

Then in 1993 once again President Clinton decided with the Democrat leadership that once again we ought to do something to try to fix the deficit problem. In both cases taxes were raised; and in both cases, one succeeding the other, it was the biggest tax increase in the history of our country, in 1990 trumped by 1993.

When we come and look at the books today we see that we have still got the same deficit problem because we have not done anything about spending, and by increasing taxes we have simply put a damper on the national economy.

This year, the President's report on the economy suggests that in the years ahead we can anticipate a 2.3- to 2.5-percent growth in our national economy. And, once again, many of us think on this side of the aisle and I am sure there are some on yours who believe that this is because of the bad tax policy that was put in place in 1990 and 1993.

What the Republican tax proposal for this year is, it is a growth package. It deals with capital gains to get growth. It deals with reforming the alternative minimum wage to get growth. It deals with promoting savings and investment by giving different treatment to the IRA's and putting in place what we call our super-IRA plan.

It has to do with the senior citizens earning test, and it has to do with a family tax credit for middle America so that the families of America can share in this growth opportunity along with our Government and with our Federal revenues.

So when the gentleman, the previous speaker from Illinois, Mr. DURBIN, criticized us for the 1980's, we are willing to take our share of the criticism. We are willing to look at what we did wrong in the 1980's, which was our failure to curtail spending, but we are not willing to concede, not for a minute, that good growth tax policy is what the American economy needs, and as a result, we will have the revenue to balance the budget by the year 2002.

---

#### TAX BENEFIT FOR RUPERT MURDOCH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, this weekend, the New York Daily News made some disturbing revelations about the kinds of secret, backroom deals being cut by House Republicans.

Last week, the House passed legislation that would allow tax deductions for the self-employed and repeal tax benefits for minority broadcasters.

But hidden in the conference report was one special provision that would allow Rupert Murdoch to reap tens of millions of dollars in tax benefits.

According to Sunday's New York Daily News, and I quote:

Republicans dropped their opposition to the tax break after learning Murdoch was the beneficiary of the legislation and consulting Gingrich, according to six sources involved in the negotiations.

In fact, according to an earlier New York Daily News story on Saturday, a Senate staffer is reported as saying, "the Republicans were going to kill the deal until they found out that Murdoch owned the station. Then they almost magically approved it."

Keep in mind: The Republicans claimed they opposed this kind of tax break. And in 18 other pending cases, they refused to allow these deals to go forward.

Only the case involving Rupert Murdoch's TV station in Atlanta was allowed to go through with a special tax break.

I am here today to call on Speaker NEWT GINGRICH to explain exactly why his own publisher got special treatment, and exactly why this multi-million-dollar tax break for Rupert Murdoch was allowed to secretly slip through.

For the Speaker to claim that he had to agree to a special provision that was put in by a Senator is ludicrous.

Just last week, when Democrats tried to keep a Senate provision that would stop billionaires who renounce their citizenship from avoiding their taxes, the Speaker said no.

And following lockstep with his lead, every Republican but five voted against closing this loophole for billionaires.

Now we find that hidden in this same bill was a special provision that would allow one billionaire, who just happens to be the Speaker's publisher, to reap a multi-million-dollar windfall.

Does anybody really believe that the Speaker could not do anything to stop this?

It seems to me that the lesson here is no matter which way you cut it, if you are a multimillionaire or if you are a billionaire, Republican tax bills are going to look out for you.

What we have here is a window on the whole Contract With America and the way the Gingrich Republicans operate.

This week we are going to be dealing with what the Speaker himself calls the crown jewel of the contract—a tax bill that will give more than half its benefits to people making more than \$100,000 a year.

The Gingrich Republican tax bill may be a crown jewel for the wealthy—but for the rest of America, it's fool's gold.

Last week's special windfall for Rupert Murdoch must not stand.

There is still time for the Senate to stop this multi-million-dollar boondoggle.

I am calling on the Senate to strip this provision out and send us a clean bill.

BOB DOLE should send this bill back without the special break for Rupert Murdoch.

Even more important, the Speaker himself needs to come clean, on his ties with Murdoch, on his role in this special tax break, and on the tangle of special interests that are tainting all his dealings.

This is precisely the kind of thing we warned about when NEWT GINGRICH entered his \$4.5 million book deal with Rupert Murdoch.

And this is why now, more than ever, we need a professional, nonpartisan, outside counsel to come in and sort out this whole mess.

It is looking more and more every day like the so-called Contract With America is really a contract with corporate special interests, or perhaps a contract with NEWT GINGRICH's special friends.

---

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. There being no further requests for morning business, pursuant to clause 12, rule I, the House will stand in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 11 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 2 p.m.

---

□ 1400

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska] at 2 p.m.

---

#### PRAYER

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

The beauty and refreshment of this spring day reminds us of the need for renewal and restoration in our lives. This day is Your gift, O gracious God, a gift that reminds us of Your bountiful good will to us and to all people. We are sensitive to the fresh air of spring, we are alert to the green buds that now surround us, wherever we look our senses are filled with the resurgence of life and new possibilities of our growth in faith and hope and love. Fill us, we pray, with the joy and the blessing and the light of this day, that we will walk with Your favor and be the people You would have us be. In Your name, we pray, Amen.

---

#### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

---

#### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair requests the gentleman from

North Carolina [Mr. JONES] to lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. JONES 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 PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Edwin Thomas, one of his secretaries.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Hallen, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 464. An act to make the reporting deadlines for studies conducted in Federal court demonstration districts consistent with the deadlines for pilot districts, and for other purposes; and

S. 532. An act to clarify the rules governing venue, and for other purposes.

#### REPUBLICAN CONTRACT WITH AMERICA

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

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, our Contract With America states the following:

On the first day of Congress, a Republican House will require Congress to live under the same laws as everyone else; cut committee staffs by one-third; and cut the congressional budget. We kept our promise.

It continues that in the first 100 days, we will vote on the following items: A balanced budget amendment—we kept our promise; unfunded mandates legislation—we kept our promise; line-item veto—we kept our promise; a new crime package to stop violent criminals—we kept our promise; National Security restoration to protect our freedoms—we kept our promise; Government regulatory reform—we kept our promise; commonsense legal reform to end frivolous lawsuits—we kept our promise; welfare reform to encourage work, not dependence—we kept our promise; congressional term limits to make Congress a citizen legislature—we kept our promise; family reinforcement, tax cuts for middle-income families, and the Senior Citizens' Equity Act to allow our seniors to work without Government penalty—we will do these this week.

This is our Contract With America.

#### CONGRESS MUST REGULATE COMMERCE WITH FOREIGN NATIONS

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Check this out, you promise keepers: The dollar, once valued at 234 yen has joined the *Titanic*; it is down to 86 yen.

Now check this out: All of these think tank impresarios and all of these economic gurus told Congress if you want to fix the trade problem, drive down the value of the dollar. It is so low it could walk under a closed door with a top hat on, and in Detroit the deficit keeps growing. It is not the budget deficit, it is not rescissions, it is not tax cuts.

Japan has cleaned our clock on illegal trade for years. We are in a trade war. Is America afraid to fight? This is war.

Why do we not regulate commerce with foreign nations like the Constitution charges us, Congress, and then maybe we will keep a few promises with working Americans.

I hope those gurus are in some economic unemployment line somewhere in the country.

#### CLEAN WATER ACT REAUTHORIZATION RECEIVES BIPARTISAN SUPPORT

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

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, it is becoming very clear that the environmental extremists have decided to adopt the big lie strategy to attack the clean water bill. They are saying that the bill was written behind closed doors by Republicans with industry.

Here are the facts. The clean water bill provides over \$3 billion a year to continue cleaning up America's waters.

The original cosponsors, 16 of us, 8 Republicans, 8 Democrats. The bill passed overwhelmingly in the subcommittee last week, 19 to 5, with a majority of Democrats as well as Republicans voting in favor of it. It has been an open process.

The EPA testified more than three times before our committee. In fact it was so open that the Governors' Association sent us a letter saying we commend you for the unprecedented inclusion of State and local government representatives in the process for developing a Clean Water Act reauthorization.

Now, it is true, we do want to correct the overzealous regulations, but do not be misled by the big lie. This is good legislation with strong bipartisan support.

#### UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT'S HUSKIES WIN NCAA TOURNAMENT AND NATIONAL WOMEN'S BASKETBALL TITLE

(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, yesterday the University of Connecticut's women's basketball team put the final flourish on a perfect season by winning the NCAA tournament and national women's basketball title. I join fans from all across our State in congratulating the players, the coaches, and the entire university for this historic achievement. We are so proud of you; you are true champions.

The Huskies' achievement is even more remarkable when you consider the team had to come from behind to defeat the talented Tennessee Volunteers. Either team would have made a terrific champion, but 1995 is UConn's year. In fact the Huskies' undefeated season marks only the second time in the 14-year history of the tournament that a women's team has finished the season with an unblemished record.

There was another piece of history made last night when President Clinton called to congratulate the team. It was the first time a President has called the NCAA women's champion after the title game. Let us hope that this tradition continues, along with the winning tradition of women's basketball at the University of Connecticut, the 1995 National Champions.

Go Huskies.

#### TOP 10 LIST OF PEOPLE MAKING MORE THAN \$100,000 WHO WILL GET A TAX BREAK UNDER THE REPUBLICAN PROPOSAL

(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, it looks like the Republicans are at it again: Rob from the poor to give to the rich. First it was the school lunch program; now it is college scholarships. It would not be so bad if tax breaks were going to people who really deserve them, but that is not the case. That is why I made up my top 10 list in the spirit of the times—top 10 list of people making more than \$100,000 who would get a tax break under the Republican proposal.

No. 10, big developers.

No. 9, doctors.

No. 8, wealthy landlords.

No. 7, big agri-farmers.

No. 6, corporate managers.

Remember, these are people who are going to get a tax break under the Republican proposal.

No. 5, overpaid conservative talk show hosts.

No. 4, the chairman of the local country clubs' admissions boards.

No. 3, wealthy lobbyists.

No. 2, attorneys.

And the No. 1 group that is going to get the tax break under their proposal, your local Congressman, because they make over \$100,000.

Do you think they need a tax break? I do not.