

benefit of future Federal retirees. Instead, it will go into the general treasury to finance tax cuts for others.

Fact: 50 percent of Federal employees are part of the FERS retirement system which everyone agrees has absolutely no unfunded liability. Nevertheless, these workers are subjected to the same tax hike and will get no additional retirement benefit or security.

Fact: CRS has determined that the Federal retirement system does not have an unfunded liability problem and faces no threat of insolvency. These findings have been verified and confirmed by the GAO.

H.R. 1215 includes a huge, unfair tax hike selectively imposed on 2 million working Americans. This tax hike does not belong in a tax reduction bill and must be defeated. I will oppose any rule that does not address this tax hike, and I will oppose any so-called Tax Fairness bill that arbitrarily punishes these 2 million Federal workers.

TAX CUTS FOR THE RICH, THE CROWN JEWEL OF THE REPUBLICAN CONTACT

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

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, Speaker NEWT GINGRICH, the Speaker of this House, has called the tax cut for the rich bill that we are going to be debating today the crown jewel of the Republican Contract on America. Well, he is also quoted in the Washington Times yesterday. Speaker NEWT GINGRICH quoted fairness is the animating principle, end quote, of the bill says House speaker NEWT GINGRICH who attacks the Democrats' argument as, quote, class warfare, unquote.

□ 1200

Well, I am going to leave it to the American people to decide if it is fair to take \$15 billion of financial aid from the children of middle and low income families, who would want to use that financial aid to go to college, and use the \$15 billion to allow some of our biggest corporations in America to pay no taxes. Corporations like Anheuser-Busch, Boeing, du Pont, General Dynamics, PepsiCo, Texaco, Westinghouse, and Xerox—all of them would be allowed to pay no taxes under this bill.

Is it fair to take \$50 billion of heat and housing aid from elders and nutrition from young people and child care and subsistence from poor people and give that to the wealthiest families who make \$200,000 a year? Is it fair?

TAX FAIRNESS MEANS TAX RELIEF FOR SENIOR CITIZENS

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

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, the time has come to provide tax relief for all Americans, especially for our senior

citizens. Today our grandparents are used as money trees by the Federal Government. Instead of treating our elders with respect, our Government has come to look at them as just another tax target.

For instance, the earnings limit imposed on working seniors actually discourages work. The tax is so unfair that if a senior citizen earns over \$11,000 in a year, he or she will be assessed a marginal tax rate of 56 percent. That is 56 percent; that is ridiculous. This rate is twice the rate that millionaires pay.

Excuse me, but I think there is something wrong with this picture.

In our Contract with America, Republicans promised to reduce the tax burden imposed on senior citizens. We are committed to tax fairness and to protecting our grandparents. We owe it to those who fought the wars, raised the families, and built the Nation to protect them from an out-of-control Federal Government bent on taxing the American people into the poorhouse.

Let us cut taxes now.

AWARD OF PURPLE HEART TO SERVICE MEMBERS KILLED IN IRAQI "NO FLY" ZONE INCIDENT

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

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend the Army and Air Force for their decision to award the Purple Heart posthumously to members of the Armed Forces killed on April 14, 1994, in a friendly fire incident in the northern Iraqi no fly zone. Fourteen American service members on peacekeeping duty—were killed when two American F-15C fighter aircraft accidentally shot down two United States Black Hawk helicopters in northern Iraq.

Mrs. Kaye Mounsey, the widow of Army WO Eric Mounsey—a pilot of one of the helicopters—resides in Culver City in my congressional district. I met with Mrs. Mounsey last summer and she related to me the concern which she and other family members shared about the initial decision of the military not to award the Purple Heart.

As a result of language inserted in last year's defense appropriations conference report and the consistent advocacy of family members that decision has now been reversed. It was the appropriate thing to do.

I am pleased that the services have agreed to recognize the sacrifice of these members of the Armed Forces. It is the appropriate thing to do. While there is little we can do to compensate for the loss of a husband, brother, sister or child, it is essential that we acknowledge the Nation's gratitude for the ultimate sacrifice that these Americans gave in service to their country.

The role and complexity of United States Armed Forces missions have evolved and it is important that the services acknowledge that

evolution. While the criteria for award of one of the Armed Forces' highest honors must remain high, I commend the services for recognizing that the Iraqi incident, occurring in the presence of hostile forces, meets the criteria for award of the Purple Heart.

A HISTORY LESSON IN ECONOMICS

(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, of course, the Democrats and the White House are concerned about the circus coming to town. They hate having the competition. Besides, they might get stomped on by a charging elephant. They already had that experience in November.

But have they no shame? For the past 40 years, while controlling the House, the Democrats had deficit spending, and now suddenly they are deficit hawks concerned about a tax cut that might hurt the economy or the deficit, according to them.

Of course, we know that Democrats love taxes, so they do not want to give up on any tax revenue. But I would say to my friends on that side of the aisle, if they would look at history, economic history, they would see that tax cuts actually increase revenues.

From 1956 to 1969, taxes were down, and GDP increased. From 1970 to 1982, taxes were up and GDP went down, revenue from taxes went down. From 1983 to 1988, revenue from taxes went up and taxes were down. But then after the 1989-90 tax bill, taxes went up and revenues went down.

Mr. Speaker, this is economic history. It is not partisan politics. I would be happy to share it with any of the Members.

THE CIRCUS AND THE GOP SHARE THE SPOTLIGHT

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

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, much as been said this morning about the circus coming to town, and it is true. As we speak, the circus is out here on the Capitol Grounds, celebrating its 125th anniversary, complete with clowns and elephants performing tricks.

While the elephants are outside performing their tricks, the GOP elephants in this Chamber are performing their tricks on the American people. They say they are for balancing the budget, but instead they are about to pass legislation giving tax breaks for the rich, at the expense of the rest of the American people. These tax cuts for the wealthy, which the Speaker calls his crown jewel, will surely explode the national deficit and at the same time cut or eliminate college student loans, take food out of the mouths

of schoolchildren, cut funds for education, and decimate senior citizens and veterans' health care.

The Speaker is planning a big speech and festivities celebrating the end of the 100 days of the contract on America. These Republican circus festivities may not be as entertaining as the real circus, but to paraphrase a very famous song, Mr. Speaker: "Where are the clowns and who are the clowns?"

Mr. Speaker, it looks like they are here.

PASSAGE OF THE TAX BILL HOLDS OUT HOPE FOR NEXT YEAR'S TAXPAYERS

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

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I want to talk to the folks at home, my clients that I left at home. I am a tax consultant, and at this time of the year I am usually up 24 hours a day practically helping people get through the maze of taxes and trying to explain to them why every year they keep going up and up and up.

I want to tell you next year what is going to happen when you have your tax return filed. It will be different than it is this year if this bill passes today.

First of all, when you get to the end, you are going to get to take \$500 off per child, but really that just means you get to keep \$500 of your hard-earned money that the Government is not going to take. You can buy a washing machine with it or you can take the kids to Disneyland, but you will spend the money and that will cause tax revenues to come into the economy. Do you trust you better to spend your money and spur the economy, or do you think it is better to have it go into the big buildings that are being built all the way around me here in Washington, DC, filling them with the bureaucracy? Which one is better? Which one is better for the economy? Which one can use the money, the Government or you who were going to sell or were about to sell that rental that you fixed up and you are holding it because you do not want it all to go away in taxes because of the huge tax increase that was passed in 1986 by this side of the aisle? I want to tell you that next year you can actually sell it and we will not keep all the money if we pass this legislation.

I encourage you to call your legislator and tell him, "Pass this middle class tax cut, and do it today."

FEDERAL WORKERS THREATENED WITH TAX INCREASES TO GIVE TAX CUTS TO OTHERS

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

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, 1 hour ago we turned and faced this flag. We pledged allegiance to it, and we pledged liberty and justice for all.

Mr. Speaker, where is the justice when we take an average of \$5,000 from each of America's civil servants in order to pay a tax cut of about \$1,000 over the next 5 years to America's taxpayers? Where is the justice to increase taxes on America's civil servants and reduce their benefits in order to provide tax cuts for other people?

There is no justice, and there is no integrity, Mr. Speaker, when 8 years ago America's civil servants were faced with one of their most important decisions, the financial security of their wives and children when they retire, and we promised them we would never again change their retirement system.

Mr. Speaker, we are going to do that today. Where is the justice? Where is the integrity of this institution?

I urge my colleagues to vote against this tax cut bill and against the rule.

AN AVERSION TO TAX CUTS

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

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I do not know why Democrats hate employers, but they do. Just listen to what they say about tax cuts.

I do not know why Democrats hate middle-class two-earner families, but they do. Just listen to what they say about tax cuts.

I do not know why Democrats hate small business men and women, but they do. Just listen to what they say about tax cuts.

I do not know why Democrats hate success, but they do. Just listen to what they say about tax cuts.

I do not know why Democrats hate the guy who gets lucky and wins the lottery, but they do. Just listen to what they say about tax cuts.

Democrats start with the idea that everything earned by everybody is theirs to spend. Democrats believe that every tax is a good thing because it allows them to do what they see as good things, and they hate anyone who gets money back from their tax bill because it takes away from their ability to spend.

Democrats love taxes. They hate to reduce taxes, and they hate the thought that there are Americans who would like to keep more of the money they earn for themselves.

THE RUPERT MURDOCH TAX BREAK

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

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, this House passed legislation that provided for a \$63 million gift to Rupert Murdoch. It was done in the most slea-

zy, offensive way to this institution. And, yes, it was done.

Mr. ARCHER, what a shame on you, and what a shame on this institution, and what a shame on the Speaker that it was done.

We have the ability to correct what was done. Yesterday I attempted to offer a joint resolution to take out that obscene provision. I have tried to do that today. I have spoken to Mr. ARMEY this morning and asked for his consent, because it does require unanimous consent to take out that provision.

I urge you, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, who talk in good faith about this institution and about how things need to change, to do in deed what your words have said. Mr. ARCHER, I ask you—you are sitting here right now—to do in deeds what your words and your Speaker have said, take out that provision.

MEMBER'S RESPONSE TO CHARGES INVOLVING TAX PRO- VISION

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

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman has used my name and violated the rules of the House because remarks are supposed to be addressed to the Speaker, not to individual Members, and, second, what he just said is totally distorted.

The amendment to which he refers was introduced in the conference committee by the Democratic Senator from Illinois, CAROL MOSELEY-BRAUN, and pushed by the—

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SOLOMON. Regular order.

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CAMP). Regular order has been called. The gentleman will suspend. Mr. ARCHER has the floor.

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to answer to the American people why you did what you did?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida is out of order.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, regular order.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, is anarchy acceptable procedure on the floor of the House? Is interruption and anarchy the basis on which we will conduct our business on the floor of the House? I hope not.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may not be interrupted. The gentleman from Texas may proceed.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman has totally distorted what he spoke of. He should go to the Democrat Senator from Illinois, Senator CAROL MOSELEY-BRAUN, and ask her why she insisted and why the Senate insisted, in order to be able to get this conference report out, on this provision