

Margaret Carlson said, "It was pandering of the worst sort, and it's indefensible."

Morton Kondracke said, "It's evidence of a character disorder on Bill Clinton's part."

Mr. Speaker, candidate Bill Clinton promised a middle-class tax cut, but then President Bill Clinton raised taxes on the American people. This week the Republican majority will deliver on those promised tax cuts, and it is about time.

WE CANNOT ALLOW THIS RECONCILIATION TO TAKE OUR ECONOMY HOSTAGE

(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, today, as we begin debating the reconciliation, we are debating nothing less than the path the United States will take in the future. On issues from education to the environment, health care to nutrition, the choices we make will have an impact for many years.

But of all the choices we make, none is more critical than this: We cannot allow our very significant differences over reconciliation to take our economy hostage. We cannot allow a failure to raise the debt ceiling to force America into default.

I want to make just two simple points (about this): First, no matter how stringent the budget action we take this week, the debt ceiling will still have to be raised. There is no way to avoid it without pushing us into default.

And second, no one knows what the consequences of default could be because it has never happened before. I, for one, see a real potential for worldwide economic disruption. I urge my colleagues to avoid politics or grandstanding on this incredibly important issue.

TAXES ARE KILLING THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

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

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Speaker, enough of the rhetoric from the other side. We are engaged in a great debate here about the budget, about the issue of tax cuts or deficit relief.

Mr. Speaker, I just heard the minority leader come to this floor and say the Republicans were out of touch. He said they ought to take a step out and talk to real working Americans.

Mr. Speaker, he did not know what I did last weekend because last weekend I spent hours in front of grocery stores and drug stores in any district, and I asked the American people the question my colleagues and I are debating, "Do you need tax relief?" And their answer, and I did this in a working-class

neighborhood in my district with real people, was that we need tax relief.

Mr. Speaker, one of them said, "Taxes are killing the American people."

Now the other side calls this tax relief for the rich, but that is garbage, and they know it. Rich people do not have any more children than poor people.

As young ladies walked up to me with one baby in their arms and another dragging along behind them, I asked them, "Could you use a thousand dollars' tax credit?"

Mr. Speaker, they said to me, "You bet I could."

I ask my colleagues, "Whose money is it, and who can better spend it?" That side says government can spend it better. I say we can spend it better by giving it to the American people.

WELCOME TO THE GINGRICH REVOLUTION

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

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, my Republican colleagues say their tax package benefits the middle class. I guess it all depends on how you define middle class.

In today's Washington Post one Republican Congressman explains that GOP tax credits for people making \$200,000 a year are not tax breaks for the wealthy, because people making \$200,000 a year are not wealthy, they are lower middle class.

The Congressman is quoted as saying: "When I see someone who is making anywhere from \$300,000 to \$750,000 a year, that's middle class."

If Republicans consider a person making \$750,000 a year as middle class, I am beginning to understand how they can claim that this budget helps the middled class. In fact, by GOP calculations, NEWT GINGRICH might qualify for food stamps. Except there would not be food stamps, because they are being cut to help out those poor, struggling families making \$750,000 a year. Welcome to the Gingrich revolution.

A PATRIOTIC OBJECTION

(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, tomorrow a courageous young man named Michael New is to be arraigned for a court martial.

Mr. New's offense is that he refused to wear the blue uniform of the United Nations on a peacekeeping mission to Macedonia.

He has not refused to go overseas on the peacekeeping mission as ordered.

He simply has taken the position that his oath upon entering military service was to the United States—not the United Nations—and he wanted to wear his U.S. Army uniform.

Obviously, this young man loves America, and he has taken a very patriotic stand.

Most Americans believe that the young men and women in our Armed Forces should not be sent overseas except under the command of American generals and admirals.

The Members of Congress who are the most concerned with the treatment of Mr. New are generally the Members who are among the strongest supporters of the U.S. military.

Our Armed Forces are going to squander a great deal of public and congressional support if they continue to prosecute Michael New.

They could easily have found other duty for someone who was making a reasonable, principled, and patriotic objection as was Mr. New.

RECONCILIATION WITH A "W"

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

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I talked about the words that the Gingrich revolution uses to sneak up on people and make them think that they are all warm fuzzies. Reconciliation is one of those words. It sounds so warm and wonderful, but let me say, unless you are in the middle class that the Republicans have had defined by them, by the gentleman from North Carolina, Congressman HEINEMAN, as those people from \$300,000 a year to \$750,000, unless you are in that middle class, reconciliation is spelled this way for you.

This is really "wreconciliation" for the middle class. That is where I am, and I think we need to go into this much further and point it out before this all happens and before people are lulled to sleep.

What happens to the elderly? Boom. What happens to families? Boom. What happens to children? Boom. We are going to wreck families, children, and all sorts of people's sustainable income that has kept them in what we define as the middle class.

So, pull it away, and away they fall. This is wreconciliation; do not be fooled by the word.

THE TRUTH ABOUT BUDGET RECONCILIATION

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

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, Jay Thomas, who lives in Wichita, KS, said, "I would just like to know where I could go to hear the truth," and, as we heard before, supposedly we snuck up on people, because he heard that nutrition programs were being cut and that children would starve, but there have been no reports of children starving. In fact, nutrition programs are up 4 percent in the Republican budget.

My colleagues heard that Medicare was at a \$270 billion cut. Yet it has gone from \$4,800 per year to \$6,700 per year with more people in the system in 7 years, an increase. Plus it has a lockbox provision so any savings goes right back into providing more health care and not for tax breaks for the rich like we would hear some other people allegedly saying.

And tax breaks for the rich; let us talk about that. When he knows that women who have three children are driving to work this morning so they can provide for those children and the tax breaks, I want that young woman to know that she will get \$1,500, \$1,500, of a tax break. She is not rich, she is poor.

So where is the credibility? Listen, Jay. The truth is that we are going to balance the budget to preserve a future for the children. We are going to preserve and protect Medicare. We are going to reform welfare, requiring work, bringing the work ethic back in, and we are going to give tax breaks to families, all under the 7-year balanced budget Reconciliation Act.

□ 1130

SUPPORT THE COALITION BUDGET

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

Mr. PAYNE of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, if you could vote for a bill that would balance the budget in 7 years, cut the deficit faster and deeper than any plan now on the table, and achieve real budget process reforms, would you?

That's the choice every Member of this House will face tomorrow when the House votes on the Budget Reconciliation Act. We can vote for the bill that was written by the Republican leadership, or we can vote for a better plan, the substitute bill that was developed by the conservative Democratic Coalition.

It is the coalition's budget that spends less of our constituents' hardearned money over 7 years.

It is the coalition's budget that contains real budget process reforms like a line item veto that applies right now and a deficit reduction lockbox that can't be picked.

And it is the coalition's budget says its wrong to borrow money from our kids to pay for big tax cuts right now.

But that's not all, Mr. Speaker.

Because the coalition rejects tax cuts and doesn't backload its spending cuts as the Republican plan does, we are able to provide \$100 billion more for Medicare and \$100 billion more for Medicaid than their plan. And we don't slash spending for student loans and agriculture.

The conservative Democratic Coalition's budget is tough and it is fair. It's a better deal for your constituents and mine. I urge my colleagues to vote for it.

SUPPORT TAX CUTS

(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, last week in my home State of Texas the President admitted what Republicans and the American people already knew—he raised taxes too much.

Two short years ago Mr. Clinton and the Democrats raised America's taxes by \$258 billion, the largest tax increase in American history.

Republicans now want to return that money back to hardworking Americans by providing tax cuts for families, for seniors, and for America's jobcreating businesses. It is time to put the people back in charge of their wallets. Let's get government out of our pockets.

It's nice to see the President admit his own mistake. Fortunately it's not too late for him to right his wrong, he can let all Americans keep more of what they earn. Support tax cuts and sign the budget. It's good for America.

REPUBLICAN BUDGET CUTS SCORN RURAL AMERICA

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

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, this week we will vote on proposed budget cuts that ignore the past, disregard the present, and worse: Scorns the future, especially for rural America.

Scorn is a harsh word to use in describing the impact of Republican budget cuts on our children, but consider what these cuts will do to rural children in North Carolina.

Almost a quarter of a million needy children in North Carolina, and 4½ million nationwide will be dropped from Medicaid.

More than 60,000 North Carolina young people will be denied a summer job, 4,000 will lose Head Start, and all 129 school districts will lose money for Safe and Drug Free Schools, affecting threequarters of a million rural children.

Nutrition assistance for North Carolina children is cut by more than 20 percent, \$500 million, affecting 320,000 children.

When combined with housing cuts affecting thousands of North Carolina children, the elimination of heating assistance from 200,000 children, and the denial of child care help for 20,000 children—scorn may not be a harsh enough word—cruel and inhuman might be more appropriate choices.

HELP THE POOR BY CUTTING TAXES

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

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, as we debate tax cuts this week, I think we should look to the example of President Reagan.

In 1981, President Reagan cut taxes, setting off the longest peacetime expansion in American history. What happened during the ensuing decade?

More than 19 million high paying jobs were created.

Real median family income increased 13 percent.

The number of Americans trapped in poverty dropped by 4 million.

The rich carried a greater percentage of the tax burden.

Now listen carefully. Of those in the bottom fifth income bracket in 1979, 65 percent jumped at least two income brackets during the 1980's. And more made it to the top income bracket than stayed in the bottom.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle: Do you want to help the poor? Well then, cut taxes.

FOCUS SHOULD BE ON THE CHILDREN

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

Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, Hubert Humphrey once said that "the moral test of government is how that government treats those who are in the dawn of life, the children; those who are in the twilight of life, the elderly; and those who are in the shadows of life—the sick, the needy and the handicapped."

I would like to focus on the children. In the United States today, a child is born into poverty every 30 seconds.

Yet my Republican colleagues are systematically throwing millions of lower middle class families with children into poverty.

By cutting Medicaid, school lunch programs, student loans, low income heating assistance, the earned income tax credit, Federal housing assistance, aid for families with dependent children, and education they are cutting short the hopes of the children of this country.

These cuts will push millions of children into the shadows of life, and into lives of uncertainty, insecurity, and poverty.

In the United States, every 30 seconds a baby is born into poverty. Are we now shooting for every 15 seconds?

At some point, Mr. Speaker, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle must ask themselves if giving a tax break to the wealthiest Americans is worth the cost of our children.

PASSING THE RECONCILIATION BILL IS THE BEST THING CONGRESS CAN DO FOR THE AMERICAN ECONOMY AND THE POOR

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