

Make the telephone calls on October 23rd when we have the National Education Funding Support Day. Organize some kind of group and demonstrate your concern by going to a school and linking up with a school. Some people have gone to schools and provided books, gifts. Other people have helped programs in schools. There is one group of parking agents who have said they will provide a week of safe conduct to certain schools in certain parts of the cities that have had trouble with kids not being able to get to school safely.

Whatever your particular organization can do, do it. We are urging that churches adopt a school and link up with what we call net day. There is a net day project that most of you have heard about. Net day means that that is a day when a locale or a State pledges to wire all of its schools, to provide the wiring necessary for the schools to have appropriate computers and for the schools to link up with the Internet.

A minimum net day effort is to wire the library of the school and five classrooms. So let us have some net days on October 23, then for the period between October 23 and the middle of November, in the middle of November we have National Education Week, from October 23 to the middle of November. Try to mobilize and get together the necessary ingredients and elements to wire your school, to wire the library and wire four classrooms. That is what net day is all about.

At the same time, you might consider the fact that there is a campaign on called the campaign to get the E rate. The E rate means a rate for the wired schools, for their being able to utilize the services, whether they are online services or whatever to come in the future at a reduced rate.

All schools and libraries, according to the law passed by the Congress, we passed the law which says the FCC must work out a way for all schools and libraries to get a reduced rate, to be accommodated. It does not spell out how the FCC should do that, so the Secretary of Labor has proposed that they do it for free to all schools and libraries. It will be easier to administer that way, and what the companies will be doing is developing future customers.

Madam Speaker, we have massive numbers of customers that, if they make it easy for them to get the necessary wiring and the cost of using the Internet and the various services is zero for the schools, then the kinds of people they will develop in the schools will be customers in the future forever. People spend 12 years in school, but they live two or three times that long. If they learn how to use these various facilities, they will be creating a market for themselves.

So we say the E rate should not just be a discount rate, but for schools and libraries why not have it completely

free? And that is one proposal I would like to see us support. Secretary Riley has a proposal. If we do not get that, then there are various discounts that are being proposed that we will also fight for.

The FCC will make this decision sometime within the next 2 months, so it is important, as we participate in National Education Funding Support Day, to understand how important that is. That is a once in a generation time activity. Once you get that kind of benefit, it goes on and on, and it has implications for many years and many generations to come.

We talk a lot about how costly these new educational technology items are, computers, et cetera. And it is true they cost so much more than a desk and chair and book. In New York City we are struggling with the problem of just providing a desk and a chair. But we cannot get locked into a situation where we do not discuss educational technology, computers, online Internet, because we have not solved the problem of the desk and the chair. If every city in America had decided it would not build an airport until it fixed all the roads and all the sidewalks, then very few cities in America would have airports. They would be in very bad shape if they did not have airports.

So you have to look to the future and get involved in the new technology and what it can do for the imaginations of the youngsters who are in our schools and make certain that the schools in the inner city communities, like New York City, like my district in Brooklyn, one of the poorest districts, is not left behind because they do not have the computers and they do not have the access to the Internet.

Madam Speaker, all of it has to go together. We have to fight for the desk and fight for the chair, fight for the space in a building, fight for the safety in the building, the end of the violations related to asbestos or lead poisoning, ventilation. We have to fight for it all at one time.

It costs money. It will cost money, but it is not half as costly as some of the modern expenditures that we are accustomed to. We are ready to appropriate \$13 billion more to the Department of Defense. In fact, that is what the majority, Republican majority has done. They have added \$13 billion to the President's request for defense. A new attack submarine costs \$775 million. A B-2 bomber, we can give 7 million more children an opportunity to become productive citizens for the cost of three B-2 bombers. We could double the safe and drug-free schools program for the cost of the *Seawolf* submarine program. America could hire an additional 267,000 elementary and secondary schoolteachers for a billion dollars. For a billion dollars we could spend an extra \$23 on every elementary and secondary school child in the country. We could purchase 398,000 multimedia computers for a billion dollars.

You say a billion dollars is a lot of money. A billion dollars is what—the CIA had \$2 billion in its slush fund that they could not account for. It had gotten lost. To let you know, \$2 billion for the CIA was not very much, but \$2 billion would go a long way in terms of spending for our school children.

Modern costs are high, but we should not get overwhelmed. We should understand that, if education is a number one national security item, if the people of the country, in their common-sense wisdom, have decided education ought to be the highest priority, then let us not hesitate to make the investment in education, to take us across that bridge to the 21st century. Our children deserve it, our great Nation needs it. I think we can do not less than what our capacity allows us to do.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 211. Concurrent Resolution directing the Clerk of the House of Representatives to make a technical correction in the enrollment of H.R. 3060.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees, to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 3816) "An Act making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1997, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a concurrent resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 67. Concurrent resolution to authorize printing of the report of the Commission on Protecting and Reducing Government Secrecy.

ROCKFORD RESCUE MISSION: BRINGING THE COMMUNITY TOGETHER TO SOLVE COMMUNITY PROBLEMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANZULLO] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. MANZULLO. Madam Speaker, I come to the floor of the House today to praise the efforts of the Rockford Rescue Mission in their winning fight against homelessness, addiction, and poverty. For more than 30 years, the Rockford Rescue Mission has provided food, shelter, job training, and drug and alcohol rehabilitation to the most needy in the Rockford community.

In 1964, Mr. Stewart, a recovering alcoholic, recognized that there were a number of men in downtown Rockford who were either alcoholic, unemployed,

undereducated, lacking direction, or a combination of these. Mr. Stewart saw that these men congregated in relatively the same area and felt that there had to be some way to reach them and help them find direction back to being contributing members of the community.

With just \$9.63, Stewart rented a small building on Kishwaukee Street, and the Rockford Rescue Mission was born. He took in the homeless. He fed them, gave them a place to rest, and helped in every way he could to see these men back to being part of the community instead of wayward outcasts.

Mr. Stewart asked his pastor and his wife, the Reverend Gerald and Nadine Pitney, to take over the directorship of the Mission. Reverend and Mrs. Pitney agreed and began a life-long, family commitment to serving and helping the poorest of the poor in the city. The Mission started small, serving only a few single men needing food and shelter.

Over the years, the needs of the Rockford community changed. More and more women and families needed help and direction. As these demands developed, the volunteers and limited staff worked tirelessly to expand the facilities and types of assistance they offered to meet Rockford's growing needs. Today, under the leadership of the Reverend Perry Pitney (the son of the Reverend Gerald and Nadine Pitney), the Rockford Rescue Mission is continuing its efforts to adjust to the changing needs of the community.

Reverend Perry Pitney, recognizing that the needs of Rockford's homeless have changed dramatically since the Mission first opened, stated, "The reality of who the homeless are has changed dramatically over the past few years. The idea of old, alcoholic male drifters passing through a community is now a proven myth. Homelessness is a local issue and must be dealt with locally."

The needs of the homeless in the Rockford community continue to grow. In 1995, the Rockford Rescue Mission served over 80,000 meals, housed over 18,000 people, and gave away over 87,000 food items, clothing, and household necessities. Now the Rockford Rescue Mission is looking to triple its size. In doing so, they will expand their programs for outreach into the community. The current facilities cannot keep up with the overwhelming number of people searching for a place to begin again. The Rockford Rescue Mission is dedicated to the future of Rockford and is committed to keeping its doors open to everyone seeking help.

The staff of the Mission wants Rockford to continue being a city of hope. The expansion of facilities and services will help supply the tools necessary to fight a winning battle against homelessness and poverty. This is a picture of what some of their new facilities will look like.

Homelessness, poverty, substance abuse, and unemployment are not prob-

lems unique to Rockford, Illinois. Nearly every community in this nation faces these problems. Clearly, our communities are all searching for workable solutions to help those of our neighbors looking to start over. The Rockford Rescue Mission has set itself apart as a model of compassion with real results.

Help: that is what the Rockford Rescue Mission is all about. Compassion: that is what drives the staff and volunteers to commit themselves to the betterment of the futures of men, women, and families in need. In turn, the entire Rockford community will have a better future.

I come to the floor of the House today to congratulate the Rockford Rescue Mission for more than three decades of service to people. In the best traditions of the United States, they have lived and taught compassion. They are expanding their efforts to reach more people. They have started work on renovating two buildings which will provide space for a thrift shop, the Helping Hand program, emergency services for men, women, and families, and a men's recovery program. The Mission realizes that programs to help children must be stepped up, curbing gang participation and violence. The Mission realizes that the cycle of poverty and homelessness is often perpetuated generation after generation. Reaching the children and breaking that cycle is of paramount importance.

Too many organizations today say, "All we need is more government money, more Federal grants, and we can accomplish the task." But Rockford Rescue Mission has accomplished all this without any government money. They did it on their own, meeting their obligations through donations from individuals, churches, and businesses. They have succeeded in helping the Rockville community by involving the Rockford community. The Rockford Rescue Mission has done more to fight poverty and homelessness than most government programs. Why? Remember what Reverend Pitney said, "Homelessness is a local issue and must be dealt with locally."

The Rockford Rescue Mission on South Madison Street in Rockford, IL has provided day to day survival assistance for three decades. Their philosophy is to help "All whom we can, in all ways we can, as long as ever we can." Day after day for 30 years, the Rockford Rescue Mission has helped the neediest of the needy with no questions asked. The Rockford Rescue Mission has helped find food, shelter, clothing, and guidance for the homeless, the battered, the addicted, and the hungry.

JUDICIAL TAXATION

Madam Speaker, we hear over and over how the Government must spend more money here and there. Who is the government? Is it us, here in Congress? Is it the bureaucrats inside the beltway? No. It is the average American person.

Who is the average American? The average American is the one who gets

up at the crack of dawn fixes the children's breakfast, reads the morning paper, takes the dog out for a walk, kisses the spouse good-bye as one and in many cases both leave for work.

The average American goes to work to support the family, pay the bills, maybe sometime save enough to buy something new, or go on vacation. The average American wants a good life, and strives hard for it. The average American is competitive and wants to get ahead; no doubt wants America to get ahead.

So, I ask again, who is the government? My colleagues, the Government is the people—the average American person, who puts in a hard day's work.

But in today's society, as I alluded to a moment ago, it is becoming the norm—in a two parent household—that both parents must work to make ends meet.

Each person must work about a third of the day or more in order to cover the costs that each government (local, State and Federal) requires in order to operate.

Is it any wonder that Americans are upset when their government simply suggests that more money will take care of a problem; that more money is going to solve an inconsistency?

I want to take some time tonight to explain what is happening in a school district in Rockford, IL.

People living in Public School District 205 are dismayed over the sharp increase in their property taxes as a result of a Federal court remedy in a desegregation lawsuit against the school district. The complaints I have received from people include the fact that taxpayers are funding millions of dollars for a school master, attorney's fees, consultants, etc., while seeing little money going to educate their children. They complain, and rightly so, that huge spikes in real estate taxes are making homes in Rockford very difficult to sell. Seniors have advised me they can barely pay the taxes on their homes. This situation with the Rockford schools is dividing and devastating the city.

Rockford is not the only community affected by judicial taxation. There are numerous school districts having the same problems we are. The Federal judge in Kansas City, MO ordered taxes increased and spent over \$1 billion, and there has been little improvement in the school system or with regards to desegregation numbers. Lawyers, masters, and consultants have been the beneficiaries of these court orders while the children's education has seen little improvement.

The people of Rockford continue to be placed in a situation where the Federal court enters remedies to be paid for with a checkbook that has no limits.

I know many of the people in the city of Rockford. They are not segregationists. They are concerned Americans. They are concerned about their neighbors. They are concerned about the

quality of their schools and their children's education. But they are also concerned about making it through life. They are concerned about their living expenses. They are concerned about making ends meet. They are concerned about putting food on the table. They are concerned average Americans.

But, a law suit is filed. A judge makes a finding that there is not racial equality. The first thing that is needed—money. Money will solve the problem, so we need to raise capital in order to bring about equity.

Isn't anyone asking or wondering—Is there another way? What happens when the people are tapped out?

What about all of the additional daily expenses: other taxes, bills, food on the table?

I want to discuss constitutional authority and the expense of taxes for a moment.

The Constitution is the document that grants the authority to Congress, the executive branch, and the judiciary. Nowhere within that document does it say that anyone at the Federal level of government other than Congress can institute a tax increase, period. That's what it says, that's what it should mean.

But, a Federal judge, practically anywhere across the Nation, still will continue such tax mandates from on high. The people who are affected still will have to pony up expenses, whether they be to pay for the judicially imposed taxes, or to fight the imposition in court—which again takes money.

Judicial taxation is not, however, limited to school districts. Federal judges have ordered tax increases to build public housing and expand jails. Any State or local government is subject to such rulings from the Federal courts.

Now, are we seeing a pattern here? Does it really take more money to resolve a problem?

The Federal Government needs more money; so, it raises taxes. We've seen it done, several times over the past 20 years. Yes, we've seen in both Democrat and Republican administrations. We have seen it twice in the 1990's. Most recently, we had the largest tax increase in the history of this Nation—the \$268 billion Clinton tax increase—to pay down the deficit and bring down the debt. Guess what, spending has continued to rise. The debt has continued to increase to over \$5.1 trillion. That is a lot of money.

Remember that State governments still must operate. That costs money. Local governments need money to operate.

Now, in addition to all of that, we have a situation in which a Federal judge orders a community to pay more for something that is not necessarily their fault. Whether it be for a new jail—because of overcrowding, or to build a new school—because the ones that were closed down were not good enough. Remedies are necessary, but we must always examine the costs.

American parents, Rockford citizens, have always been concerned about the economic well-being and competitiveness of their children. No one has a greater stake in good jobs at good wages than do the parents who nurture and support their children. This will not change.

Parents know that excellent schools exist all over America. These schools often excel in spite of, not because of, out-of-State administrators or Federal judges. Parents ordinarily seek out schools that are friendly, familiar, and near. In so doing, they help create a sense of the school as a community dedicated to learning.

Researchers have found this sense of community to be an indispensable factor in academic success. Yet it is precisely this community that will be lost if the impact of un-democratically raised taxes continues this upward fashion.

Well, in school district 205—this Federal judge's order is tearing the community apart. People are fleeing the community because they don't have the money to pay for the extra expenses. I say again—the situation in Rockford, IL, is dividing the devastating the city.

Even Bill Clinton stated in his acceptance speech at the 1992 Democratic National Convention, "governments do not raise children—parents do."

If we are to take this seriously, that government cannot buy love and equality for children any more than money can buy happiness for adults, we must remember the forgotten American.

We are currently entering into a debate on reforming the Federal Tax Code. We will be studying the impact of Federal tax policy on personal savings and spending, the impact on State and local governments, as well as the overall effect on the economy.

One additional area that Congress needs to address is the impact judicial mandates and taxes on State and local governments. Actions by Federal judges that directly or indirectly force a State or local government to raise taxes have had serious impacts on our Nation's economy. In many cases, remedy decisions have forced State and local governments to increase taxes, putting more pressure on take home pay or affecting property values.

Everywhere you look, someone is getting taxes for this or that reason. A nickel here, a nickel there, doesn't seem like much. Now, multiply that out, over the long term. Before long, it adds up to \$50 here, \$50 there. Not much, some say. Guess what? It is a lot of money.

The forgotten American pays every single day—the one who gets up at the crack of dawn. Members here in Congress have the task to check the spending.

I have introduced legislation which places very strict limitations on the power of a Federal court to increase taxes for purposes of carrying out a judicial order.

This legislation is not about desegregation or any other decision where a Federal law has been broken. It is about taxpayers paying for Federal court remedies involving the raising of taxes without the permission of the taxpayers—this is taxation without representation. The remedy should be tempered by the community's ability to pay for it, without raising taxes.

If the school board, municipality, or State government feels that taxes have to be raised, then it should go to the people and ask for an increase. Otherwise, the school board should work within its means. There is no such thing as a school district dollar just as there is no such thing as a Federal tax dollar. The money belongs to the people. Judicial taxation is a back door method to take people's hard earned money without representation.

I am not criticizing Federal judges. Our judges are honorable people. But a judge works within the parameters of the laws available to him or her. The purpose of my legislation is to make it very difficult for a Federal judge, who is an unelected official, to raise taxes, and therefore press him or her to work within the budgetary constraints of the State or local government.

Any lasting result that could come out of a judge's remedy decision must come from the community and must have the people behind it. There has been no success in cases where judicial mandates alone act as the remedy. As I mentioned before, there are many people who are willing to make a positive contribution to solving these problems. By relieving the State and local governments of the burden of judicial taxation, the people of a State, city, or school district will be able to step forward and be part of a solution that is best for the community.

Let me be explicitly clear that I am not talking about whatever remedies are made by the court. I am talking about how to pay for whatever remedy results from any decision. That is where Congress can have input into this area. I take no position on what remedial actions may be enacted—that is a matter of the elected officials on the State and local level, but I am constrained to take a position on how those remedies are funded. This becomes a Federal function because this is a Federal judge applying Federal and constitutional law.

Congress must act on tax reform in all areas. The power of unchecked taxation is a very serious threat to our system of government, it is a threat to the average American who is trying to make ends meet.

Government—every single one of us—cannot continue to stand idly by and watch the tax dollars be raised and spent unchecked. We have an obligation, as the guardians of the Federal purse, to make sure that the money of the forgotten American is spent wisely.

Because we must remember how hard the average American, the forgotten American has to work in order to pay

for the bed where he or she sleeps, pay for the food and coffee they eat and drink for breakfast, pay for the food that they pack for their kids' lunches, pay for the gas to power the car that they must buy, and go to work and come home to the house that must be paid for. This is the forgotten American who pays, not only for the bills in everyday life, but for the tax bills that run the American Government. It is for these people that we, ourselves, must work hard to make sure that each and every tax dollar is raised and spent correctly and wisely.

The time for reform is now.

THE DRUG ISSUE—IT'S EVERYONE'S
RESPONSIBILITY

Madam Speaker, this evening I also want to discuss one of the biggest problems facing this nation: illegal drug use.

Statistics show that illicit use is rising at an alarming rate. Drug use among our nation's children has more than doubled in the past four years—a staggering rate of increase.

The scourge of illicit drugs is rampant in our society. How do we know this? Well, we read it in our local newspapers everyday; we hear about it on the daily radio and television talk shows; we see it on our nightly news programs.

Some may say that this saturation reporting is desensitizing the general public to the problems that drug abuse is causing in America's communities, homes and schools, and with our children—our future.

I've heard a lot of rhetoric from both political parties about drug abuse. However, this is not a partisan issue. Drug abuse knows no political ideology.

Let's take a look at some of those alarming statistics from some recent studies. On August 1, 1996 the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services reported:

Drug use among teenagers has skyrocketed—from 1992 to 1995, and overall drug use among those 12 years-old to 17 years-old has gone up 78 percent;

Marijuana use from the same period more than doubled at 105 percent;

Use of the hallucinogenic drug LSD also more than doubled at a 103 percent increase; and

Cocaine use increased a staggering 166 percent for that time frame.

Another study—this one from Luntz Research, shows that among teenagers up to the age of 17:

60 percent say they can buy marijuana within one day;

62 percent have friends who use marijuana;

58 percent have been solicited to buy marijuana; and

58 percent know someone who personally uses hard drugs such as LSD, heroin or cocaine.

This is staggering as much as it is tragic.

There is a study that is particularly disturbing. It is a survey, apparently the first of its kind, that asked parents

and teens about attitudes toward drugs. Sponsored by Columbia University's Center on Addiction and Substance Abuse, it found that:

Two-thirds of baby-boomer parents who experimented with marijuana as teenagers expect their own children will do the same;

Overall, that 46 percent of the parents surveyed said they expect their children to try illegal drugs;

Forty-nine percent—almost half—of parents surveyed knew someone who uses illegal drugs today; and

One-third of parents have friends who currently use marijuana. These are friends of the parents.

These studies reveal a common theme: that drug use is on the increase and there seems to be a growing apathy about its misuse. The message that drug use is bad for society is somehow getting lost.

It is not just the numbers; it is the simple fact that people feel that there is a need to experiment and use drugs, and that it is somehow expected. In areas around the country, it seems to have become almost a right of passage for our adolescents into adulthood.

Is this the message we want to send? Of course not. Drug abuse reaps deadly consequences. Almost three-quarters of all crime is somehow drug related. Drug abuse sets the stage for death by overdose and suicide. There are scores of accidents caused by drug use. Make no mistake about it: drugs have an impact on each and every member of our society, and we must do something about it. And I don't mean we, as Congress. No the we I am talking about is everyone in our country.

The issue of drugs is not, and should not be, about election year politicking. It is and must be about attempting to deal with this scourge, this blight on our nation. Who's to blame? That is the political question. What to do? That is the real question. Let's not talk about blame; let's talk about what to do.

To answer that question we must begin by asking ourselves whether we have done what we can to work against this national disgrace. Drug abuse knows no race, no political persuasion, no economic class, no gender. It is everyone's problem because it affects everyone.

That is why everyone must do his or her part to work for a lasting solution. It starts at home. The effort begins with parents and guardians. The responsibility continues with our schools—it takes constant reminders from our teachers and administrators about the problems of drugs. The responsibility is with our media and entertainment industry, and it continues with our business leaders. Responsibility is with our elected officials—Republican, Democrat, and Independents.

Our children need guidance and role models so that when they come of age they can exercise individual responsibility and make the right choices concerning drugs.

But is the next generation being given the direction it desperately needs? When I look at the Columbia University study, it makes me wonder. Joseph Califano, president of the National Center on Addiction and Substance Abuse at Columbia University and a former secretary to the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare states:

That the baby boomers appear to be so ambivalent and so resigned to drug use by kids is very disturbing. They should be mad as hell. Instead, they're saying there's nothing we can do about it.

In the past, Mr. Califano astutely remarked:

Drugs are not dangerous because they are illegal; they are illegal because they are dangerous. Not all children who use illegal drugs will become addicts, but all children, particularly the poorest, are vulnerable to abuse and addiction. Russian roulette is not a game anyone should play. Legalizing drugs is not only playing Russian roulette with our children. It's slipping a couple of extra bullets in the chamber.

He makes a good, solid point. People should care about drugs, drug abuse and society's attitudes about it. Congress, most of all, should never discuss legalization of drugs. We should be discussing how to keep people from using drugs at all.

I want to discuss how one member of this body thought he could make a difference. He is Representative ROB PORTMAN. Mr. PORTMAN saw a problem and decided he wanted to address it head on. When he found that it worked, he decided to share this information with other members of Congress. It is something that is based in common-sense, indeed. It is the Community Anti-Drug Coalition.

This coalition is an attempt by participating members of Congress to mobilize the local communities in conjunction with local law enforcement; schools; parent/teacher associations; community clubs—such as the Lions and Rotary Clubs; the media—television, newspaper and radio; churches; state and local politicians; local, state, and national anti-drug and rehabilitations services to jointly arrive at a solution to end illegal drug use and drug abuse. The effort is to get everyone involved in community-wide, and by extension, a nation-wide anti-drug awareness project. It is a very exciting opportunity for members of Congress to utilize their public offices as a soap box and encourage all members of their communities to get involved in the simple message that we all know to be true: Drugs are dangerous, drugs are bad, people should not use drugs.

I encourage everyone watching at home and members here in the chamber to get involved. This is a problem that needs a comprehensive solution. The solution involves participation and action by all segments of the local community and at all levels of government. Let's not wait any longer.

□ 2200

Lastly this evening I am going to be joined by my colleague, Congressman

PETER HOEKSTRA of Michigan. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOEKSTRA].

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding. It was with some interest, as I was coming out to Washington earlier today, that I read in USA Today and went out and took a look at what the Associated Press [AP] had to say about the similar article that was in USA Today. It is described by Bruce Babbitt, one of the members of the President's administration. He describes it as "It is a great win/win situation for everyone." And you take a look at it and say, now, what would somebody in the President's administration be calling a win/win, a win/win for everybody. If it is a win/win for everyone, it is a win for those of us in Washington, it is a win for the American people and whatever projects.

And when you get beyond the win/win, what you find is that it is, quoted in one of the Washington papers, Babbitt proposes a new tax.

You were talking earlier in your special order about taxes. We know how much the American people are taxed. And it appears that for Mr. Babbitt and for the President, perhaps that number is not high enough yet, that when 38 cents of every dollar that the American family earns goes to pay taxes at the local, the State or the Federal level, maybe that is not quite enough; that when the average American family works until May 7 of every year to pay that 38 cents or to pay their share of State and local and Federal taxes, Mr. Babbitt and the President still do not believe that that is enough. When they figure out that the cost of government, when you not only take the cost of taxes that we directly pay, but you add in the indirect cost of government and the rules and regulations and that we work, that the average family works until July 3 to pay those additional costs, we find out now what Independence Day means. It has a whole new meaning.

It no longer means independence from the tyranny of taxation with no representation, but in today's world, it means that on July 4 is the first day that the average American keeps what they earn on that day and they do not send it to one form of government or another or are not paying for the cost of regulations.

Mr. MANZULLO. Madam Speaker, what happens during the month of July and August is that the average American decides to go on vacation.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Madam Speaker, what in the world does vacation have to do with new taxes?

Mr. MANZULLO. Well, Secretary Babbitt has found a way to tax the accoutrements of vacation.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. What is that?

Mr. MANZULLO. Things that you use on vacation.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Madam Speaker, I believe that we ought to be fair to Mr. Babbitt, and I have misspoken myself.

We are not talking about a new tax. The fee or the—excuse me, the term that the Secretary uses is, U.S. Interior Secretary Bruce Babbitt would put a, not a tax—a surcharge on outdoor-related equipment, and so it is not a tax.

Later on now the AP goes on to take the liberty of describing a surcharge as a tax, but Mr. Babbitt has not called it a tax. He is working with, teaming with a wildlife group. And they also do not use the term "surcharge" or "tax." They call it a "user fee." This is what I think is interesting. We will talk a little bit about the amount. We will talk about the amount.

But listen what they say about a user fee, which Mr. Babbitt calls a surcharge, which the Associated Press calls a tax, and which you and I would probably call a tax because what it means is that an American citizen is taking some money and sending it to government, and that is typically a tax.

But they go on to say, make sure that the user fee must not act as a barrier to a product's sale. The user fee must not act as a barrier to a product's sale. So obviously, again, this is a case of companies and small businesses, because we will go through the list, these things are sold by small businesses. These small business people in America just must be making excess obscene products.

I know that the distinguished chairwoman in the Speaker's chair this evening is chairing the Small Business Administration and cannot participate in this dialog. But I am sure if she had the liberty to participate in this dialog, the meetings and the hearings that we have had with her, she would clearly indicate that small businesses are under tremendous pressure and that any attempt to go back to small businesses or the American people probably would be hindrance to the sale of a new product.

□ 2215

This is naive people in Washington saying we can charge people more, but of course it will not be a barrier to sale of more product. I gladly yield.

Mr. MANZULLO. You know, what is interesting is what is going to be taxed. I mean film.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Gentleman give an example?

Mr. MANZULLO. Film. Secretary Babbitt wants to put a 2 to 3-percent national sales tax on cameras, film, lenses and, look at this, an outdoor sleeping mat.

Now there is no tax on a mattress inside the house, no national tax, but if you sleep outside, he wants to have a 5-percent outdoor recreation equipment.

We just bought my son a mountain bike. We do not live in the mountains, but we bought him a mountain bike, and he wants to put a 5-percent tax on mountain bikes.

Look at the list of things he wants to tax: backpacks, camping stoves.

I have Century Tool located in the district that I represent, and I am going to talk to them tomorrow and say: "Look at Secretary Babbitt, wants to put a 5-percent surcharge because people cook outside, that somehow they're to be penalized for that."

Camping utensils, canoes, canteens; 5-percent tax on canteens, climbing equipment, compasses.

Secretary Babbitt needs to perhaps have a compass to find his way out of this tax hysteria, but he wants to have a 5-percent tax put on compasses, cooking bags, floatation vests, hiking boots, kayaks. The whole ski industry would be subjected to now a new 5-percent tax: skis, poles, boots.

Sleeping bags. My kids have sleeping bags; they never slept outside. They sleep on the floor of the family room.

Snow shoes, Tents.

Every tent in America would be subjected to a new 5-percent Babbitt tax, Babbitt-Clinton tax. And canoe paddles, or prepacked camp foods.

That is interesting.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. If the gentleman would yield?

Mr. MANZULLO. Yes.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. I mean you are getting to the fun parts now. I mean we think about it, the list that you have just gone through. Backpacks? The majority of backpacks in this country—

Mr. MANZULLO. Is for school.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Go to schools. It is the kids.

I have got three kids, 14, 11 and 8. They all go to school every morning with backpacks. Those now next year, when we go out and buy them with a Clinton, new Clinton-Babbitt tax, those backpacks will cost 5 percent more.

But you forgot a couple of interesting things in there because obviously it is clear that Mr. Babbitt believes that government is not taking enough money, and otherwise he would not be proposing it. But remember this is a big number. This is a 5-percent tax. In Michigan our sales tax is 6 percent. You now tack on a 5-percent on top of that so he obviously believes government is not big enough and is not spending too much and he wants a little bit more money. But he also believes that the IRS is not big enough because we are going to have to come up with rules and regulations to implement this. We are going to tax certain camping utensils, but only those that are connected or folding. So, if it does not connect or snap together or fold, you do not pay the tax.

Mr. MANZULLO. So if a Swiss army knife has a spoon on it or a fork, that would be taxed, but a smaller Swiss army knife would not be taxed.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. If it only had knives, and if it had just the blades with no forks—

Mr. MANZULLO. Screwdrivers and things like that.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. I do not know, but we would have a bureaucrat at the IRS who would make that call.

Mr. MANZULLO. And what about talking about—

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Do not go to the calls yet, but take a look at another one, the floatation vests.

Mr. MANZULLO. Floatation vests?

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Floatation vests. Select, and for those—you know, this is, I am glad that they have already got the bureaucrats involved because for most people, floatation vests are just kind of like life preservers. But are we going to tax all floatation vests, or are we going to go to the IRS and come up with a set of rules and regulations that say these vests are taxed, taxed as 5 percent, and these are not? We are only going to tax selected classes of life preservers, but of course we are not going to tax standard lifeboat vests.

You know, there is stuff on here. You outline the skis, polls, boots. That includes cross-country and downhill. Make sure we do not forget snowboards; they are now on the list. I do not know what a stuff sack is, but they are going to be taxed.

Now let us go on. So we have covered—if you are going to have any fun outside, you know you can figure you are going to pay 5 percent, and it is not on this list, but I bet it soon will be: rollerblades will be on there. I cannot imagine not having rollerblades.

Mr. MANZULLO. Well if you have skis, you have to have rollerblades as a matter of equity—

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Otherwise it would be discrimination.

Mr. MANZULLO. Right.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. But then going on to the category that you were talking about: cause. For those of you that have bird feeders in your backyard you will now know that we are going to have the Clinton-Babbitt backyard and wildlife products tax.

Mr. MANZULLO. At 5 percent.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Five percent, the Backyard and Wildlife Products Act. Five percent. And what are we going to tax here? We are going to tax wild birdseed and other wild animal feed except seed that is packaged for pet feed.

All right. So we are going to have somebody in Washington again describing, you know, what is pet feed and what is wild animal feed.

Mr. MANZULLO. Reclaiming my time, would birdseed for robins and birds that are not considered to be wild, would that be taxed?

Perhaps the tax would be based upon the tax people would have to come to your backyard and determine which birds were eating the seed, then have a proportionate tax based upon that.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Yes, and I would guess that if you took your seed that was packaged for pet feed and you ran out of wild bird feed but you took your seeds for pet feed and you used it outside for a wild bird, you know, you would be breaking the law.

Mr. MANZULLO. But what if your pets are wild birds?

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Well, if it is a pet and it is wild, then it cannot be your pet. But I bet we would have a regulation on defining when a pet is a pet and when it is wild it is not.

Mr. MANZULLO. And would the gentleman comment on whether or not the new Clinton tax would impact birds that decided to be hygienic and take a bath?

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Yes, we cover that, or excuse me, the Clinton-Babbitt tax covers that because we do have a tax here on wild birdbaths.

Mr. MANZULLO. Wild birdbaths.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Wild birdbaths, and we also have a tax on wild bird houses, bat houses, squirrel houses and houses constructed for use by other wildlife, nest platforms for wild birds.

Mr. MANZULLO. And You know what is amazing about this is that Mr. Babbitt, claiming to be a conservationist, would want to try to do everything possible to encourage the wisest use possible of our natural resources and to encourage people to feed the wild birds in the backyard, and instead he wants to impose another tax.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. I beg to take exception because I take Mr. Babbitt at his word. He does believe that he is doing the best for wildlife because what he is doing is he is saying: "You as American citizens don't know what to do for wildlife or the birds in your backyard. Send me the tax because when I collect the money, States would then apply for the money to fund specific projects and would be required to match 25 percent of the Federal grants."

So this is not about protecting or preserving the environment; it is just about how we do it. You pay the tax, you send the money to Washington so that the bureaucrats here in Washington can figure out what projects are best to do, and you know you cannot do that at the State level. We have got to have people in the Interior Department who are going to get this money from the IRS, who will then review the grants, and this is, you know, goes back—you are aware of the myth project that we have been working on, the myth that says only Washington can do things right. This is going to create a new department on not Independence Avenue, on Dependence Avenue, because it is going to be once again bureaucrats making decisions.

In this case they are taking your money that you are going to buy birdbaths, birdhouses, bat houses, birdseed and this even goes on. You got a hummingbird feeder in your backyard.

Mr. MUNZULLO. So what?

Mr. HOEKSTRA. You got to pay taxes on the hummingbird feeder. If you go to the grocery store and you buy suet and you put it in this little mesh thing, I am sorry, that is now taxed. You have to pay.

Mr. MANZULLO. It is a tax on fat.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. A tax on fat.

Mr. MANZULLO. And if the gentleman will yield, then there is a special tax, a 5-percent tax on books, videos and audio. We have a CD-ROM that we play on the back porch of our farm. We call R. Olsen. Occasionally an eagle will stop by on its way to the Mississippi River, or a great blue heron,

and we have the Roger Torrey Peterson bird guides, the tremendous bird guides, the books that you buy so you can examine and identify the birds in your backyard, and those audio tapes of wildlife calls, you know, the owl tapes, you know what I mean. We play those at night, and the owls, you can see the owls fluttering around, and we take the flashlight, teach the kids about nature.

My wife is a biologist and loves to teach the kids about the environment. All that will be subject to another 5 percent tax, talk about an additional tax on educational materials.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. If the gentleman will yield, it goes on. We have talked about outdoor recreation equipment, backyard wildlife products, books and videos. You talked about the binoculars or may be we have not covered that yet; binoculars, hand lenses, spotting scopes, tripods, window mounts. Sorry. Those all now also have a 5-percent tax.

This now goes on, talks about recreational vehicles, RVs. Now the tax rate is much lower on this.

Mr. MANZULLO. Starting lower.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. What is that?

Mr. MANZULLO. Starting lower.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. But we all know once a tax is in place, we do not raise it. Well, maybe that is not right. Usually when we have a tax in place it provides a floor from which to raise it, but you go out and buy an RV, or you go out and buy a sport utility vehicle—you know, a camper, a motor home a travel trailer or any of this. We are now talking about a quarter to a half a percent tax on these items.

You know we have been joking about this, about what the Clinton-Babbitt tax looks like, because I mean it is, it is taking more money out of the system, it is moving decision-making to Washington. But this is a serious proposal, and this is indicative of what this administration believes. They believe Washington does not have enough money, that the American people are not even intelligent enough to make basic decisions about wildlife in these types of things, and they want more, they want more rules and regulations, and they want to grow the IRS, and they want more of our money, and they are blatantly going out and talking about increasing taxes and not talking about tax simplification. This is complicating the tax code, and it provides another avenue for Washington to suck a little bit more money out of our pockets and feed it to the bureaucrats here in Washington.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Madam Speaker, if the gentleman will yield?

Mr. MANZULLO. Yes.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. I thank the gentleman, and I just wanted to take a brief moment here, that Sunday I heard a speaker, and he mentioned an item that I think would be very appropriate here, although it is very enlightening to hear the gentlemen discuss this issue. But he mentioned about a

speaker who had a speech prepared, and everyone started leaving, and more people left, and more people left, and more people left. Finally there was only one left. So he went and finished his speech, then went to thank the gentleman for staying, and the gentleman says: "The only reason I stayed is because I'm the next speaker."

And I thought I would mention this at this time.

□ 2230

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Madam Speaker, we thank the gentleman for staying.

Mr. MANZULLO. We thank the gentleman for staying. Does the gentleman from Michigan have anything else to add?

Mr. HOEKSTRA. We are going to hear a lot more about this issue and others like it. We on our side of the aisle, we have pushed for family tax relief. We believe that Washington already collects enough of our money and we do not want any more money in Washington. We want to return it back to families. We want to return it back to small businesses, because we believe the best engine for growth in this country are small businesses and Americans deciding the priorities for where they spend their money.

This I believe is just the beginning of a whole new series of taxes that a Clinton administration would love to put on the American people. You and I were both here in 1993 when we in this Congress, you and I both voted against it, but when we in this Congress came forward and it passed the Clinton tax increase, where again it became very clear, government is not big enough, we do not have enough money, we want more. This is just what I believe is the first scheme to get more money from the American people.

I think it goes after it exactly the wrong way. It taxes the very things that are important to families, that are important to children. It hides the tax, because it would be a tax at the manufacturer's level, not at the sales tax level, so once again people will be paying taxes and they will not know that it is actually going to the Federal Government. At the same time, it does it in such a way that much of the tax dollars that will be raised will be used to fund bureaucrats here in Washington.

The gentleman and I, we are talking about tax simplification, we are talking about going to a flat tax, we are talking about going to a consumption tax, or anything that takes the huge array of IRS tax booklets, so we could actually go fill our taxes out on a postcard or whatever. All this represents is a whole new series of taxes, complicated taxes describing what camping utensils will and will not be taxed, which flotation vest, which hiking boots. It is absolutely the wrong way to go at this time, or almost at any time.

I cannot see any time where this kind of a tax in this kind of a direction

would be appropriate. But it is an important lesson I think for the American people to understand that this is what the Clinton administration is talking about. This is the direction they are going.

Mr. MANZULLO. Reclaiming my time, Madam Speaker, and we have at times tried to put a bit of levity into Secretary Babbitt's and President Clinton's proposal to increase taxes on things such as bicycles, mountain bicycles and outdoor sleeping mats. I think it is a dark day in America when the administration would come to the American people and say, because you use the outdoors, we are going to tax you.

We are talking about a hidden 2 percent to 3 percent tax on a camera, on films. We are talking about kids that buy binoculars to look at birds and other animals in the fields, we will have a 5 percent hidden tax. We are talking about a simple book that talks about nature.

Is that not interesting? You can have a book that describes how to rearrange the inside of a house, that would not be subject to a tax, but a book that talks about how to examine birds and wildlife and things outside—ostensibly even plants—would be subject to a tax.

This is the forgotten America of whom I have spoken so many times in this Congress, the person who gets up at the crack of dawn, packs the lunch. Perhaps both spouses go to work; one of them is working solely for taxes. They get the kids off to school, they write the checks, and they ask themselves in the morning, why is it that we are working harder than ever in our entire lives and taking home less money?

The answer is very simple, because government at all levels is too big. What is even more dangerous about this new proposed Babbitt-Clinton tax is the fact that Americans will be paying a tax and not even know it is a tax, because the tax will be buried into the cost of the manufacturer's product.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. If the gentleman will continue to yield, Madam Speaker, think of the arrogance that is used to describe this tax, the arrogance toward the American taxpayer, because they say the user fee must not act as a barrier to a product sale.

Do these people never get outside of the beltway? Who thinks that the average American family, the parents that pack their kids off to school in the morning, that they have an extra 5 percent to pay for backpacks, for compasses, for dry bags, sleeping bags, hiking boots? No big deal, it is only 5 percent. They have that.

They talk about the pressure on the family, and the financial pressure, but then it is kind of like where are they coming from? Five percent, of course they can; hey, they have 5 percent more to send to Washington. And they do it on a whole range of things.

It is an arrogant way of taking a look at the American family and saying, we in Washington need 5 percent

more, and you, at the family level, you have it. You can afford to easily give us 5 percent, because if we ask you for 5 percent more, that will not be a barrier to you being able to buy this product.

Where have they been? And maybe it is time for the Clinton-Babbitt team to get outside of the beltway and talk to some real Americans, and find out how much 5 percent means to them.

Mr. MANZULLO. Madam Speaker, I include for the RECORD this teaming with wildlife product list which shows the proposed tax on the products.

The material referred to is as follows:

TEAMING WITH WILDLIFE PRODUCT LIST

The following list is a draft of those products being considered for a user fee. Before this list is incorporated into the draft legislation, we are asking companies, customers (users) and coalition members to provide feedback on this list, as well as other details of the proposal. The products listed below would have a graduated user fee of ¼%-5% of the manufacturer's price. The user fee must not act as a barrier to a product's sale. Beside each category is a suggested level for the user fee. Feedback from companies and consumers will help determine the final list of products and the percent to apply to each.

Outdoor Recreation Equipment (5%): Backpacks, Camping stoves, Camping stove fuel, Camping tarps, Camping utensils (connected/folding), Canoes, Canteens, Climbing equipment, Compasses, Cooking kits, Dry bags, Flotation vests (selected classes—not standard life boat vests), Hiking boots, Hiking staves, Kayaks/spray skirts, Mountain bicycles, Outdoor sleeping mats, Skis/poles/boots (cross-country, downhill, telemark), Sleeping bags, Snowshoes, Tents, Paddles, Portable water purifiers, Prepacked camp foods, Scuba diving masks/snorkels/goggles/flippers, Snowboards, Stuff sacks, Wet suits/Air tanks/Regulators/Spearguns, Whitewater rafts.

Backyard and Wildlife Products (5%): Wild bird seed and other wild animal feed (except seed packaged for pet feed); Wild animal and wild bird feeders such as hummingbird feeders, suet feeders and other types of feeders; Wild bird baths; Wild bird houses, bat houses, squirrel houses and houses constructed for use by other wildlife; Nest platforms for wild birds.

Books, videos, Audio (5%): Field guides to bird identification, nest identification, animal tracks, mammals, fishes butterflies, insects and other animal groups; "How-to" guides such as wildlife viewing guides, hiking and paddling guides, etc.; Audio tapes of wildlife calls; CD-Rom guides to wildlife and its enjoyment.

Binoc, Monoc and Spot Scopes (5%): Binoculars, Hand lenses, Monoculars, Spotting scopes, Tripods, Window mounts.

Photographic Equipment and Supplies (2-3%): Cameras, Film, Lenses, Lens filters, Photo disc, Range finders (including those designed for use with photographic cameras and parts thereof).

Recreational Vehicles (RV's) (¼%-½%, no more than \$100): Campers/motor homes/travel trailers.

Sport Utility Vehicles (¼% no more than \$100):

MEXICAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA] is recognized for 60 minutes.