

Toys for Tots program is one which we should all support.

Toys for Tots was started in 1947 by Major William Hendricks in Los Angeles County. He began the program through the Marine Corps Reserve when he saw that there was no other program which provided toys for children on Christmas morning. The program expanded throughout the country just one year later. Today, having provided toys to over 100 million children since its inception, Toys for Tots reaches around the world. The Marine Corps Reserve has carried forth its motto of *Semper Fidelis*—"Always Faithful"—to their support for children.

No national program becomes successful without the active involvement of key people in each locality. Sergeant Greenleaf has done an outstanding job of running the program in my home county, Bay County, since 1980. That first year he helped bring smiles to 263 children, and last year helped bring more than 24,500 toys to nearly 6,500 children. He did this as a volunteer, in addition to his duties as a Bay City police officer.

And at this time of year, he puts in enough hours to rival Santa himself, as he pulls double duty between the time as a police officer and the hours necessary to make Toys for Tots the continuing success that it is. His belief that no child should wake up Christmas morning without a smile is a philosophy that all of us should support.

Toys for Tots is a wonderful program that is in many of our home communities. I urge all of our colleagues to actively support this annual campaign and make sure to provide an extra thank you to Gunnery Sergeant Robert K. Greenleaf and his colleagues responsible for each of these local programs.

#### THE JOB CREATION AND WAGE ENHANCEMENT ACT

**HON. BILL ARCHER**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, January 4, 1995*

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, today I am proud to introduce the Job Creation and Wage Enhancement Act. This bill is an important component of the Contract With America.

For the past several decades, Federal taxes, regulations, and mandates have increasingly limited job creation, suppressed wages, and stifled economic growth. This bill is an important step in reversing this trend.

The Job Creation and Wage Enhancement Act would cut taxes and government redtape. It recognizes that the way to unleash the American economy is by lowering taxes and getting government out of the way.

First, the bill would cut taxes on capital gains. Investors who sell a capital asset would have a 50-percent capital gains deduction. In addition, capital assets would be indexed for inflation, ending the unfair practice of taxing gains due to inflation. Taxpayers who sell their homes at a loss could deduct that loss as a capital loss.

Second, the bill would increase depreciation deductions for business equipment. Currently, depreciation deductions do now allow businesses to recover the true economic cost of their business investment. The bill would increase depreciation deductions to approach

the economic equivalent of expensing. The bill would also increase to \$25,000 the amount a small business could expense annually.

The bill would raise the current estate and gift tax exemption equivalent to \$750,000. It would also clarify the home office deduction in instances where the taxpayer conducts essential administrative or management activities in his or her home.

The bill also would empower taxpayers to allocate a portion of their tax liability to a public debt reduction fund. These funds would be strictly earmarked for national debt reduction. Under the law, Congress would be required to cut spending equal to the amount designated by taxpayers. If these cuts are not realized, an across-the-board sequester would be imposed.

Significant regulatory relief would also be provided by the bill. Federal agencies would be required to assess the risks and cost of regulations they impose. Federal agencies would be forced to announce the cost of their policies and to complete regulatory impact analyses.

Congress doesn't get off the hook either. Congress would be required to report the cost of mandates it imposes on State and local governments.

The bill would reduce the paperwork burden imposed on American businesses by 5 percent and limit the government's ability to impose undue burdens on private property owners.

Since I was first elected to Congress, I have been fighting for capital gains tax relief and other savings and investment incentives. This bill provides these incentives. It lowers taxes on investment and reins in government regulation to create additional jobs, raise wages, and recognize private property rights.

Last November, the voters told us that they wanted lower taxes and less government. This bill, along with other bills in the Contract With America, provides just that.

#### INTRODUCING THE UNFUNDED MANDATE REFORM ACT OF 1995

**HON. WILLIAM F. CLINGER, JR.**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

**HON. THOMAS M. DAVIS**

OF VIRGINIA

**HON. ROB PORTMAN**

OF OHIO

**HON. GARY A. CONDIT**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, January 4, 1995*

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Speaker, today we are introducing legislation to help end the practice of Congress imposing crippling mandates on State and local governments without knowing the cost of such mandates or providing the funding to carry them out. For too long, Congress has imposed its own agenda on State and local governments without taking any responsibility for the costs. And the costs are staggering—in 1993, unfunded Federal mandates cost States tens of billions of dollars, counties approximately \$4.8 billion, and cities \$6.5 billion. But cost is not the full story. Unfunded mandates force State and local governments to reduce vital services and/or in-

crease taxes, revamp their budgets and reorder their priorities. This is not the kind of Federal-State-local government partnership the Founders envisioned. We need a new kind of federalism.

Our bill, the "Unfunded Mandate Reform Act of 1995," requires authorizing legislation containing a mandate on State and local governments or on the private sector to include a Congressional Budget Office estimate of the costs of such mandate. Any mandate imposing annual aggregate costs of \$50 million or more on State and local governments would be subject to a vote on the House floor and, unless a majority of Congress overrides a point of order, the mandate must be funded or those mandates will not become effective. Alternatively, an authorizing committee may reduce the programmatic or financial responsibilities of State and local governments consistent with the level of Federal funding that can be provided. Any mandate that does become effective in 1 year shall be repealed at the beginning of the first fiscal year for which funding has not been provided.

This mandate relief legislation also requires each agency to assess the effects of Federal regulations on State and local government and the private sector and to minimize regulatory burdens imposed by such mandates. Federal agencies must prepare, under our legislation, statements describing, among other things, the costs and benefits of mandates to State and local governments and to the private sector. This is designed to make the regulatory process more sensible and accountable.

Although the mechanisms in our legislation apply to prospective mandates, we have also created a commission to review all existing mandates for purposes of streamlining or eliminating those that no longer make sense. The Commission on Unfunded Federal Mandates will make recommendations to the Congress within 1 year of its formation.

Currently, Members of Congress consider legislation containing unfunded mandates without any information on their cost to State and local governments and the private sector, without a separate debate in committee and on the House floor and without recorded votes on the issue. As a result, there is no honesty in the process, no accountability for this irresponsible practice. Our legislation will change all that. It will also establish a sensible and long-overdue rule that Congress shall not impose Federal mandates on State and local governments without providing adequate funding to comply with such mandates.

#### PLAY BALL

**HON. PAT WILLIAMS**

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, January 4, 1995*

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, big league ballplayers, major league team owners: play ball!

Today, we are witness to a collective bargaining impasse that endangers not only the 1995 season but the game itself.

I have today introduced legislation to provide mandatory and binding arbitration if the parties fail to reach agreement.

Collective bargaining in this country works very well. The public, through their government, should intervene only in a crisis. We now have reached a crisis in the well-being of our national pastime.

# INTRODUCTION OF THE REGULATORY SUNSET ACT OF 1995

**HON. JIM CHAPMAN**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, January 4, 1995*

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I am pleased to introduce the Regulatory Sunset Act of 1995. This legislation, which I first introduced in the 103d Congress, will put a framework in place to curb the excessive costs of both current and future federal regulations. The concept is simple.

Regulations which are obsolete, inconsistent, duplicative, or impede competition will be abolished or modified. Not only will future regulations, which cause an unnecessary burden be affected, but the thousands of existing regulations would be placed under intense review and scrutiny by the Regulatory Sunset Act of 1995. As the 104th Congress begins the process of reviewing the Federal regulatory system, it is important that this combined focus not be forgotten.

This issue of Federal regulatory reform has not been born overnight. Since 1978, each administration has tried to curtail the impact of Federal regulations. Unfortunately, these attempts have not made much of a difference as total regulatory costs exceed \$500 billion annually. This burden on the American taxpayer must be reduced, and the only way to effectively do that is to take a serious look at existing regulations.

I believe my legislation achieves the goal of reducing excessive existing regulations, while ensuring future regulations are not overburdensome. The Regulatory Sunset Act of 1995 will mandate the automatic termination of agency regulations that do not measure up to criteria outlined in the bill. All existing regulations will sunset in 7 years unless reauthorized and new regulations promulgated after enactment of this bill will be subject to a three year sunset unless reauthorized. Once a regulation has been reauthorized, it will be subject to continuous review every 7 years thereafter.

The bill also establishes a Regulatory Sunset Commission that will review agency recommendations on regulations and has the final authority over whether regulations should be continued, terminated, or modified. If the Commission recommends modification of a regulation, it provides time for agencies to make appropriate modifications so the regulation can then be continued.

While certain Federal regulations are necessary to meet statutory requirements and protect the environment and health and safety of individuals, excessive regulatory burdens have impacted our ability to ensure an expanding economy. It is past time to address regulations that have unintended adverse impacts. I urge my colleagues to cosponsor the Regulatory Sunset Act of 1995 and join me in taking a new approach to reforming our regulatory program.

## "POVERTY'S TRAP"

**HON. JOHN D. DINGELL**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, January 4, 1995*

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I agree with your statement before the House that today is an historic day. In the elections of 1992 and 1994, Americans gave their elected leaders a clear signal that they expect the Federal Government to do a better job in spending the Nation's treasure and tending to the needs of its citizens.

As we continue the debate begun by President Clinton, Vice President GORE, and the 103d Congress to reform the operations of the Federal Government, I believe it is important that we not lose track of needs of ordinary Americans. People who must live with the fears and anxieties created by job insecurity, global competition, and rapid technological change clearly feel caught in the middle of these forces. Their faith in Government to help solve these problems is badly shaken.

Two years ago, the President and Congress began a process of deep budget cuts and Government reorganization. Contrary to assertions made about failure, the 103d Congress put forth a \$500 billion deficit reduction plan which has more than met its target—it is now estimated that the 1993 deficit reduction plan will result in close to \$700 billion in savings. Congress achieved true reductions in Government spending in a manner which lessened the deficit, reduced interest rates, and allowed capital expansion and vigorous economic growth—while containing growth-killing inflation.

What does this mean for middle Americans? Employment levels are at their highest in years. In fact, between January, 1993 and September, 1994, more jobs were created than in the previous 4 years combined. Lower interest payments on the Federal debt meant banks could make loans to small businesses and families at lower rates. Millions of homeowners were able to save thousands of dollars on their home mortgages. Retail sales were up more than four times as compared to the previous 4-year period. By all indications, the 1993 deficit reduction plan continues to give direct benefits to American families.

As the 104th Congress begins its debate to further reduce the deficit and make Government services more effective, it is crucial that the changes adopted by this Congress help those Americans who are still trying to catch up from the excesses of the failed supply-side economic strategies. Mr. Speaker, I commend to your attention to an editorial published earlier this week in the Detroit Free Press, which very succinctly lays out my belief that Congress must fight to protect the interests of our Nation's working families. As this debate about our future begins, let us not forget them.

[From the Detroit Free Press, Jan. 2, 1995]

POVERTY'S TRAP—THE POOR STILL GET  
POORER, EVEN IN A HEALTHY ECONOMY

When Michigan's unemployment rate is at an unprecedented low, why are so many people in our state still poor?

By 1988, as the supply-side Reagan administration drew to a close, some observers were fretting that the share of national income held by the poorest fifth of U.S. households had dropped to 4.6 percent. But that

figure has declined even further, to just 3.6 percent by 1993.

Meanwhile, the richest 20 percent of U.S. households now control nearly half the nation's income, the highest percentage recorded since this statistic has been kept. The numbers also show a deterioration in the proportion of wealth held by people in and around the middle.

Some analysts argue that this divergence reflects an educated, well-paid elite pulling ahead of the rest of American society. But the statistics also may suggest how many jobs are not what they used to be: More jobs are part-time, or temporary, or full-time but without benefits. Even solid jobs can vanish in the blink of an eye; ask your neighbors who work at Kmart and Perry headquarters about that.

Michigan has had plenty of experience with what happens when factory jobs dwindle and corporations downsize. The next job is rarely as good. So it's not surprising that our cities, where these trends come together, are especially afflicted by poverty and the maldistribution of income.

Among the nation's 10 biggest cities, Detroit ranked second only to New York in disparity of income between rich and poor, according to an analysis of 1990 Census figures recently prepared for the New York Times. Detroit's top fifth of earners had the lowest average income among their counterparts in the largest cities. And Detroit's poorest group was an even more distant also-ran in its category.

We dare not underestimate the economic difficulties facing urban residents and people who struggle everywhere else in Michigan. Good jobs may not be where they live. It may take a succession of jobs, or a combination of jobs, to sustain a family. And job loss can hit anywhere, anytime.

A booming overall economy may be a necessary condition for reducing poverty. But as too many Michiganders know, it is not by itself a sufficient condition. Elected officials, and the people who put them in office, ought not forget that.

# INTRODUCTION OF THE GUN BAN REPEAL ACT OF 1995

**HON. JIM CHAPMAN**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, January 4, 1995*

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing—along with 21 original cosponsors—the Gun Ban Repeal Act of 1995. I encourage Members to join us in cosponsoring this important legislation.

As you know, the 103d Congress enacted the ban on so-called assault weapons and certain ammunition feeding devices by the narrowest of margins. The Gun Ban Repeal Act will undo that well-intentioned, but misguided, approach to combating gun violence in our society.

My legislation will delete from Public Law the provisions which outlaw the specified firearms and ammunition feeding devices. This bill will effect no other provision of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994, and it will do nothing to hinder the ability of the House to enact new crime control legislation. The Act simply serves as the proper vehicle for the majority of the membership of the House—both Republicans and Democrats—to remove the most objectionable gun control measure enacted by the previous Congress.