apple pie, but the money comes from the purveyors of greed. Their identities will be hidden and their financial interests will never reach the light of day.

Is it any wonder that the American consumer has lost confidence?

I will stand up for the American consumer. I will oppose the purveyors of greed and their army of mercenaries.

I will vote for the President's program. I will vote for the American people and against the purveyors of greed.

#### TRAVEL AND TAXES

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

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, well, it looks like Travelgate has become the big story on the Nation's headlines. President Clinton has decided to have his chief of staff investigate what really happened.

I wish the White House would spend more time investigating what their tax package will do to American families. They should examine how the Btu tax will hit poor and middle class families the hardest.

They should reconsider how their Social Security tax will hurt senior citizens. They should ask themselves why they haven't listened to American public opinion, and cut spending first.

When the President gets his travel office back together, he should consider a trip to middle America. There, the people will tell him to cut spending first.

I urge my colleagues to vote against the reconciliation rule and the final bill. We do not need more taxes or more spending.

#### JUST SAY NO TO SPECIAL INTERESTS

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

Mr. KREIDLER. Mr. Speaker, as we prepare to vote on the deficit reduction

package, a rightwing group is targeting some of us with a campaign of distortions.

The group is called Citizens for a Sound Economy, and it is running ads in my district opposing the Btu tax.

People in my State know this group well, because 2 years ago it bankrolled a term limit initiative that was so extreme the voters rejected it.

Most of its money comes from the Koch brothers, two of the world's richest men, who have a big interest in—guess what—big oil.

The chairman of Citizens for a Sound Economy is Jim Miller, who doubled the national debt when he was Ronald Reagan's budget director.

Taking advice on deficit reduction from Jim Miller and the Koch brothers is like taking tax advice from Leona Helmsley.

I do not like the Btu tax, and neither do a lot of my constituents. We would not need that tax if Jim Miller and his friends had done their jobs when they were in charge.

But now we can either do nothing, and let the deficit get worse, or we can start fixing it.

I came to Congress to fix the mess. And I do not need billionaire special interests telling me how to do that.

#### YES, IT IS SHOWTIME

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

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, yes it's showtime: massive tax increases on senior citizens and on the middle class; an energy tax that cost 600,000 jobs; new Federal social welfare spending programs; \$1 trillion in additional cumulative debt; gimmicks, glitz, and let the good times roll.

Yes, it's showtime.

#### LET US PASS THE PLAN

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

Mr. TUCKER. Mr. Speaker, yes, it is showtime, and guess who gave us the original showtime. Well, let us see, what Hollywood actor ascended to the Presidency?

I think it was the Republican Party that was the original creator of showtime in the 1980's. That is right, Mr. Speaker, they showed us how the rich could get richer and the poor could get poorer. But guess what, now the real showtime has got to come to bear, and that is the time we find that the rich are going to have to ante up, because in this plan, Mr. Speaker, 66 percent of all the taxes are on those people making \$200,000 a year or more, 75 percent of all new revenues are going to go on those persons making \$100,000 a year or more.

It is showtime, all right, and it is time to fish or cut bait, because the

Republicans want you to believe that this plan is only about the greatest tax increase in this country.

But guess what, this plan is also the greatest deficit reduction plan that we have ever seen in history. They do not want you to know about that.

But guess what, that is what it is, and that is what I am going to vote on today, Mr. Speaker, and we are going to pass the plan.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY). The Chair would remind our guests in the gallery that we are delighted to have you with us, but you are to refrain from responding either positively or negatively to statements made by Members on the floor.

#### CUT SPENDING FIRST

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, today we will vote on the largest tax increase in American history. The Congressional Budget Office, which is controlled by the Democrats, estimates these tax increases at \$322 billion. This comes to over \$1,200 per person.

Anyone who thinks only the wealthy will pay is living in a dream world. Taxes always come back to the middle and lower middle income people.

The President said during his campaign that he was going to raise taxes only on those making over \$200,000 a year. The truth is these taxes are going to hit everybody regardless of income, because prices will go up on everything.

A newscaster for channel 5 here this morning said the so-called midnight compromise from last night is really just a face-saving measure for conservative Democrats. He said it is really meaningless. He said no one knows what the proposed spending targets really mean. It is a charade, a hoax. The President's package has no spending cuts, and, in fact, increases spending during the first 2 years.

The cuts in years 4 and 5 will never see the light of day until and unless more conservatives are elected to the Congress.

People in my district, Democrats, Republicans, and Independents, are saying cut spending first.

#### A HISTORIC CHANGE

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

Mr. SLATTERY. Mr. Speaker, nearly 50 cents of every dollar that the American taxpayers send to Washington is spent on entitlement programs, and anyone who knows anything about the

arithmetic of our budget understands that we are not going to solve our deficit problem until we get these entitlement programs under control.

This part of our deficit has been on autopilot for 20 years, and last night, about 1 o'clock in the morning, we were able to come to a very difficult compromise on an effort to cap entitlement spending for the first time in our Nation's history.

I believe this to be a historic change in our budget process. Our colleagues, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PENNY], and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM], and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT], deserve a lot of credit for negotiating the toughest entitlement cap that we can possibly get through this Congress.

I think this particular provision in the package is definitely worthy of everyone's support, and I urge my colleagues to support the reconciliation package today.

Please, look at the entitlement cap and understand what a historic change this is. We are taking entitlements off of autopilot, and it is worthy of our support.

#### BUDGET RECONCILIATION A HARD SELL

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

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Speaker, as a farmer, I know that the budget reconciliation is going to be hard to sell, especially to our Nation's farmers.

The plain, simple truth is that the budget reconciliation cuts nearly \$3 billion from farm programs while, at the same time, increases and expands the Food Stamp Program by over \$7 billion. Those are the facts that the supporters of this budget need to explain.

For me, it is easy. I voted against the budget. I wanted to see that needed cuts were made, but made fairly, rather than by heaping the burden even higher on farmers.

For my Democrat colleagues, however, I can only wish you luck. I want to see you go and visit a farmer in your district, put your foot up on the bumper of his truck, and tell him why the money being cut from crop insurance is better spent by expanding the Food Stamp Program. Or explain to him the equity of the Btu or estate taxes. I would like to be there when you try. But let me give you a word of warning: Do not do it near a running combine.

□ 1150

#### SUPPORTING THE RECONCILIATION ACT

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

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, the Budget Reconciliation Act is about hard choices. It's hard to ignore our sagging economy and the Federal deficit. It's also hard to leave our children with little or no means to accessible, affordable health care, and hundreds of thousands of Americans without jobs. And it's hard to support an energy tax that would raise production costs on our farmers, and we've cut the burden in half by exempting on-farm use of gasoline and diesel from the energy tax. But it's time to face the hard facts. We must put American back to work.

We cannot continue to wait, and hope, that change will come. This plan is the largest deficit-reduction package in the history of the Republic. It reduces our Federal deficit by \$496 billion over the next 5 years. It helps fund jobs programs and job training for our citizens, and assumes full funding for Head Start, a very important educational program for our children. And it does out spending.

There is no easy way out, Mr. Speaker. It's time to make the tough decisions. Let's jumpstart our economy and let's make the right choice by voting for the Budget Reconciliation Act.

#### THE CLINTON TAX PLAN

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, today is the day we answer a fundamental question: Are American families and businesses undertaxed? Or, does the Federal Government just spend too much? I think we all know the answer to this question.

Day after day, I talk to folks across my Sixth District of Virginia and they tell me how the tax burden is eating into their already tight family budgets. A vote for President Clinton's \$360 billion tax boondoggle is a slap in the face to every one of these families. They work hard to earn a living, to buy the groceries, pay for new school clothes for the kids, and cover the insurance payments and mortgage. They deserve better.

I ask each Member of the House to ask himself or herself a question: Will our Nation be better off in 4 years if we pass these huge new tax increases?

I heard the President calling this a deficit-reduction tax increase. That's like a spring snowstorm. You can see it coming down, but it just does not stick. This money that President Clinton is trying to dig out of the pockets of America's families and businesses will be wasted on expensive new Government pork-barrel programs which do nothing more than provide jobs for Washington, DC, bureaucrats. The President likes to create a Government program to solve every problem but as former President Reagan put it so well, "Government does not solve problems. It subsidizes them."

#### PASS THE RECONCILIATION BILL

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

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, this is the biggest vote of the decade. Are we going to vote simply as Democrats or Republicans, or as Americans wanting to give the President a chance to govern?

This economic plan has pain for everyone. There are hundreds of reasons to vote against it. But fundamentally it is not about spending cuts or deficit reduction; it is about whether we as a nation can govern and eliminate the gridlock of the last 12 years.

Mr. Speaker, this is it. Today we will vote on and pass the President's reconciliation bill—a bill that cuts the deficit, restores faith and fairness in Government, and sets a positive course for this country.

Let me restate some of the facts:

This plan is the most aggressive deficit-cutting plan we have ever seen. It cuts the deficit by \$500 billion over 5 years.

This plan is fair—the heaviest burden is shouldered by those who can and should pay—the wealthiest of Americans. In fact, the vast majority of the tax increase will be paid by those making over \$200,000 per year.

This plan reminds us of the reason America voted for Bill Clinton. It calls for shared sacrifice and is based on honesty—not the smoke and mirrors of the last 12 years. Most of all, it demonstrates the courage needed to make the tough cuts.

Mr. Speaker, this is our moment of truth, our time to stand and deliver for the American people. Today America will see—gridlock is dead.

#### THE BILL CLINTON TAX BILL: GIVING CREDIT WHERE CREDIT IS DUE

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

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Speaker, Americans naturally take pride in what they make. When Henry Ford started his car company he named it after himself. When a man named Amos perfected his cookie recipe, he named his treat after himself, "Famous Amos."

Hard-working people all over this great country take pride in their work and want their names on it. Craftsmen and artists autograph their creations. Lawmakers put their names on bills. If you take pride in your work you should take credit.

And if the President takes pride in his work he should put his name on his creation. If his tax proposal passes it should be passed on as the Bill Clinton tax. So, when struggling families open their utility bill they can see clearly the Bill Clinton energy tax added to the statement.

Or when that elderly couple receives a smaller Social Security check, they will know that it was the Bill Clinton Social Security tax that will force them to do with less.

If the President truly believes in his proposals he should proudly name the taxes after himself. Even Dr. Frankenstein had his monster.

#### IT'S ABOUT JOBS, CONGRESS, NOT ABOUT TAXES

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, another 5-year plan for America, new record taxes on American workers and American companies. Meanwhile, American subsidiaries overseas once again escape the Tax Code. Now figure this out: If you stay in America, you are taxed; if you move overseas, you get tax breaks.

I am opposed to this madness.

In addition, we are going to open up the borders with Mexico—wow. I predict jobs and investment going to Mexico like Olympic sprinters. In return, we will get a used Ford pickup, 2 tons of heroin, and 3 baseball players, to be named later.

I am voting "no," dammit; it is about jobs, Congress, not about taxes.

The American people are taxed-off.

#### THE LARGEST TAX INCREASE IN HISTORY, AND NO AMENDMENTS ARE ALLOWED

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

Mr. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, early this morning the Democrat leadership exhibited the arrogance of power which makes congressional term limits such a compelling cause. They decided to make a deal in order to pass the largest tax increase in history, and the deal was over a rule that will come out here today that will not allow us to offer amendments or even their Members to offer amendments that would alter the face of the energy tax or remove it, et cetera. Only one substitute is allowed; ours granted by only one. I think that kind of arrogance is going to get to them. The fact of the matter is that we are dealing with not only the largest tax increase in history but we are dealing with the fact that this bill out here today will not have any reductions in spending for the first 2 years. And when we get down the pike, assuming that it works—and I do not believe the math will work—assuming it does, at the end of 5 years we will have added \$1 trillion to the debt, from \$4.5 trillion to \$5.5 trillion, and still have \$200 billion in deficits; nowhere near a balanced budget.

I submit, my colleagues, what the American people will understand more after the pain than they do even now—

and I think they understand now—the way to solve the problem of the deficits and get to a balanced budget is to cut the spending, not increase the taxes.

#### THE BUDGET RESOLUTION

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

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, today, Mr. Speaker, we will vote on the President's 1994 budget.

The action we take today will have a resounding effect on the lives of the American people regardless of the outcome.

The passage of this budget will begin a road toward economic stability, healthier and better nourished children, and more meaningful job opportunities, to name just a few of its benefits.

For the last week or so the word entitlement has been brandished about as though it were some Fascist buzz word to warn those in support of the programs that our lives would be held in bondage if those services were not capped.

Well, for me, the word entitlement means to enable, qualify, and allow.

The provisions in this budget will enable Americans to gain more control of their lives.

It will qualify them for resources needed to become more productive citizens.

It will instill in our people dignity and pride in a government that works for them and not against them.

And that, Mr. Speaker, is something to which we all are entitled, and President Clinton's budget will start that process.

#### REBELLION IS A GOOD THING

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

Mr. BAKER of California. Mr. Speaker, President Clinton admires Thomas Jefferson. Well, Jefferson said "a little rebellion now and then is a good thing." And today, it's an especially good thing for the American taxpayers.

Because right now, President Clinton has a rebellion on his hands. Not just Republicans, but members of his own Democrat Party, are saying the liberal Clinton program of tax and spend is unpopular among the people and a recipe for economic disaster in this country. The energy tax will cost our recovering economy 500,000 jobs; the tax on Social Security benefits will bring pain to America's seniors; the income tax bill will steal capital needed to create jobs and expand business.

A rebellion against the Clinton program of tax increases and new spending is a good thing, Mr. Speaker. It is a good thing for the country and good for the American taxpayer.

Cut spending first.

□ 1200

#### IN SUPPORT OF PRESIDENT'S DEFICIT REDUCTION PACKAGE

(Ms. MCKINNEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this deficit reduction package. This package addresses the twin deficits that plague the people of Georgia's 11th Congressional District.

This package reduces the budget deficit that threatens the future of our children. Children are especially spared cuts in entitlement spending. Spending is shifted to essential programs for children and families, groups that lost ground during the last 12 years. Full funding of Head Start, full funding of the Mickey Leland Hunger Prevention Act, full funding of WIC, full funding of childhood immunizations.

The earned income tax credit assures that this country's children of working parents will not be raised in poverty. Georgia families received a total of \$425 million from the earned income tax credit last year. We expect to receive an additional \$282 million from the expanded earned income tax credit.

The budget is not just a political document. It is also a moral statement of our national priorities.

Our President's budget says that government should no longer serve the needs of a few of us at the expense of the rest of us.

Mr. Speaker, President Clinton's budget is good and it is good for Georgia. It is good for this country.

#### NO TRUST AND CONFIDENCE IN PRESIDENT

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

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, around the country people are asking why is the Clinton administration such a disaster after only 130 days. His negatives are higher than his positives.

Well, as a previous speaker said, everyone looks at Thomas Jefferson in the Clinton administration. Thomas Jefferson said that a President can only be successful if the people have trust and confidence in him.

Well, here is what President Clinton said about Social Security, which is being taxed in this bill today, 9½ million Social Security recipients are being taxed to the tune of \$29 billion.

Here is what Clinton said in September of last year:

We are not going to fool with Social Security. It is sound and I am going to keep it that way. You can take it to the bank.

That was his quote.

Today we are voting on a \$29 billion tax on senior citizens.

You see, there is no trust and confidence. Another broken campaign promise.

You cannot go around and tell people whatever they want to hear and then when you are in office do whatever you feel like and break every promise. That is why this country is in trouble and that is why the Clinton administration is in trouble. There is no trust and confidence in this administration, and rightly so.

#### GIVE THE PRESIDENT A CHANCE

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

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Speaker, in 1981 as a third term Member of Congress, I listened to Ronald Reagan ask the American people and this Congress to give him a chance, to give his program, which I might add was very complicated and very controversial, a chance. I voted for his tax reduction bill. I was one of about 50 Democratic Members of Congress who voted for Reagan's tax bill, not because it was perfect; but because it offered a chance and he, the new President asked for it.

Now our new President has asked us for the same chance, a chance to reduce the deficit dramatically and to do it with fairness, equity, growth, and jobs.

Yes, it is controversial. Yes, it may have some problems with it, as did the Reagan program, but he has asked for our help. He has asked us to give him a chance.

Americans do not like excessive partisanship. I am sorry that no Republican in the House, like nearly 50 Democrats in 1981, but not one Republican chooses to give our President the same chance that I and the nearly one-fifth of the Democrats of the House did for President Reagan in 1981.

Mr. Speaker, I believe Americans are fair and I believe that today they will applaud our efforts to give Bill Clinton a chance to make America a better place.

#### THE PRESIDENT'S TAX DEAL

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

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, when the American people got up this morning, they turned on the news to hear that the President had finally made a "deal" with the Congress on his middle-class tax increase.

The American people need to know that this deal was struck at 4 a.m. this morning behind closed doors, and the only deal made was how big the tax increase is going to be on working Americans.

This is not a good deal for American taxpayers. It is a raw deal.

It is still \$322 billion of tax increases over 5 years with no real deficit reduction.

It contains 20 times tax increases as spending cuts in the first year, and six

times tax increases over spending cuts over the next 5 years.

Where is the fiscal responsibility that Mr. Clinton claimed to have during his campaign?

Mr. Speaker, I hope the people across this Nation watching right now will call their Representatives in Washington and tell them to vote no on this middle-of-the-night thievery.

#### EXCELLENCE IN EDUCATION IN KENTUCKY

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

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, there are many good-faith differences among and between us on how best to restore America's economic health and these will be debated today, but there is no difference among us or between us on revering and honoring States and localities and schools which distinguish themselves in education programs and which achieve excellence in those programs.

In a few moments I will be joining Louisville Mayor Jerry Abramson and county judge executive of Jefferson County, David Armstrong, at ceremonies in which the city of Louisville and the county of Jefferson will be jointly honored as a community of excellence in education.

On tomorrow the Federal Department of Education will announce that six Kentucky schools, including two from my district, St. Xavier High School, my alma mater, and Assumption Academy, will be designated as blue ribbon schools, schools of high achievement in education.

Mr. Speaker, in Kentucky, in Louisville, in Jefferson County, education is important. Education is put on a high pedestal, and education in our communities is marked by excellence.

#### TARPON SPRINGS WAR MEMORIAL

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

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, several years ago, two Vietnam veterans, Robert Renneke and Dr. Fred Roever, in my district proposed building a memorial to honor those killed, or yet missing in action, who hailed from the local area. Like so many other memorial projects, this one was ridiculed by some who contended it was a waste of time and money. However, I am pleased to say that the monument's supporters persevered and in 1992, the city of Tarpon Springs, FL, held a dedication ceremony for this important memorial. Although the memorial started with the purpose of recognizing our great Vietnam veterans, it soon expanded to include those from the area who served and gave their lives in all wars.

And so I take to the floor today to salute Messrs. Renneke and Roever and

the community as a whole who made the Tarpon Springs war memorial possible. In this way we might always remember how blessed we are in the modern world to live in a free society, nor forget that this blessing is due to the sacrifices of our friends, relatives, neighbors, and countrymen who served us all when duty called.

#### STOCK MARKET SUPPORTS DEFICIT REDUCTION

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

Mr. KOPETSKI. Mr. Speaker, the number one problem facing the United States today is the Federal deficit, \$4 trillion, \$3 trillion of which has grown in the last 12 years under the Republican rule in the White House.

This is a tough political vote today, no doubt about it, but I do not understand why you folks do not admit there is \$250 billion of spending cuts.

Yes, there are tax increases there, and we asked the wealthiest in this country to pay a little bit more. We asked the top corporations in this country to pay a little bit more.

Republicans like to say this is bad for business. On the eve of this vote, the stock market had its greatest record level in the history of this country. You want good evidence of how good this is for business? Ask the stock market. Do not ask the self-proclaimed business experts on the Republican side of the aisle. Ask those who are involved with the economy at the stock market. Record highs at the stock market on the eve of this vote.

Right now the market is up. The market is up and that is because they understand this is a true deficit reduction package which means lower interest rates for this country, which will put money into the pockets of every business person, money into the pockets of every consumer in this Nation, record highs at the stock market. That is the best evidence that this is good for business in America.

□ 1210

#### WHAT WAS BILL THINKING?

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

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. Speaker, in the last 2 weeks, we have all asked ourselves the question, "What was Bill thinking?", when we read about Travelgate and Hair Force One. Well, I think we need to ask that question again.

On May 20, the White House announced that the President has named his former Tennessee campaign chairman, Jim Hall, to replace Christopher Hart on the National Transportation Safety Board. Mr. Hall is a lawyer and a real estate developer and has worked on the staffs of former Senators Albert

Gore, Sr. and Edmund Muskie as well as Clinton's Tennessee campaign manager.

What makes this all the more troubling, is that Mr. Hall will be replacing an extremely well-qualified board member, Chris Hart.

Mr. Hart is an instrument-rated pilot with certificates in commercial, single- and multi-engine aircraft. He has a master's degree in aerospace engineering and has conducted research on helicopters.

A magna cum laude graduate of Princeton University with a juris doctor degree from Harvard Law School, Chris Hart is exactly the kind of person we need on the safety board.

But I have got to ask "what was Bill thinking" when he decided to replace an aerospace engineer with a real estate developer on the National Transportation Safety Board? Why, Mr. President, would you remove the most qualified person from the safety board? Oh, by the way, Chris Hart, the most qualified member of the NTSB who President Clinton has replaced is an African-American.

#### SETTING THE RECORD STRAIGHT ON THE RECONCILIATION BILL

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

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, the debate today has just begun, and already the air is filled with misstatements.

The largest tax increase in history? That is simply wrong. In 1993 dollars, the TEFRA bill of 1982 was \$58 billion larger than this. That is the fact. The 1982 bill was supported actively by Senator DOLE and signed by President Reagan. That is right, it was \$58 billion larger than this one.

Second, they say this is six times taxes versus cuts. That is simply not true. This bill cuts spending first, and we guarantee it.

Mr. Speaker, those Members who come after me whose policies created most of the national debt of \$4.5 trillion have no standing to lecture America about deficit reduction.

#### A RETURN TO OLD-FASHIONED BACK ROOM POLITICS

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

Mr. BUNNING. Mr. Speaker, I'm mad enough to fight and anyone who believes in democracy ought to be just as angry.

What is going on today isn't the democratic process at all. This is a rollback to old fashioned, back room politics.

Nobody really knows what happened last night at 2 a.m. But it sure looks like deals were cut.

In the dark of night, in a back room outside the Rules Committee, away

from the cameras and the public, the power brokers of the Democratic Party got together and cut just enough deals to buy just enough votes to save Bill Clinton's tax plan.

Look at the rule. It magically enacts seven amendments that will never have to be debated in the light of day. But it denies the Republicans the opportunity to offer or debate, in public, any amendments except for one substitute.

That is not Democracy.

That is the arrogance of the Democrat majority.

#### GERMANY TURNS TO CAPITALISM WHILE THE UNITED STATES LEANS TOWARD BIGGER GOVERNMENT

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

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, two great nations are at the crossroads of their economic future. We all know how flat our economic growth is in the United States. The Clinton administration has chosen the path of increasing individual and business taxes, increasing energy taxes, increased Government spending.

Germany, on the other hand, faced with higher inflation, higher wage rates, higher unemployment, and the assimilation of the former Socialist East Germany has chosen instead to slash government spending, cut business taxes, and reduce regulations. I think the Germans have got it right. They have decided to turn their economy loose and allow the genius of capitalism to work. We on the other hand are headed toward bigger government, bigger deficits, and bigger problems down the road.

#### THE CLINTON ADMINISTRATION'S FRIGHTENING NUMBERS

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Clinton administration has been racking up some pretty frightening numbers lately. According to Tuesday's USA Today/CNN Gallup Poll only 23 percent of Americans are saying that the Clinton administration's economic plan should be passed as is, while 68 percent—over two-thirds of Americans—say that the plan should either be greatly modified or rejected.

As bad as President Clinton's numbers are, they ain't nothing compared to the tax and spending numbers he is inflicting on the American people. Numbers like \$43 billion in new taxes next year, \$322 billion in new taxes over the next 5 years, 600,000 in lost jobs from an energy tax that will cost every family \$475, and an increase in Social Security benefits that will be taxed.

No wonder that with tax numbers like those, President Clinton sets another new low with every poll taken. I urge my Democrat colleagues to pay attention to the American people and reject more taxing and spending or they may see another frightening number: 1994.

#### THE SAGA OF A SUMMER JOB

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

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, we spent a lot of time in the past couple of days talking about jobs, particularly summer jobs. Here is an interesting story about a summer job and our help-the-little-man Government. It is a story about 14-year-old Tommy McCoy from Savannah, GA.

Tommy was the batboy for the Savannah Cardinals. He was competent, he did a great job, and he was a hustler. He was popular with the members of the team, and everyone liked him. He did such a good job that the newspaper wrote an article specifically about Tommy.

Well, what happened? Among the thousands of readers was a Department of Labor employee who did the bureaucratic thing and turned Tommy in for violating section 570.35 of the child labor laws which says that 14-year-olds cannot work past 9 p.m. even if their parents say it is OK, even if their grades are good, even if they are out of school for the summer.

So Tommy McCoy got fired by this compassionate Government of ours.

Mr. Speaker, I have written to Labor Secretary Reich and asked him to reexamine this rigid, unreasonable rule, and I ask the Members of the House to join me in this effort and ask the Department of Labor to make a waiver for kids who are doing the right thing, who are showing initiative, and who have a summer job which was not provided by the Government.

Mr. Speaker, I think if we do that, we will be doing something for summer jobs.

#### SURVEYS SHOW PUBLIC OPPOSITION TO THE BTU TAX

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

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, the proposed Btu tax is both hidden and regressive.

This stealth tax is deliberately hidden, and it will be passed on to hard-working Americans through higher prices on everything from lettuce to Levis, and since middle America spends a greater percentage of their income on food, clothes, and haircuts than the wealthy, then a greater percentage of their income will go to this stealth energy tax.

Mr. Speaker, the energy tax was designed in this hidden manner because they do not want people to see it, but I guarantee they will feel it. A recent Wall Street Journal poll indicated that more than 60 percent of the public opposes the proposed energy tax. It is riddled with exemptions, and before all the deals are cut, it is going to resemble a lace doily.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to defend their constituents from this huge tax increase.

#### THE MIDDLE CLASS ENERGY TAX WILL HURT AMERICA

(Mr. TORKILDSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. TORKILDSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the proposed Btu tax which President Clinton wants to impose on the American people.

During the campaign, candidate Clinton promised not to make the middle class pay for his programs. Well, this Btu tax will make the middle class pay and pay. The energy tax will cost \$70 billion, mostly from the middle class.

And the middle class will pay more than just the tax on gasoline and other energy. Everyone will pay more, even the poor, when the price of a loaf of bread and a gallon of milk goes up.

I applaud the bipartisan effort in the Senate to remove the middle-class energy tax. The Senate knows that we need to cut spending first and the American people want us to cut spending first. Hopefully the House of Representatives will get the message, too.

Mr. President, \$400 a year in new energy taxes may only be a couple of haircuts for you, but to a family in America it means a whole lot more.

□ 1220

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY). Members are reminded that they should address their remarks to the Chair.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

(Mr. GRAMS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. Speaker, it's been so long since the Republicans have controlled this House that many people may have given up hope that it would ever happen.

Well, Mr. Speaker, there is hope again. And we can thank President Clinton, and the Democratic leadership.

After all, just think how angry the American people are going to be when House Democrats vote today to stick them with the largest tax increase in American history.

Think of how angry they will be when they discover that Congress found it easier to rob taxpayers pocket-books than out Government spending.

And think how they are going to react when they get stuck with a \$500 per year energy tax.

Now, I know my Democratic colleagues don't think that is a lot of money. After all, \$500 only buy two Clinton haircuts.

But for average Americans, today's Btu tax alone will be devastating. And it will be especially devastating to the 600,000 Americans that are going to lose their jobs because of it.

Mr. Speaker, I remind my Democratic colleagues that the voters won't forget. Ask George Bush who agreed to a tax hike in 1990.

If you think you are going to have a tough time explaining this vote to your fellow Democrats in the Senate, just think how tough a time you are going to have with your own constituents in November 1994.

#### VACATING OF SPECIAL ORDER AND REINSTATEMENT OF SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to vacate my 60-minute special order tonight and, in lieu thereof, be permitted to address the House for 5 minutes so I can address El Presidente's problem with our military culture and why he is in the face of our military to speak at West Point over the weekend. Some Members have used the term, they are not pronouncing it correctly, it is called showtime. And this is showtime.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

#### BROKEN CAMPAIGN PROMISES

(Mr. DORNAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to discuss the rhetorical question asked, with all America listening by the gentleman from Kansas, DAN GLICKMAN, my good friend.

The gentleman asks why there are no Republicans supporting the Clinton tax hike when 50 Democrats, including the gentleman from Kansas, supported Ronald Reagan in his first year?

It is simply this: President Ronald Reagan was keeping every one of his campaign promises, and President Clinton is breaking every one of his campaign promises. Anybody have any trouble with that analysis? It is very simple. Indeed, doesn't anybody else find it amusing that we will soon be debating a reconciliation bill that cannot be reconciled with any of Clinton's campaign promises?

Here is the hottest document on the Hill. It is called the Clinton tax bill, updated resource materials for Republican Members. I urge all Americans to

get a copy so they can get the facts. They certainly won't get from the other side of the aisle.

Contrary to the remarks of a previous speaker, this is not showtime today. This is the same old thing: more taxes, more spending, more regulations, more deficit, more debt, both personal and Federal, interest rates going up, inflation going up.

I will trail off on what is going down: investment going down, productivity going down, hard work going down, savings going down.

#### THOUGHTS ON THE RECONCILIATION BILL

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

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a great deal of good-sounding rhetoric, particularly from the other side of the aisle, that the purpose of today's bill is indeed to address the deficit. But normally, over the last number of weeks, we have heard the administration's plan, their plan has been to address the deficit "and."

And words have always been added after "address the deficit," and they have always been good-sounding words like "get the economy moving again" or "increase the number of jobs."

But the word "and" is their euphemism for new spending ideas. After all, the very first proposal from the administration to reach Congress was for the more deficit spending.

Now they tell us that we can have confidence that this bill will indeed raise revenue to go to the deficit. What do they provide?

They provide such things like a trust fund to address the deficit, a trust fund.

Do my colleagues know we already have a trust fund for the excessive revenues received from Social Security? And where is that money today? Is that money down the street in a bank? Of course, it is not. That money has been spent by the Congress, and Congress has returned, in its place, an IOU, a giant Treasury bill.

That is exactly what can happen with the revenue raised through increased taxes in a deficit trust fund.

Congress puts it in the books, borrows it, spends it, and it is not there any more.

I suggest we should not have confidence that there will be any differences here.

#### TERM LIMITS

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

Mr. HUFFINGTON. Mr. Speaker, this bill is a sham. According to the Congressional Monitor, this \$343 billion measure would bring in \$275 billion in new revenues, that is, taxes, and man-

date \$68 billion in spending cuts, \$4 of taxes, \$1 of cuts. There is not \$1 of real deficit reduction. None at all. There are no net spending cuts in the first 2 years. All potential savings are in the third year and beyond. What is the solution to this travesty? Term limits—pure and simple. Until we get rid of the professional politicians, we will never be able to stop the spenders.

On this very day, the Democratic Congress will pass the largest tax increase in history, the front page headline in Roll Call stated "Foley to Sue to Try and Kill Term Limits". Mr. Speaker, the American people are voting for term limits—2 to 1. Mr. Speaker, it's time to listen to what the American people want, citizen politicians not professional politicians.

#### THINK ABOUT YOUR VOTE

(Ms. DUNN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, no politician has ever lost an election by voting against a tax increase. But plenty have lost by voting to raise taxes.

I hope my friends on the other side of the aisle keep that in mind as we vote on the reconciliation rule. A vote for the reconciliation rule is a vote for the largest tax increase in history.

The President and his allies in the House complained endlessly about how bad the last 12 years have been. Well, Mr. Speaker, during the Reagan-Bush era, our country enjoyed an economic boom unprecedented in our history. We whipped inflation and we tamed interest rates. The era came to an end because the Democratic Congress forced President Bush to raise taxes. The recession from that tax increase lingers still today.

And now, the Democrats, led by President Clinton, want to raise even more taxes. This is like pulling the plug on a patient who is slowly making a recovery.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my Democratic colleagues to think clearly about their vote on the reconciliation rule and on final passage. It just may be the most important vote of your career.

#### A FLAWED VISION OF CHANGE

(Mr. HOKE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, this budget reconciliation that we are being asked to support today and to vote on reflects the deeply flawed vision of change for America that President Clinton has. He clearly has misunderstood and completely misinterpreted what the people want.

I had the opportunity last weekend to listen to the people of northeastern Ohio and find out what they want.

What they want is not bigger Government. They want less Government. They do not want higher taxes. They

want lower taxes. They do not want less freedom. They want more freedom. That is what they are asking for.

Mr. Speaker, they want change, absolutely, but they want the kind of change that the President was elected for. They want the kind of change that the President promised.

In my town meetings last week, they said, "Cut spending first; don't raise taxes."

What is the bottom line here. The bottom line is that the President gets everything that he asked for. He will increase the national debt by over \$1 trillion in the next 4 years.

Just for everyone's information, that is the same amount of money that the debt increased during Ronald Reagan's first term, the same amount that the debt increased during Ronald Reagan's second term, the same amount that the debt increased during George Bush's 4 years in office.

Nothing has changed.

#### IN SUPPORT OF PRESIDENT CLINTON'S BUDGET RECONCILIATION AMENDMENT

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

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning to urge my colleagues in the House to have courage. The courage to lead.

When you get right down to it, the fundamental issue we are confronted with today is: Will the Democrats have the courage, and the guts, to govern this country? Are we fit to lead?

I say emphatically that we can govern effectively. And our vote today in support of the President's plan will demonstrate that.

When I cast my vote for this bill today I will be adding my voice in support of the President's economic agenda. That agenda puts a sizeable dent in the Republican-generated deficit. The working poor are helped, the middle class are given a break, and it begins to right the wrong-headed policies of failed Republican Presidents which have left thousands of hard-working men, women, and young people suffering for too long.

Let us give the President we helped to put in office the chance to lead this country.

□ 1230

#### ENERGY TAX DESTRUCTIVE TO WESTERN PENNSYLVANIA

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

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. Speaker, I heard the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT] come up and talk. His district is very much like mine. It is a blue collar, working class, heavy manufacturing district where we are very

concerned about the manufacturing sector of our economy.

The President said he was going to take a laser beam to the economy. He certainly did. He took a laser beam and the photon torpedoes and he just blasted the Mon Valley in my district, and a lot of blue collar workers in western Pennsylvania who rely on manufacturing and production jobs to be able to earn a living and put food on the table. That is what this energy tax is going to do. That is what the inland waterway user tax is going to do to the Mon Valley and the Mon River communities that I represent.

This is wrong, Mr. President. Mr. President, you came to the Mon Valley during your election, you came to McKeesport. You stood in John F. Kennedy Square, and the throngs said they wanted some change. They did not want you to destroy their town. They did not want you to ruin their neighborhoods.

When you come back next time, Mr. President, to John F. Kennedy Square, there will not be anybody there.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. McNULTY). Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

#### TODAY THE CLINTON PICKPOCKETING BEGINS

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the Democratic leadership has done it again. The rule we will consider today precludes the consideration of several significant amendments, including a vital amendment to protect Social Security recipients.

Last night, I joined the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ROTH] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HASTER] in asking the Committee on Rules to permit consideration of an amendment to strike the provision in the bill which imposes a new onerous tax on our older Americans. The Roth amendment is fair, and it would have given each and every one of us a chance to protect older Americans. Now more than 9 million seniors are going to get whacked.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Clinton made many promises during the campaign. Sadly, he has broken many of those promises, and the trust deficit, as David Broder has coined it, is so bad that we do not know from one day to the next whether or not Mr. Clinton is going to keep this promise or keep that promise, he has broken so many.

Instead of a tax cut for the middle class, the middle class is going to get a tax increase. Make no mistake about it, Mr. Speaker, the tax hike Mr. Clinton wants to impose on all Americans, especially the middle class, will hurt

hard-working families and will cripple jobs.

Mr. Bush had said during the campaign, "Watch out, he is coming for your wallet." Today the Clinton pickpocketing begins.

#### THE BTU TAX WOULD HIT ALASKA HARDEST

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, virtually all Alaskans agree that the Federal deficit and national debt are major problems which must be addressed immediately.

It is our job, and the President's job, to focus on how we can best solve the problem.

President Clinton has chosen to address the issue with a tax and spend program.

I disagree with this approach because it will not accomplish what he has promised.

Today, we are considering a plan to establish a Btu tax, a new tax which is not only unfair, but also unwise.

My main concern is that this new tax would be extremely unfair to Alaskans as we will be taxed more per capita than any other State in the Nation.

This is not an equitable tax, it is the equivalent of a sin tax on Alaskans because we live in the coldest climate and we have a major reliance on air and sea transportation because of our location and great size.

I have reviewed studies which estimate the national average cost of the Btu tax to be \$471 for a family of four.

This is a large tax for any family.

But it gets worse. The studies also estimate the average cost of the Btu tax for an Alaskan family will be over \$1,500, almost 400 percent higher than the national average.

Because of this gross inequity and my firm opposition to continued efforts by the President to raise taxes, I will not support this proposal.

This is not good government, just more government fueled by increased taxes.

We should be cutting Government spending, not creating a Btu tax.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing this ill-conceived proposal.

#### THE CLINTON TAX AND SPEND PACKAGE

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

Mr. ZELIFF. Mr. Speaker, money does not grow on trees. Jobs do not grow on trees, either. The House decided in its wisdom last night to take away money from our valuable SBA Program, and it approved \$14 million for a tree planting program. When needed programs like the Small Busi-

ness Administration section 7a loan program has been without funding for several weeks, this House ends up wanting to plant trees. That money could have leveraged almost \$300 million in additional lending to job-creating small businesses throughout the 7a loan program, and yet we end up wanting to plant trees.

Mr. Speaker, where are our priorities? The President told us reducing the deficit was a top priority, but he offers the American people a plan and imposes the largest tax increase in the history of our country, and then increases our debt from \$4.1 trillion to over \$6 trillion in the next 5 years.

The President says he wants to create jobs, but he offers the American people a plan that guts their defense budget and puts millions of Americans out of work. The President's Btu tax proposal will impose \$71 billion in new taxes on the American people over the next 5 years, and eliminates 400,000 to 600,000 jobs in the process.

In New Hampshire alone, the National Tax Foundation in my district says that we will lose 1,047 jobs and in the Second District 1,060 jobs, a total of 2,107 jobs.

This is bad business. We ought to cut spending first, and have less taxes and smaller government. That is the way we do it in New Hampshire. That is the way we ought to do it in the United States.

#### THE BTU TAX TARGET: RURAL AMERICA

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

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong and adamant opposition to the proposed Btu energy tax.

Since President Clinton unveiled his program in February, countless letters have flooded my office from rural constituents opposed to the energy tax. Working poor constituents and elderly folks on fixed incomes have written me, scared that the Btu tax will eat up their disposable income. I've spent hours meeting with farmers, small businessmen, and residents from rural Pennsylvania who have related how this energy tax would adversely affect them.

After reading articles and white papers, hearing testimony from experts, and listening to my constituents, there's no doubt in my mind that this ill-conceived tax is a threat to the well-being of individual taxpayers, employers, and the economy as a whole. While yielding little significant environmental benefit, this broad-based energy tax will act as a drag on our sluggish economy, forcing more people out of work and actually reducing tax revenues—the opposite of what the tax is intended to do.

In my congressional district, the tax will weaken the rural area's tenuous economic base. Spanning 17 counties,

my district is the approximate geographic population density of Connecticut with a very low population density. Farming, which is very energy-intensive, remains an integral part of the local economy. Small businesses—whose profit margins are slim—provide most of the area's job growth as is the case nationwide. But the bread and butter high wage, high skill jobs are in manufacturing which is already overburdened by excessive State and Federal taxes. The antigrowth Btu tax will kill jobs in all of these industries, leaving our rural economy even more unstable.

On top of this, because of the tax's regressiveness and my district's demographic and geographic characteristics, my constituents will be hit unusually hard by Btu tax. As one Pennsylvanian told me, "The Btu tax has the Fifth Congressional District in its cross-hairs" and President Clinton is ready to pull the trigger.

The Clinton administration has insisted that the Btu tax is regionally fair, but nothing could be further from the truth. Just because a more onerous inequitable tax could have been devised does not mean this one is fair. No one can deny that this tax will fall heaviest on rural America. Rural residents must travel greater distances to work, school, the grocery store, and the doctor's office. They are entirely dependent on automobiles since they do not have the luxury of opting for mass transit like their urban counterparts. In day-to-day activities, rural residents are forced to consume more energy, and the energy tax will penalize them on the basis of where they live.

Mr. Speaker, President Clinton's Btu tax will be devastating to rural economies across America, and I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing this destructive tax.

#### AMERICA REJECTS TAX-AND-SPEND AGENDA

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

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, in the 1992 election cycle, the American people thought they were voting for change. Candidate Clinton promised real spending cuts, real deficit reduction, and a middle-class tax cut. Candidate Clinton promised to grow the economy and create new jobs.

Unfortunately, something crucial was lost in the transition from campaigning to governing. Instead of honest change, President Clinton is offering the American people more of the same—tax, borrow, and spend.

Instead of honest spending cuts, the President is proposing \$172 billion in higher spending. Instead of halving the deficit over 4 years, the President's plan will create \$1 trillion in new debt. Instead of a middle-class tax cut, the President is proposing the largest tax increase in history, totaling \$273 billion. Instead of growing the economy,

the President's plan will grow the Federal Government and destroy American jobs.

Despite the President's appealing rhetoric of downsizing government and cutting waste, there is very little in terms of real spending restraint in the Clinton program.

The American people have looked beyond the President's appealing rhetoric of change to find more of the same—higher taxes, higher spending, and higher deficits. This frustration is reflected in a new CNN/USA Today poll. The President's job approval rating has hit a new low, with 44 percent approving his job performance and 46 percent disapproving.

The message is clear. The people want the Congress to reject the President's tax-and-spend agenda, and to cut spending first. And they are watching.

□ 1240

#### VOTE "NO" ON BUDGET RECONCILIATION

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

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, no nation in history has ever taxed itself into economic recovery. In 1990, only 33 Republicans voted for President Bush's tax increase, and most of them are sorry for that today.

With an 82-vote advantage in the House, something is wrong when the other side of the aisle cannot pass it. On the plane, several of my colleagues from the other side of the aisle said their constituents in townhall meetings, Democratic constituents, said, "Don't raise our taxes or you're not coming back."

Two minutes ago in the aisle another Democratic Member friend of mine said, "DUKE, I've got a call from AL GORE four different times trying to pressure me to vote for this thing."

If you have to whip it that hard in the House, something is wrong.

In 1966 there was a flat tax, Gramm-Rudman which did not solve the problem. In 1990 caps were supposed to have started. Since 1940, spending has increased \$1.59.

The American people do not believe if you increase taxes and cut later that it is going to work. The President says that there is no tax on the middle class. Well, Mr. Speaker, you have the Btu tax, the gas tax, sales tax, and people do not believe it.

I would ask my colleagues on the other side not to support the budget.

#### PASS THE LARGEST BUDGET DEFICIT REDUCTION IN HISTORY

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

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, in 1980 the annual Federal deficit of this coun-

try was around \$74 billion. By 1986 it had risen to over \$200 billion, and by the end of the 12 years of the Reagan-Bush administrations it was over \$300 billion.

In 1980 the entire national indebtedness of this country that was accumulated over a 200-year period was approximately \$1 trillion. At the end of the Reagan-Bush era it was \$4 trillion, \$3 trillion more than when it started out.

This Congress during that period, only with one exception, voted less of a deficit than was sent over by the administration.

Ladies and gentlemen, the deficit figures during the 1980's are the proof of the pudding as to why we find ourselves in this tight financial position today. We now have a President who has advocated and pushed forward the largest budget deficit reduction in the history of the country. We must support it.

#### AMERICAN PEOPLE ARE LOSERS WITH PASSAGE OF TAX INCREASES

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

Mr. MACHTLEY. Mr. Speaker, here is what bothers me about this tax-and-pain which we are going to address today: If the President's tax bill wins, the ultimate loser will be the American people.

One of the worst aspects of this proposal is the new energy, Btu tax that will especially hit those on lower incomes and those people on fixed incomes.

The bottom line is that this energy, Btu tax fails the basic test of good government, the test of fairness. That was the President's test.

We will all pay more taxes to help reduce our deficit, but those who can least afford to pay more money are going to be asked to pay more under this test.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics reports that the middle class spent 7 percent of their income on energy in 1991. At the same time, the poorest one-fifth of Americans spent 22 percent of their income on energy expenses. To make this imbalance even greater is neither fair nor right.

Moreover, the energy tax has an adverse impact on areas of this country that is unfair. In my State it will cost each family an additional \$300.

Let us ax this tax and make this country fair.

#### BUDGET RECONCILIATION

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

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, today we will cast the most important vote of this Congress. This vote will not sim-

ply define this Congress. It will define this country. On this vote hangs our future, and on this vote we will stake our reputation. It will be the measure of our courage and the greatest test of our will.

For 12 years our Nation's leaders have run from our problems. The day has finally come when we show the American people that we will not continue to turn our backs on the challenges before us—that we will stand and fight. And if we do not show them that we can govern, that we will make the tough choices to fix what is wrong, then the American people will turn their backs on us.

Without public confidence in the integrity of Government we cannot govern. If the people lose faith in democracy—and they are dangerously close—then all we stand for is lost. That is the choice we make here today.

The choices we are being asked to make are painful. No one wants to raise taxes, and I have fought hard against them, but this package asks the wealthy to pay their fair share, and provides half a trillion dollars in deficit reduction, half a trillion dollars to ease the mortgage on our children's future.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to strengthen this body, to show that we can govern, to look to the future. I urge them to vote for this bill.

#### SETTLEMENT OF PENDING TRADE CASES ON FLAT-ROLLED STEEL PRODUCTS

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

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, today the majority party is prepared to pass the President's Btu tax. This tax will cost Ohio 24,000 jobs and \$1.3 billion in economic activity. The tax will be devastating to the quality of opportunity for Ohio citizens. Also I want to discuss another subject that threatens steel and steel-related jobs in Ohio and throughout the United States.

Ten foreign governments have filed proposals to the U.S. Department of Commerce requesting a settlement of 34 pending trade cases on flat-rolled steel products. The cases are part of a total of 84 actions now pending before Commerce and the ITC involving over \$2.2 billion in product value. It is the largest legal action ever taken under U.S. trade law.

If successful in obtaining the proposed suspension agreements, our trading partners and their companies, will be able to trade an admission of guilt for a suspension agreement that exempts them from punitive duties that would otherwise be leveled on the unfairly traded products. The agreements would essentially create steel quotas which we found were largely unsuccessful in the 1980s for stopping subsidies and dumping.

Quotas do not work and neither will the suspension agreements. The problem with world steel trade is structural overcapacity. This problem can only be resolved through the use of our trade laws to address the immediate symptoms, which are dumping and subsidies. A permanent resolution will be found in the successful conclusion of the multilateral steel accord and GATT Uruguay round.

I encourage the administration to let the process go forward and refuse outside settlements. To do otherwise will further diminish the effectiveness of these laws and compromise ongoing negotiations for an international agreement on steel trade set to resume next month in Geneva.

#### CUTTING SPENDING

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

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, on February 17 the President came into this Hall and told the American people we have to do three things: stimulate the economy; increase revenues; and out government spending.

On March 19, this body approved the stimulus package.

Today, after 12 years of deep and painful reductions which cut the muscle out of many Federal programs, we are considering legislation to cut spending even further.

In many of the programs we'll cut today, there is precious little left to cut. Presidents Reagan and Bush already cut them to the bone.

But we'll cut them because we know we have to bite the bullet and reduce the deficit.

Now, some of us progressive Democrats have probably made a mistake, here. We haven't made enough noise about the real cuts being made today.

We've allowed those on the other side to clamor on and on about revenue increases as if there weren't any significant cuts in this bill. But there are lots of them.

In our desire to be responsible, we are making cuts in this legislation which the American people are really going to feel, especially when the appropriations bills move out of here over the next 3 months.

The \$50 billion we're cutting out of Medicare in this bill today is going to have an impact on senior citizens, and on small and large businesses.

The Federal Government will save \$50 billion, but we are shifting—make no mistake about it, that's what we're doing—we are simply shifting that cost onto the private sector. They are going to pay for that.

Every Member of this body will see these kinds of cuts, not just across the Nation, but back home in their own district. In my area we'll see cuts in the Bonneville Power Administration, cuts in electric power that are going to be devastating to our economy.

These are real and painful cuts, and they are being made despite 12 years of cuts that in many instances have already gone too deep.

Those on the other side completely ignore this fact.

They ignore or minimize the cuts made by this bill. Instead, they pretend this is a bill that only raises revenues.

Not only are they wrong, Mr. Speaker, but I will predict that within a month, those on the other side who argue today that the cuts in this bill don't go far enough will be back here complaining that they go too deep.

They'll be back up here in about a month to say they didn't favor these cuts. They didn't think these cuts were going to be made in that area.

#### IMPACT OF THE ENERGY TAX

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

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I just received an estimate from the Tax Foundation on the effects of President Clinton's tax plan on California. According to Dr. Arthur Hall, the senior economist at the Tax Foundation, he says that if the President's new energy tax is enacted it will cost the Nation 463,000 jobs. For California alone, the job loss will be 54,000 jobs.

Mr. Speaker, the President is promoting this plan as a job creation, economic stimulus plan. But according to the Tax Foundation, it will be a job-destroying plan.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot afford this kind of help. This new tax attacks the very engine on economic growth in our economy. It attacks small business and it attacks the consumer.

□ 1250

Past experience shows that it will just go to fuel new Government spending. That is the one thing that Congress always increases, spending. New social spending goes up every year, year after year.

I ask my colleagues to vote "no" on this bill.

#### NOW IS THE TIME TO MAKE HARD CHOICES

(Ms. HARMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I conditioned my support of this rule and the reconciliation package on the addition of effective enforcement mechanisms to assure all revenues go directly and only to deficit reduction.

This bill includes the deficit reduction trust fund and a hard freeze on all discretionary spending for 5 years. This bill will achieve the largest deficit reduction in history.

Getting the deficit monster under control is critical to retain and build high-skilled, high-wage jobs. We must

free up the vital capital that is being siphoned away by deficit spending so that the market can invest in new industries and new growth. That is our children's future.

When I got elected to Congress, I vowed to listen to my constituents and then to lead. I have spent months listening in public forums, in front of markets and shipping malls, in my office, and to the intelligent ideas in my mail box.

Now is the time to lead, to make the hard choices I was elected to make.

I rise in support of this rule and this package which provide the real and substantial deficit reduction my constituents and our country are demanding.

#### LET US GET ON WITH JOBS FOR YOUNG AMERICANS

(Ms. PELOSI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, this past weekend I had the opportunity to attend my own daughter's graduation from law school. I have another getting her master's degree. This is a mother bragging up here this year.

But our colleagues will be attending graduations in the weeks ahead, either personally or in their official capacities, and when they do, they will see a new phenomenon that I do not think I saw present in graduations in years gone by, and that is there is almost a lever of despair among these graduates because of the lack of prospects for jobs when they get out of school.

We all know that graduations are called commencements. We were told when we were in school commencement that it was the beginning. It may have seemed like the end to our education, formal education, but it was the commencement of the new life, the new beginning as we went out into the world.

For these graduates, graduating in May and June 1993, the new beginning is a dismal one, and for their families it is as well, because we have been having what is called the jobless recovery in our country.

How much is it going to take? When will the Republicans get the message that we need to reduce the deficit, reduce the cost of capital, so that small businesses can create jobs and give hope to these new graduates? I urge my colleagues to support the President's package today so that we can get on with the jobs for young Americans. It is about reducing the deficit. It is about governing our country.

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

[Mr. BACHUS of Alabama addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

### SUPPORT THE PRESIDENT'S ECONOMIC PLAN

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

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, there are components of the Clinton plan which are not acceptable to me, but based on the rhetoric this morning, I think we need to put some things in perspective.

There is one alternative before us put together by the minority in the House of Representatives. For all the crocodile tears about protecting the middle class, oddly enough, over 75 percent of the tax benefits of that plan goes to the very wealthy and to corporations while, at the same time, reducing the deficit \$140 billion less than what President Clinton's plan does, and while at the same time not itemizing where those cuts would be. It is one of those feel-good kinds of proposals that we have had, the political demagogues talking about too often in the past.

At least you could say this for President Clinton: He is specific about his plan. It reduces the deficit more than any other plan in American history, and he is dealing with the American public as adults.

The other proposal we hear about is the Ross Perot proposal. It has some positive qualities, but \$62 billion more in taxes than what President Clinton is talking about.

If you do not like a 7.5-cent gas tax, try a 50-cent gas tax while at the same time reducing the deficit less than President Clinton's plan does.

We have always had a lot of people sitting in the bleachers complaining about the people on the floor who are actually playing the game. It is time to get down and play the game ourselves with bipartisan support instead of this kind of wrangling.

### MANY AMERICANS "RICH" UNDER PRESIDENT'S DEFINITION

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

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Speaker, in just 6 months the President has managed to make the whole country rich. No, he has not changed the Nation's living standards one iota, but he has changed the definition of "rich." In last year's campaign, only the rich were going to pay candidate Clinton's new taxes; the rich were defined as making \$200,000. President-elect Clinton still said only the rich would pay his taxes, but the rich only had to make \$100,000.

Now in office, President Bill Clinton says people making as little as \$25,000 are rich enough to pay his Social Security tax. But \$25,000 still excluded too many people from being rich enough to pay President Clinton's taxes, so he decided that everyone who has the money to buy a gallon of gas, a 40-watt light

bulb, a lump of coal, or a kilowatt of electricity is rich enough to pay his energy tax. Regrettably, this whole charade just goes to prove that when President Clinton soaks the rich everyone takes a bath.

□ 1300

### REPUBLICANS OFFER THE SAME OLD PROMISES

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, what we are hearing from this side of the aisle today is what I call the SOS message, or same old stuff; or the SOP message, same old promises. This is the same crowd who told us in 1981 that if we just adopted President Reagan's budget, that somehow we would get to zero deficits in 4 years. Instead, we wound up with \$200 billion deficits as far as the eye can see. This is the same crowd that followed economic policies which doubled the income of the rich from \$300,000 a year on average to \$600,000, while everybody else in the country was losing ground. After 12 long years of failed promises, missed targets, protecting the rich, is it not finally time that we depart from that message of the past and give this President a chance to bring this economy back to its senses and to produce the kind of economic growth we need to give people a chance to make a decent living in this country again?

The President deserves this chance; stand aside and give it to him.

### BUDGET RECONCILIATION BILL

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

Mr. RAMSTAD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Kasich Republican plan. The two choices today are clear.

The Republican plan cuts spending first—the Democrat plan taxes people first.

The Democrat plan imposes the largest tax increase in American history—\$355 billion over 5 years. Tax increases represent 81 percent of the Democrat package, which will raise the national debt \$1.5 trillion over the next 5 years—according to their own figures.

The Democrat plan will increase the deficit, destroy jobs, and stifle the economy just as it is struggling to recover.

The energy tax alone will cost 8,500 jobs in my home State of Minnesota, and almost 1,000 jobs in my Third District; 610,000 jobs will be lost nationally because of the energy tax, according to the National Association of Manufacturers [NAM]. And the energy tax will cut gross domestic product [GDP] by at least \$30 billion each year, according to

the independent economic consulting firm DR/McGraw-Hill.

In addition, Northwest Airlines and its 24,000 Minnesota jobs will be put in serious jeopardy by the new energy tax.

The energy tax is a big hit on the middle class. The average family of four will see its energy bill go up by \$425 a year, according to the non-partisan Tax Foundation.

Middle-income families will be hit the hardest—just because the President and Congress refuse to cut spending.

Mr. Speaker, we need to cut spending first, and that's exactly what the Kasich Republican plan does. It reduces the budget deficit by \$352 billion in spending cuts over the next 5 years—without increasing taxes.

Congress must say "no" to the largest tax increase in American history and say no to the energy tax which will kill American jobs.

Congress must cut spending first. Say "yes" to the Kasich substitute.

### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY). The Chair announces that by mutual agreement with the leadership on both sides of the aisle, the Chair will limit to 13 the additional 1-minute on each side.

### LOWER INTEREST RATES MEAN LOWERED DEFICITS

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

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, I have only been here 6 years before this one. I feel like I am living a Lewis Carroll novel. If it had not been for the sham, the fraud budgets submitted to this body in the preceding 12 years, we would not be in the fix we are in right now.

Let us look at the hard economics of just one little piece of this proposition: There are \$14 trillion in debt held publicly and privately in this country. If you assume only four-tenths of 1 percent in interest rate drop because of finally getting serious about the deficit, we will more than cover all of the tax increases by savings in interest over the next 5 years.

But that four-tenths is one-half, one-half of what we have already realized in interest rate reductions because this country is counting, finally, on something serious being done on the deficit.

That is our responsibility today.

### LET US DEFEAT THE RULE ON RECONCILIATION

(Mr. SOLOMON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker and my Democratic colleagues, during a mara-

thon Rules meeting last evening, 17 hours and ending at 4 a.m., this morning, if I look a little tired, scores and scores of Democrats and Republicans pleaded, pleaded for the right to come to this floor and offer amendments that would knock out the Btu tax, would knock out the Social Security tax. And, my colleagues, you were gagged, all of you, by your Speaker and your Rules Committee. You cannot offer any.

Members, you can spit out that gag, you can come to this floor, and you can do what this organization says, the National Committee to Preserve Social Security, it urges you to come to the floor and defeat the previous question, and you can then vote for that amendment you paraded upstairs and asked for.

The U.S. Chamber of Commerce urges you to defeat the previous question so that you can come to this floor and vote for your amendment, wipe out that onerous Btu tax.

The Wall Street Journal goes on to say,

The point is that Members shouldn't be able to claim that they oppose parts of the tax bill but were helpless to amend it. A vote for the closed rule is a vote for the largest tax increase in American history.

Be men and women, come down to this floor and stand up for your 585,000 constituents and vote "no" on the rule.

Let us do what the American people want us to do.

#### WE HAVE MADE THE TOUGH CHOICES

(Mrs. KENNELLY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, this woman has come down to the floor and, like the gentleman before me, she is part of the process. The President made a plan, he made the tough choices, he presented the plan to us.

That plan went to the Committee on the Budget, where the tough choices were made.

Then the budget resolution, some thought that was a tough vote, but they had to make it, and they made it.

Now we are here in the budget reconciliation; many choices having been made, the process has reached the point where we can take a vote so that we can go forward in this country.

It is deficit reduction, it is investment in the country. The Btu, none of us likes to raise taxes; but the Btu, across the board, is as fair a tax as many we looked at; the carbon tax, the hydro tax, the oil import tax; much fairer.

Does any of us like taxes? No. But we are here today to break gridlock, to go forward, to show that we in the Congress can govern with the President.

#### TIME FOR A REAL CHANGE, CUT SPENDING, DON'T RAISE TAXES

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, President Clinton is trying to sell the American people the largest tax increase in our Nation's history by telling them someone else will pay the bill.

He has used the phony family economic income standard which counts employer health care coverage and pension contributions and the infamous imputed rent on the family home as income, to magically turn middle-class Americans into wealthy Americans.

Then, he claims that these newly wealthy Americans will bear the brunt of his tax increase—75 percent according to the distinguished majority leader this week.

The Democrats changed the formula used presently to compute wealth so they can issue the fallacious statement on the House floor in this debate. In fact, middle-income people will be considered rich and are going to be taxed.

The vote today creates new entitlements, does not eliminate a single Federal program, and places an extremely regressive Btu tax on every American.

History has shown that for \$1 in new taxes, Congress spends \$1.59, \$2.37 in 1990. We will never tax our way out of the deficit. We have to cut spending first or we will never break out of the cycle of debt.

#### WE CAN LOWER THE DEFICIT BY VOTING FOR THE PRESIDENT'S PLAN

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

Mr. PASTOR. Mr. Speaker, when I voted against the balanced budget amendment, there were Republicans in my congressional district who criticized me, that I was not for reducing the deficit.

When I voted against the line-item veto, there were Republicans in my district who criticized me, that I was not doing enough to lower the deficit.

When I voted against the expanded rescission, again I was criticized because I was not doing enough to lower the deficit.

Well Mr. Speaker, today I am very proud to tell you I kept my promise, and I am going to lower the deficit by voting for this plan. For the first time, for the first time in 12 years, we are going to do something about the deficit. Today you will hear some of my colleagues on this side argue against, because they are still in the same plan of 12 years ago: line-item veto, balanced budget amendment—all rhetoric.

If they really want to do something about this deficit, they should join us and support this plan.

□ 1310

#### AMERICAN PEOPLE WANT SPENDING CUT FIRST

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

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, the American people have sent a loud, clear message: Cut spending first, but if you are going to make us pay more taxes, at the very least, guarantee to us that every penny we pay goes to reduce the deficit, not for increased spending.

But, Mr. Speaker, you just do not get it. Your budget reconciliation package does just the opposite. It raises \$2 of new taxes for every \$1 in spending cuts, meaning that most of the new tax revenue will, in fact, go for new spending, not deficit reduction.

I offered a taxpayer protection amendment that would require that each year the deficit come down by an amount not less than the new taxes collected or the taxes are repealed, automatically and immediately.

No deficit reduction, no new taxes. But, your Rules Committee refused to allow the House to vote on this sensible amendment.

Mr. Speaker, you have sent a message back to the American people and I hope they are hearing it loud and clear: You are going to be saddled with huge permanent tax increases and 4 years from now the deficit will be larger than ever.

#### FIRST TIME IN 12 YEARS CONGRESS WILL REDUCE DEFICIT

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

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Speaker, for 12 years we have heard talk about deficit reduction and now for the first time we actually have an opportunity to do it. And what happens? My colleagues on the other side of the aisle want to find every reason possible why we ought not do it. They want to confuse the issue and talk about there are too many taxes and not enough spending cuts.

But the fact remains, Mr. Speaker, that this is the first time in 12 years that this Congress will reduce the deficit, and that is what is important. We will reduce the drag on our economy and we will begin to move forward on cutting both spending and the size of Government.

Another element that is significant in this package is tax fairness. Tax fairness, no matter how much they rant and rave about taxes on the other side of the aisle, the fact remains that most of the taxes in this package will be paid by the wealthy. Seventy percent of the taxes will be paid by the 6 percent who are the wealthiest in this country.

And do you know what? That is a change. That is called tax fairness.

We accomplish something very significant with this package. We reduce the deficit. We lower long-term interest rates, and that is what puts people back to work, because housing is stimulated, the economy is stimulated. We have already seen the bond market respond favorably to this package, the anticipation that this will pass.

We have had 12 years of stagnation and 12 years of rhetoric. I think it is great we are about to have a first year of movement, a first year of innovation and a first year of deficit reduction.

#### RONALD REAGAN KEPT HIS CAMPAIGN PROMISES

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I have been fascinated by some of the 1 minutes that have been delivered by our colleagues on the other side of the aisle.

The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. GLICKMAN] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] talked about the fact that Democrats supported Ronald Reagan's economic growth package in 1981. Fifty of them came over and did that.

The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. GLICKMAN] said "what we should be doing is that Republicans should be giving President Clinton that same level of support.

"We have got to remember something, Mr. Speaker. Ronald Reagan was keeping his campaign promise. I never saw in that volume, Putting People First," a plan to increase the Btu tax. I never saw him putting people first a plan to increase the Social Security tax on retired Americans.

We want to support a plan that President Clinton will bring forward if it would in any way look like the campaign pledges he made to the American people last fall.

#### TODAY IS THE DAY TO PUT OUR VOTES WHERE OUR RHETORIC HAS BEEN

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

Mr. SWIFT. Mr. Speaker, one of the phrases that has become a clique in this country, when you talk about the deficit, is we have to bite the bullet. We have got to make the tough choices.

What we are being asked today is not popular. It would not be a tough choice if it were popular by definition.

We have to provide investment in this country which has been neglected for over a decade. We have to deal with the deficit, and that requires spending cuts which are only popular in the aggregate. The individual spending cuts are unpopular, and it involves taxes which is unpopular.

But it is very interesting to see the number of people who have used that rhetoric about biting the bullet and making the tough choices who are now finding all kinds of reasons to say today is not the day, this is not the vehicle.

This is a proposal that is more specific, more complete, more effective than anything that has been offered in the last 12 years.

Today is the day, this is the bullet, and it is time to put our votes where our rhetoric has been.

#### DO WE OWN GOVERNMENT OR DOES IT OWN US?

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I wonder what Americans expect to own for \$17,000? You might think you could put a downpayment on a home, buy a car, invest for your retirement, or finance part of a college education. Certainly for most Americans \$17,000 is a great deal of money. But today, every American man, woman, and child already owes that \$17,000 to pay their share of our national debt. By the time we have lived with the Clinton tax plan for 5 years, that share of debt will have increased to more than \$20,000 for each person.

And what do we get for all that money? Even after all the sacrifice, we will still own an annual national budget deficit of several hundred billion dollars. And we will still own several hundred billion dollars of annual Government waste and pork that Democrats will not let us chop out.

The question is, do the American people own Government or does their Government own them? Sadly, the answer seems to be that American taxpayers have been bought, but not paid for.

#### OPPOSE BLIND-SIDE ECONOMICS

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

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the Clinton tax increase, the largest tax increase in American history, which will hit the middle class, bring our economy to a standstill and in the end increase the deficit.

My friends on the other side of the aisle have characterized this plan as an attack on the deficit. Pure Clintonese.

I remember in this body in 1990 when they claimed that the 1990 tax increase would bring down the deficit. Instead, we got higher taxes and a higher deficit and that is exactly what this tax increase will do as well.

This proposal will not reduce the deficit because it does not eliminate one Federal domestic program. Get that. The American people are being ex-

pected to suffer \$300 billion in higher taxes, but they could not find even one little domestic program to eliminate, saying that they could not find one little program.

This plan will sock it to the middle class. If you take the Robin Hood rhetoric aside, the average American is going to pay considerably higher taxes after being promised a middle-class tax cut.

Well, Mr. Speaker, this is not supply-side economics. This is blind-side economics. The American people are going to wake up on April 15 next year and feel like they were hit by a truck from Arkansas.

#### AN OPPORTUNITY TO SAVE TAXPAYER MONEY

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

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, it is very obvious there is deep division within this House and differences of opinion today as we undertake this very important responsibility.

The one thing that unites us is our desire to find those items in the budget that we can declare unnecessary so that we can cut Federal spending.

I think there is strong agreement on that proposition on both sides of the aisle.

Well, I am here to help you with that very difficult process today, because within hours the General Accounting Office has just released testimony indicating that the price tag for the superconducting super collider, the single most expensive piece of scientific equipment ever contemplated for purchase in the history of man, has gone up another \$4 billion.

Keep in mind a project that started out with a projected cost of \$4.4 billion is now certified by the General Accounting Office to cost at least \$11 billion.

Also keep in mind that we, this House, by an overwhelming vote approved a project if there was foreign participation of at least 20 percent of the total cost.

To date, Mr. Speaker, we do not have foreign participation, not the first yen from the Japanese. We are supposed to have \$1.7 billion. We have got \$15 million.

Here is an opportunity to save money, to get serious about priorities. Help us defeat the superconducting super collider.

#### DO THE REPUBLICANS REALLY SUPPORT BUDGET CUTS?

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

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, regarding the super collider superconductor, I support the gentleman's comments. I will be joining him in voting to cut out

this funding, but I also challenge those who are listening today to check the rollicall for the Republicans. It seems that they come to the floor, they are for cutting all the programs, but when it comes to star wars, when it comes to the collider, well that is not spending. That is not deficit reduction, and they choose not to support those cuts.

It seems that ever since the Republicans lost the White House, they have magically found something in this country called the middle class. That same middle class that for 12 years they shunned, they raised taxes on and they have nothing to do with.

□ 1320

But now, after the George Bush defeat, they have all of a sudden found something in their district called the middle class. Well, here is a sampling of some of the tax cuts in the bill we are going to be taking up later this afternoon: A surcharge is imposed on increases over \$250,000 a year. Is that middle class? Business club dues and lobby deductions eliminated. How many business class people are affected by that?

Mr. Speaker, it is a balanced package, and I ask the House to support it.

**THE DR. KEVORKIAN PLAN FOR OUR ECONOMY**

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

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I listened with interest as one of my colleagues praised the Clinton tax increase plan because it is going to produce \$200 billion deficits as far as the eye can see. That is, in fact, what it does, and the so-called deficit reduction is the result mostly of tax increases quantified, according to our official estimators, at about one-third trillion dollars. The trouble is that one-third trillion dollars in projected revenues will not be there because that is not the way tax rate increases and new taxes work. Higher taxes on individuals will mean less work, less savings, and less investment. Higher taxes on working senior citizens with incomes as low as \$25,000 will mean less senior citizens working and being productive. Higher taxes on energy, we are told with authority, will cost over one-half million jobs in America.

Mr. Speaker, it is no wonder they call it biting the bullet. This is really the Dr. Kevorkian plan for our economy. It will kill jobs, kill businesses, and yes, kill even the higher tax revenues that these suicidal tax increasers hope to gain.

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

[Mr. LAROCCO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

**SOME DEMOCRATS SELL OUT FOR PEANUTS**

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

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, we all know that President Clinton and his allies here on Capitol Hill are doing everything they can, twisting arms, bending arms, to try to find enough votes to pass this bill today. They are making promises left and right to pick up the necessary votes they do not yet have.

And what promise was made late last night to pick up the votes of six or seven Democrat colleagues from the South? My colleagues will not believe it, Mr. Speaker. It was peanuts. Apparently last night the President offered to limit the amount of peanuts coming into this country to drive up the price of domestically produced peanuts. Not only are the Democrats today going to stick the American people with the largest increase in the history of this world, but they are going to stick it to every kid and their parents in this country who buys candy bars and peanut butter and jelly sandwiches.

Mr. Speaker, it is incredible, absolutely incredible, that six or seven of my colleagues have sold out for peanuts.

**INTRODUCTION OF THE MICROENTERPRISE OPPORTUNITY EXPANSION ACT**

(Miss COLLINS of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Miss COLLINS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing the Microenterprise Opportunity Expansion Act with a great sense of satisfaction and accomplishment over the prospects for microenterprises across the country.

In 1988, when I first began preparing microenterprise legislation, very few people in Government with whom I spoke were at all familiar with the concept of microenterprise development. In 1990, when I introduced the first bill in Congress to promote microenterprise in the United States, there were still only a few Members of Congress or congressional staff that were familiar with microenterprise programs and their benefits.

Now, in 1993, the landscape has been overhauled. Today, we have a President who vocally and frequently touts the virtues of promoting microenterprises. Additionally, a number of other Members of Congress have initiated other efforts on this subject including, most notably, H.R. 455, the Microenterprise and Asset Development Act, introduced by Representative TONY HALL, of which I am pleased to be a lead cosponsor. Finally, the public, the Congress, and the Administration have come to recognize the value of helping people help them-

selves and the importance of Government policies which tangibly assist these individuals.

Microenterprises are the very smallest businesses, having five or fewer employees, at least one of whom owns it. Often, microenterprises have no employees beyond the owner-operator(s), which is the reason that self-employment is often an issue. It is frequently seen as a road out of reliance on public assistance, although startup help is regularly needed.

Two examples from the Chicago-based Women's Self-Employment Project (WSEP) demonstrate the value of microenterprise programs and the need for this legislation.

Ms. Lynn Hardy was on welfare when she joined one of WSEP's programs in 1990. She used her first \$1,500 loan to begin a graphic arts business known as Lynn's Designs. At first, Ms. Hardy limited her services to business cards and signs. Within 18 months, however, she expanded her services to calendars, posters, airbrushed T-shirts, and day care murals. Ms. Hardy borrowed from the loan fund a second time, using \$3,500 to purchase supplies. Through her own strength, the support of other new entrepreneurs at the program, and WSEP capital, Ms. Hardy now supports herself and her three children. "Believe me," she wrote, " \* \* \* it will be a success story for all low-income women—letting them know with trust in God, having a vision, and WSEP you can make it."

In contrast with Lynn Hardy's success, Ms. Bernice Jackson met Government-imposed obstacles that she simply could not hurdle. In 1987, she joined a different one of WSEP's programs and participated in the self-employment training. She then started her own cleaning business which she operated for 1 year. Ms. Jackson was forced to shut down her business because it generated too much money to allow her to keep her AFDC benefits, yet not enough money to replace the necessary health and child care benefits that she was receiving from AFDC. Fortunately, for Ms. Jackson, having benefited from the training she received at WSEP, she was able to find a full-time job and work her way off of welfare. Yet, according to Ms. Jackson, "If I had been allowed to continue receiving some of my public aid benefits, that would have given me a better chance to say in business, and by now I think I would have reached my goal."

There are people like Lynn Hardy and Bernice Jackson all over the country, trying to start a microenterprise, trying to become self-sufficient, trying to get ahead. Often, however, they cannot find those first few dollars to start their company or the basic business training they need to maintain it. Many who do find the money and training are then running into governmental brick walls which block their progress.

Dedication and skill are in abundance. Unfortunately it takes more

than that to succeed in the face of obstacles and shortages of assistance.

The most common type of help that is needed is a loan. Microenterprise programs which lend startup capital are now scattered across the country. They are most often non-profit or local-government-run establishments and commonly disburse loans in amounts up to \$10,000. Most of these microlenders also offer or require varying degrees of business training, continuing technical assistance and other means of support to ensure the success of the venture.

As a result, microenterprises have a very high rate of growth and the loan repayment rate overall is around 95 percent. In the case of the WSEP, their two programs have loan repayment rates of 95 and 100 percent. Even when the venture does not succeed over the longrun, the training that the entrepreneurs receive helps them find employment and advance their careers otherwise, as happened with Bernice Jackson.

The Microenterprise Opportunity Expansion Act, which I am introducing today, aims both to eliminate Federal obstacles which stand in the way of success in this area and to increase the flow of capital to microlenders and microenterprises. The bill seeks to accomplish these goals through a variety of mechanisms.

First, it would distinguish between business and personal assets for purposes of AFDC so that business assets, including loans, would not be counted toward the eligibility requirement asset limitations of AFDC.

Second, it would exclude, for purposes of AFDC, income derived from a microenterprise for 2 years, so that aid continues during a transition period, unlike as in the case of Ms. Bernice Jackson.

Third, persons who are otherwise eligible to receive unemployment compensation payments would be able to continue to receive them even though they are starting up a microenterprise, and such payments could be combined in one lump sum payment at the start of the benefit period.

Fourth, to encourage banks to provide capital for these purposes, the bill would enable banks to receive credit under the Community Reinvestment Act for certain loans and grants that they make to microlenders and microenterprises.

Fifth, the legislation would enable thrift savings associations to receive credit toward their qualified thrift lending investment requirements under the Home Owners' Loan Act for loans made for these activities.

Sixth, it would clarify that CDBG funds could be used for administrative and operating costs of microlenders who offer training and technical assistance to their borrowers.

Seventh, the bill would create a Micro-Enterprise Technical and Operations Office [ME-TOO] in the Federal Reserve and the FDIC to function as a

clearinghouse of information relating to microenterprises to encourage banks to provide funds for these purposes.

Finally, the bill calls for a study to be conducted to analyze the loan needs to enterprises that are larger than microenterprises yet smaller than small businesses.

Mr. Speaker, these measures, taken together, would open many avenues for individuals to begin their own businesses and, in many cases, elevate themselves from public assistance. It would also facilitate the efforts of groups, organizations and lenders who are already working hard to lend a hand to these Americans.

In short, microenterprise is a good investment. It helps local communities, the economy as a whole, and, most importantly, Americans who have both needs and answers but insufficient resources. I encourage my colleagues to support this bill.

#### THE ROBIN HOOD DEMOCRAT PARTY

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

Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, as we consider the budget reconciliation vote today, I cannot help but reflect back to a comment made by one of my high school constituents. He called the Democrat Party the Robin Hood Party because they would like to take from the rich to give to the poor.

Now the redistribution of wealth question is a serious issue, and it should not be belittled. However maybe the Robin Hood Democrat Party comparison has some merit to it, except our President and the Democrats would believe that anyone earning over \$34,000 a year is rich.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, the Democrats would want to take from these individuals and give more money to Government programs and social welfare like spending programs.

Tax and spend? Robin Hood Party? Democrat Party? Maybe this youngster was not too far off. But someone please tell that \$34,000 a year blue-collar worker that he is rich.

#### LET'S GET THE JOB DONE

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

Mr. HOAGLAND. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, as you know, the time has come to be responsible, and the time has come to do what we have to do. The time has come to be non-partisan, and the time has come to do what is best for the country.

Mr. Speaker, the bill that we are going to vote on today has \$500 billion in deficit reduction. Over \$245 billion of that is in cuts.

I would like more cuts. Most of us would like more cuts. And I think we can achieve more cuts later this year.

But what is before us right now is \$500 billion in deficit reduction, and all of us acknowledge that is the most important economic item on our agenda, to bring the deficit down.

As my colleagues know, we have been ducking these decisions for 12 years, and the deficit, the debt, has gone from \$900 billion to over \$4 trillion, and we simply have got to do something about it.

I like very few parts of the plan. I deplore tax increases. They are awful. But we all know that we cannot effectively deal with the deficit without both revenue increases and cuts.

Colleagues, we have no choice. I mean we have got to turn the corner on the deficit and on the debt issue.

This is our opportunity to do it. Let us do it and get the job done.

#### THE DIFFERENCE IS CLEAR

(Mr. HOEKSTRA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, today I applaud my Democrat colleagues on the floor of the House. Congratulations on breaking gridlock, and, most importantly, I say, "Thank you for clarifying the differences between the Democratic and Republican approaches to government."

Mr. Speaker, after the vote today the American people will know what the Democratic Party stands for: for more taxes, for more spending and, perhaps most importantly, the philosophical belief that problems can be solved in Washington rather than by empowering people at the local level. In 1994 the crucial decisions will be made because at that point in time voters will be able to hold the people of this House accountable for the decisions that I have heard described as the most important decision of this House.

□ 1330

The differences are clear. There will be no differences between hollow campaign promises, but the decisions will be made on the decisions we make here.

#### PUT SPENDING CUTS FIRST

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

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I appeared before the House Rules Committee, along with many of our Republican colleagues, to argue for the right to offer amendments to today's tax bill. With one exception, my colleagues and I were denied.

In examining the rule passed out of the Rules Committee, I must say that I am offended.

It allows for only 2 hours of debate on the most important bill of this decade. Too short a time for such an important and far-reaching measure.

Worse, the rule contains seven so-called self-executing provisions that are political payoffs to special interests to gain support for the bill.

Finally, a deal that was reached early this morning to curb entitlements is a sham.

As reported, although the details have not yet truly surfaced, all the entitlement cap does is call for Congress and the President to either raise taxes or cut spending when the caps are breached. This is nothing and fails to address the central problem.

Mr. Speaker, the American people want spending cuts first, before they are asked to give more of their hard-earned money to the Government to spend.

#### PIED PIPER LEADING MEMBERS DOWN WRONG ROAD

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, Abraham Lincoln said you could fool all the people some of the time and some of the people all of the time, but you cannot fool all the people all the time. I would just say to my Democrat colleagues, if you look in the paper this morning you found that President Clinton's approval rating is now at 42 percent and his disapproval rating is at 48 percent, 48 percent. Do you know what? That is the largest in history, the largest in history.

Mr. Speaker, do you know why? It is because the American people have caught on to this President, who has broken every single promise he had made in his first 100 days in office.

And what is he doing? Like the Pied Piper, he is leading you down the path to political ruin. Now, make no mistake about it: if you vote for the largest tax increase in U.S. history, and you do not make the spending cuts that you should, many of you dear friends, whom I love so much, will not be back in 2 years. So think about that. Please do not follow this misled Pied Piper down the wrong road. It is going to ruin you. Do not do it. It is a big mistake.

#### ENOUGH IS ENOUGH

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

Mr. BLUTE. Mr. Speaker, today the House will cast one of the most important votes of the year. We will vote on President Clinton's \$340 billion tax and spend plan. I want my colleagues and constituents to know that I plan to vote "no" on that plan.

On the campaign trail the President said that he would put forth a plan

that would cut spending \$3 for every \$1 raised in taxes. Shortly after being sworn in, that became a 1 to 1 ratio. But the plan that will come before us later today will raise \$4 of taxes for every \$1 in spending cuts.

Since I came to Congress, the people back home have been sending me a message which I have received loud and clear: Cut spending first. But that message apparently has not gotten through to the White House or to many Members of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, what these taxes will do is cause the American people to rebel against Washington. I live in the State of the Boston Tea Party, an earlier tax revolt. But this plan will cause an American Tea Party, from sea to shining sea, sending a message to Washington, enough is enough.

#### TIME TO TAKE ACTION

(Mrs. LOWEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I have heard a lot of talk this morning, and I think that is exactly what the American people are sick and tired of. They are tired of doublespeak, they are tired of rhetoric, and they are tired of people saying just sweep it under the rug. They are tired of people saying it is morning in America, everything is going to be fine tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, when you go to a doctor's office they give you the medicine, and then they give you the lollipop. What we have going on around here is just handing out lollipops.

This is a President who wants to lead. We are a Congress that has to govern. It is time for the talk to be over.

This is the biggest deficit reduction package in history, \$500 billion in deficit reduction, over \$200 billion in specific cuts. Yes, we hear about Ross Perot's plan, this one's plan, that one's plan. But if you actually look at the plans if those plans were ever brought to the floor, no one else would vote on them.

Mr. Speaker, I do not like everything about this plan, but at some point the debate is over. That is our democratic way. We have to take action, we have to lead, and we have to vote. I hope my good friends on both sides of the aisle will join us and give this President a chance to lead.

#### PRESIDENT'S BUDGET PENALIZES MIDDLE-INCOME AMERICA

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

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, with President Clinton's clear dislike for the oil industry, it is understandable that he would present a plan that punishes Texas, that costs Texas 37,000 jobs through his energy tax. But why does

he have to punish the rest of the Nation?

The Tax Foundation has just issued a list of job losses for every single State in the United States of America that will result from this misguided tax. No other country in the world taxes its raw energy, because the industries in those countries must consume that energy to produce those products, and that must be passed on in higher prices.

Why does he penalize middle-income Americans \$471 per year per family in the products that they buy that include energy? Why does he insist on this tax that will cost jobs, reduce the tax base of this country, and prevent us from gaining the extra revenue that we need to balance the budget?

#### AMERICA IS FOR ALL PEOPLE

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

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to let the American people know that for the first time in a long time in this body there is going to be some courage shown today and that we are not going to fall prey to the scare tactics from the other side of the aisle, telling people about they are going to lose if they vote a certain way.

When I was running for office this past November, the Republican Party put out a saying that I was going to lose to my Republican opponent, that he had a real chance of beating me, because I was wrong on the issues. I got over 80 percent of the vote.

The fact of the matter is that for 12 years this body has done nothing but lapse behind. It is time for us to move forward and have some courage and include all Americans in our plan, not just the rich people, not just the people that have it made already. We have to expand this country and help people in this country, the middle class, the people who are less fortunate, to have a stake in this society. We have to believe that America is for everybody, not just for a few.

#### WASHINGTON POST EDITORIALS SUPPORT PRESIDENT

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

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, the last two editorials of the Washington Post say it all: Bill Clinton is right. The deficits that were allowed to accumulate over the past 12 years are one fiscal and the other social. Today the House Democrats have an opportunity to begin to reduce them both. Not quite to restore the Nation's fiscal health, but at least to put it on the path to restoration, and by providing the means to provide the ability to govern as well. Either they vote to do this, or they vote to let the country

continue to drift irresponsibly and to think as before. That is their choice, the only choice.

The House Republicans are going to sit on their hands. They always do at budget time. They used to vote no even on their own President's budget. Look, Ma, no fingerprints, that is their ideal fiscal policy.

This President, elected with only 43 percent of the vote, has courageously done what his predecessors notoriously did not: he has proposed a restoration of fiscal discipline.

It may not be a perfect program, but what is? It is a solid one, and balanced. It would do what it says it would. His opponents have made no such proposal, not one that can pass, yes or no, with the country's well-being at stake. That is the question before the House. Yes is the vote they should stand and deliver.

□ 1340

#### IN SUPPORT OF THE RECONCILIATION PACKAGE

(Mr. JACOBS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, it is the style of the day to give one another the devil for his or her honest opinions. I do not think we need to do that. There is so much, as they say, good in the worst of us and bad in the best of us that it hardly becomes any of us to say very much about the rest of us.

Whatever happens today should be done with civility. There are honest differences of opinion. This is why I intend to support this reconciliation package.

First of all, 70 percent of the tax increases, as has been said, are on the people who enjoyed the largest tax cuts during the 1980's.

Second, I have two little boys, and I am not going to push this burden off on to them.

#### ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 187) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 187

*Resolved*, That the following named Members be, and they are hereby, elected to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

Committee on agriculture: Mr. Smith of Michigan; and Mr. Everett of Alabama; and the

Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries: Mrs. Bentley of Maryland; and Mr. Taylor of North Carolina; and Mr. Torquildsen of Massachusetts; and the

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Mr. Stearns of Florida; and Mr. King of New York.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### OMNIBUS BUDGET RECONCILIATION ACT OF 1993

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 186 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 186

*Resolved*, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2264) to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 7 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1994. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and the amendments made in order by this resolution and shall not exceed two hours equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule and shall be considered as read. The modifications to the bill printed in part 1 of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against the bill, as modified, are waived. No amendment to the bill, as modified, shall be in order except the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in part 2 of the report. The amendment in the nature of a substitute may be offered only by Representative Kasich of Ohio or his designee, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to amendment. All points of order against the amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill, as modified, to the House with such amendment as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit, which may not include instructions.

#### POINT OF ORDER

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY). The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, respectfully, I make a point of order against House Resolution 186 on the grounds that it is in violation of House rule XI, clause 4(d).

Mr. Speaker, House rule XI, clause 4(d) provides that, and I quote,

Whenever the Committee on Rules reports a resolution repealing or amending any of the rules of the House of Representatives or part thereof it shall include in its report or in an accompanying document, number one, the text of any part of the rules of the House of Representatives which is proposed to be repealed and, number two, a comparative print of any part of the resolution making such an amendment, and any part of the rules of the House of Representatives to be amended, showing by an appropriate typographical device the omissions and insertions proposed to be made.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 186 provides that upon its adoption "Modifications to H.R. 2264, printed in part 1 of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole."

One of those modifications, Mr. Speaker, contained in the Committee on Rules report, adds a totally new title XV to the bill entitled "Budget Process."

Subtitle B of that title in the report is entitled "Amendment to the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974; Conforming Amendments."

Section 15211 of that subtitle is entitled "Conforming Amendments to the rules of the House of Representatives." The section includes six separate, permanent, not temporary but permanent, amendments to the House Rules which amend: rule X, clause 4(g); rule XI, clause 2(L)(3)(B); rule XI, clause 2(L)(6); rule XI, clause 7; rule XXIII, clause 8; and rule XLIX, clause 2.

And yet, despite the fact that this resolution, upon its adoption, amends House rules in those six different parts, nowhere in the report of the Committee on Rules for this resolution is there any kind of comparative print showing the changes being made from the existing rules as is required in House rule XI, clause 4(d), which I cited earlier today.

Mr. Speaker, it will not do to argue that this change is being made in an order of business resolution. House rule XI does not differentiate between special rules and other resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules. It only refers to "a resolution repealing or amending any rule of the House" whenever it is reported by the Committee on Rules.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution clearly makes such changes, and the report must, therefore, include a comparative print showing those changes. Otherwise, I can assure my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, as I look at all of these changes, which I have here now, 90 percent of the Members of this House have never seen this document that I have in my hand here. I know almost 100 percent on our side, and I am sure only those who might have been active last night between the hours of 2 a.m. and 4 a.m. have any idea what is in here.

So it just is not right. If we had these comparatives showing the differences of what is being changed or repealed or added, at least we could make some kind of a fair judgment.

I, therefore, urge that my point of order be sustained.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DERRICK] wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, I wish to be heard on the point of order.

The gentleman from New York [Mrs. SOLOMON] makes the point of order that the rule violates clause 4(D) of