

The way I see it, that contract was already full of holes.

Remember the Republican tax plan or their balanced budget amendment? Right where you thought they would tell you how to pay for it, there was a big, gaping hole.

And they had special kinds of holes for different people.

If you are a working family, trying to raise your kids, there is a sinkhole for your wages to fall into, but if you are looking for a capital gains cut, there is a nice loophole for you.

And you know those blackholes in outer space, those things that stuff gets sucked into and nothing comes out of? It turns out you do not need the Hubble telescope to see them.

Because the Republicans' cuts in home heating assistance for the elderly and child nutrition for the country's babies are a blackhole that is going to pull people into poverty and pain where they will never be heard from again.

So, Mr. Speaker, instead of getting a hole puncher, you should have used something to patch up the holes that were already in your contract from day one.

REPUBLICAN CONTRACT WITH AMERICA

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

Mr. RIGGS. 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; common sense 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 kept our promise.

Mr. Speaker, this is the Republican Contract With America.

IRS AND THE BURDEN OF PROOF

(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, the IRS actually had the gall to tell Congress, "If you change the burden of proof in a tax case, you will destroy our voluntary-compliance program." Right. Some kind of voluntary. Who is kidding whom?

If you do not voluntarily pay your voluntary taxes, the IRS will come in and voluntarily take your parakeet, your beagle, your golf clubs, your wife, your rubber ducky. Beam me up here. Voluntary?

Ladies and gentlemen, are they smoking dope around here or what?

My bill will say you have to substantiate your tax form, but when you go to court, you will be treated like an American citizen, innocent until proven guilty.

Voluntary? My assets.

WHAT ABOUT FOREIGN AID?

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

Mr. FUNDERBURK. Mr. Speaker, the first 100 days of the 104th Congress are over. We passed 9 of the 10 items in the Contract With America. The new majority set our country on a new course. But we did not go far enough. While we are at home for Easter, the Mexican dictatorship and New York City financiers will be raking in billions of American dollars and the lords in the Kremlin will be soaking up foreign aid while their planes ravage Chechnya and their scientists provide the Aya-tollahs with nuclear reactors.

Mr. Speaker, we desperately need a reality check. How can we seriously debate the future of student loans and farm programs while the State Department and the World Bank dispense billions of our dollars without the Congress saying one word? The \$20 billion handout to Mexico City is 20 times the value of the yearly tobacco crop in North Carolina. Is it not tragic that Bill Clinton and his establishment friends in Congress will drag hard-working tobacco farmers in my district through the wringer and give Mexican thugs and Russian autocrats billions of our money with a wink and a nod?

Mr. Speaker, if last November really was a revolution we had better come back here in May and cut off the foreign aid monster at its knees or the American people will put us out in the street.

TAX FAIRNESS

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

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, today is the 92d day of the imperial speakership.

You know, yesterday afternoon, discussing with one of the Gingrich Republicans about their tax bill, I advised them that I did not plan to vote for that tax bill. I planned to vote against it. He says, "You must be brave to be

able to go back to your district after voting against such a great tax bill."

Well, in the first place, I said, "I don't think that is a great tax bill. Second thing, it has no tax fairness in it. It doesn't lead to deficit reduction, but it explodes the deficit in out years."

I advised that Gingrich Republican I was going to vote for the Gephardt tax bill which limited the \$500 child credit to those earning \$95,000, not \$200,000. You know, in my district, the Ninth District in Missouri, middle income is not \$200,000. I do not have very many people earning \$200,000. Yet the Gingrich Republican says \$200,000 are middle income. They say that corporations should not have to pay any taxes here in the United States.

I say corporations should pay their fair taxes.

I voted for a tax fairness yesterday.

PROUD TO BE A PART OF THE CONTRACT WITH AMERICA

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

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, today is a great day on the Potomac.

This is the Contract With America, and even though a New York newspaper tells us only 38 percent of the people know what the Contract With America is, all of them know what a balanced-budget amendment is, all of them know what a real crime package is that punishes criminals instead of giving them dance lessons, all of them know what welfare reform is, and on down the line including the tax-relief package passed last night that restores hope to people with families, gives them a break, because we believe that people who have children know better how to spend that money on their children than the Federal Government does here in the beltway.

So we are very pleased to be part of this Contract With America, to see all 10 pieces passed as promised. It will be the first Congress to say we are going to do something during a campaign and then actually do it when they get to Washington.

I am very proud to restore hope to the next generation and to this generation, to be a part of this Congress and pass the Contract With America.

CONGRESS MUST BE TOLD WHAT IS IN LEGISLATION

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

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I stand in this well to admit that I was wrong, and I must correct my remarks. I have been here several times protesting the \$63 million that we heard Rupert Murdoch got slipped into the bill that was to give relief to middle Americans on their health care coverage. Well, I find out it is not \$63 million, it is more like \$38 million.

But I am still just as outraged that he would get this \$38 million rebate on the backs of the middle class.

I do not know what we can do at the end to correct this. We have introduced bills. We have tried to bring it to the floor, and today I am introducing one more bill that says in the future when this process is used to slip something in that this body never considered nor knew was in there, we must be told. I think it is unbelievable these kinds of games are going on, and I think the American public expects a whole lot more from us.

I think we are here to protect them and not to line the pockets of fat cats.

CLARIFICATION OF THE MURDOCH CONTRACT

(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, when such information as you have just heard is presented to the House floor, it needs to be responded to.

The fact of the matter is this: Mr. Murdoch was selling a property to the Tribune Co. headed by Quincy Jones, a black entrepreneur. Mr. Murdoch had two contracts for that property, one to be sold at this amount and one to be sold at another amount if he got a Treasury certificate.

The beneficiary of the Treasury certificate was the Quincy Jones operation, which would have received that property at less than the amount equal to the Treasury certificates. Mr. Murdoch was going to get precisely the same amount whether or not the certificates were ordered.

In the other body, the gentlewoman from Illinois argued that we should open the timeframe for the certificates to be allowed, and she amended the contract to open the timeframe to extend it.

The Senate insisted on her position. The House could not get her to remove her position, and so Quincy Jones is going to be the beneficiary of the \$38 million or \$65 million, whichever the amount is.

LEFT WANTING BY THE CONTRACT WITH AMERICA

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

Mr. KLINK. Mr. Speaker, let me get this contract correct. If I am a child and I happened to be born to a mother who is of the wrong age or who has been on assistance for too long, then the Contract With America leaves me wanting just because of the circumstances surrounding my birth. If I am a child and my mother would happen to depend on WIC, that money is now going to be block-granted, and 20 percent of it can be used for other things. The same thing for school lunch, if I am dependent upon school

lunches, we are now going to have 50 laboratories across this country where people will be able to take as much of that money out, 20 percent of it, and use it for paving highways and for doing all sorts of other things.

If I survive all of that under the Contract With America, Mr. Speaker, let me understand this, if I get to be 14 or 15 years old, and I want to learn the work ethic, I want a summer job, the Contract With America leaves me with no summer job and no opportunity to rebuild my community.

Let me understand that also, Mr. Speaker, that then if I want to go to college and get the same kind of federally backed loans that the Speaker and the majority leader had, now again, I am going to be left wanting by the Contract With America.

□ 1015

GET GOVERNMENT OUT OF MY LIFE

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

Mr. NORWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ran for this office because I saw a government out of control. I see a Congress who clearly did not understand, and this morning I see additional Members of Congress who do not understand. Like the people of the 10th District of Georgia, I want a government to protect our borders and help maintain order, but otherwise I want government out of my life, out of my business and, most especially out of my pocket.

Mr. Speaker, in these first 100 days, we have made significant steps forward. We have cut Government regulation and cut taxes to return more of the fruits of labor back to workers who earn them. I can tell we are making progress because the liberal Democrats are whining loud and the bureaucrats are running scared.

There is still a long way to go. Balancing the budget will not be easy. But to the people back home, I say we can take back this great Nation of ours from the people who think that government knows best; stay involved; stay with us; we will take this country back.

FURTHER EXPLANATION TO CORRECT THE RECORD

(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, I yield to the gentlewoman from Colorado.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I am very grateful to the gentleman from Wisconsin for yielding.

I want to point out and correct the record again: First of all, it does not pass the straight-face test that one Senator of the minority party could force this entire House to yield to something the House never considered

or the conferees on her side. There were 17 of these deals—18 of these deals—and this is the only one that stood. I cannot believe that one Senator has ever had that kind of power.

Second, I want to point out that this \$38 million revenue does go back to the seller. The idea of this was to give the sellers benefits if they sold to minority owners. And the idea has been, we all were going to do away with those, going to do away with all of those.

We found we did away with all of them except the one, and that owner happens to be Rupert Murdoch. He gets the benefit of this.

So let us make the record perfectly clear.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

INTRODUCTION OF PROSTATE CANCER DIAGNOSIS AND TREATMENT ACT OF 1995

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

Mr. FIELDS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Prostate Cancer Diagnosis and Treatment Act of 1995 in the hopes that we will finally do something to effectively battle prostate cancer. Prostate cancer is one of the deadliest forms of cancer for men—and yet, as men, we seem almost afraid to talk about it. More than 215,000 American men will be diagnosed with prostate cancer this year and more than 40,000 men will die from it. It is the most common form of cancer among men and the second leading cancer killer.

If you look around this Chamber—about every third male over age 50 probably already has prostate cancer in some form and does not know it; roughly one-quarter of those who are stricken, will get a life-threatening form of the disease. Most people find out about their prostate cancer too late, even though the cancer can be detected with a simple, inexpensive blood test—the P.S.A. test. This test is the most effective cancer screening marker there is; it can spot prostate cancer accurately 5 years or more before it presents a serious health problem. The American Cancer Society and several other groups recommend that everyone over age 50 get this test once a year, and General Schwarzkopf, a man who has undergone prostate surgery, said the test saved his life. Nevertheless, Medicare and veterans' health programs do not pay for this, so most of the 13 million Medicare men and a few million older veterans are not getting the care they need for early detection. My bill would fix that hole.

Finally, the budget for prostate cancer research is a pittance compared to what we are spending on other cancer research. Studies needed to identify the most effective treatment are either not being done, or will not be completed for several years. My bill would