

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

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, I guess the President just simply loves higher taxes. In 1993 he passed the highest tax increase in American history: an increase in the tax gas, an increase in Social Security taxes on seniors, an increase in taxes on small business. Now our Tax Freedom Day which we have heard so much about this morning keeps falling later and later every year under the Clinton watch.

In 1992, under George Bush, it was May 2, but next year, Clinton, May 3. Next year May 5; next year, May 6; and now it is May 7, the latest the tax freedom day has ever been.

We can turn the tide. We can and we should cut taxes. Let us cut them on average working families: taxes on gas, if my colleagues will, but taxes also on seniors, taxes on our small businesses, taxes on farmers, and taxes on capital gains. Let us shorten the Government's long reach into our pockets and cut taxes right across the board.

Let us turn this trend around. Maybe next year people will be able to work less for the Government and more for themselves and their families.

CUTTING FUNDING FOR EDUCATION—NOT THE RIGHT DIRECTION

(Ms. LOFGREN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I read that the majority leader made this statement on Sunday: Maybe we ought to take another look at the amount of money we are spending on education. And I thought, finally, good—we do need to take a look at the amount of money we are spending on education.

I saw today in the Washington Post that in Korea kids get out of school at 10 p.m., and they go to school 6 days a week. Is it any wonder that they are leaving us in the dust? They have gone from Third World to major competitor in a few short years because they are putting money into education.

But I learned, in fact, that the majority leader's proposal is to cut education funding to pay for a proposal to cut the gas tax.

This is not the direction we should be heading. Where I come from, families are indeed struggling to pay for very high gas bills; they are commuters. But the thing they know more than anything else is that, if we want to get ahead as a country, it is important to take the long view and make sure that our kids are the best educated in the world.

CUTTING DUPLICATION, NOT EDUCATION

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

Mr. CHRYSLER. Mr. Speaker, 128 days out of the year, 17 weeks out of 52,

are spent working to pay our taxes. In other words, for 128 days the average American works for government. Something is wrong with this picture.

Mr. Speaker, the American family is being pressured from all sides today. It does not help that government takes 128 days of his or her labor. And, thanks to Bill Clinton, Americans now work an extra 6 days to pay their taxes. That is another pay gone to finance the Government's spending by the Washington bureaucrats.

Mr. Speaker, we need less government, lower taxes, we need to let people keep more of what they earn and save, and we need to let people make their own decisions about how they spend their money, not government.

As to the remarks of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY] about education, we had 760 educational programs in 39 different departments in this Federal Government. We said 170 of them were duplicative of other ones. That is not cutting education. This is cutting duplication.

WHEN WE REDUCE THE GAS TAX, WILL CONSUMERS BENEFIT?

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

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, the bottom line is this:

When we reduce the gas tax, are consumers going to see any of the benefit? That will be determined by whether there is a free market, whether the oil companies are actually competing with one another, whether all those up and down the line will pass the price through to the consumer. Because if we reduce the tax by 4.3 cents and the consumer does not get any reduction at the pump, what good is it?

Now what we have seen in the past in the gas and oil market is that there is not real competition in certain ways. When the spot market wholesale price goes up, it immediately goes up at the pump, the price does. But when the spot market for crude oil goes down, it takes months and months and months for it to go back down.

This chart shows it all. Wholesale price falls 4.4 percent, price at the pump goes up 2 cents.

Now if that happens, the gas tax reduction will not bring any benefits to the American consumer, and we better make sure that it does.

ONCE AGAIN THE PRESIDENT REVERSES HIMSELF—THIS TIME ON ADOPTION TAX CREDIT

(Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in 1993 President Clinton passed the largest tax increase in history, and then later reversed himself in Texas when he commented that he raised taxes too much. He said he was

for a tax cut, but he vetoed tax cuts, just one right after the other: A child tax credit relief, capital gains relief, a marriage penalty relief, and many more.

Tomorrow we are going to bring a \$5,000 adoption tax credit up to be debated again for a second time, and once again the President has reversed himself. He says he likes the idea. We must continue to fight for tax cuts that help American families and children.

As my colleagues know, Americans want and even deserve a break from high taxes and not just when it is in the President's best political interest.

WHAT NEXT? AID FOR DEPENDENT COWBIRDS?

(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, even on tax freedom day it never ends. Government bureaucrats maintain that California cowbirds lay their eggs in the nest of California gnat catchers, forcing the gnat catcher to raise the little cowbirds. Now, since the gnat catcher is on the endangered species list, the bureaucrats have decided to gas the cowbirds.

Now, if this is not enough to ruffle our tarfeathers here, my colleagues, they will spend \$67 million to kill California cowbirds.

What is next folks?

A Government grant for cowbirds to lobby Bruce Babbitt?

Aid for dependent cowbirds?

Tax credits to adopt the California cowbirds?

Is it any wonder we have a \$5 trillion debt?

I submit these are not normal Government bureaucrats. These are turkeys. Anybody who would spend \$67 million to help one endangered species, a gnat catcher, and make another species, a cowbird, an endangered species, needs a proctologist, not a psychiatrist.

PROTEIN CRYSTAL GROWTH ON THE SPACE STATION

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

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I want to tell my colleagues about one area of science that will be performed aboard the space station.

Protein crystallography is a field of research that allows scientists to determine the structure of proteins that play critical roles in diseases.

To use this technique, researchers must grow large, high-quality crystals of the protein. On Earth, gravity often causes the crystals to grow imperfectly, preventing scientists from developing new disease-fighting drugs.

Protein crystals grown in space, as demonstrated on many space shuttle

flights, are superior in quality and size to those grown on Earth. This means that researchers can better develop drugs to battle disease.

In fact, protein crystal grown on the shuttle have already allowed researchers to develop drugs that are in FDA trials even as we speak.

But the growth of many crystals requires more than a few days available aboard the shuttle. That is why we need the space shuttle.

It will permit researchers to grow their crystals in a nearly perfect microgravity environment for long periods of time.

Mr. Speaker, researchers from universities and companies around the world strongly support the international space station, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

MAY 7, 1996, TAX FREEDOM DAY

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

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I offer congratulations to you and congratulations to every hard-working American taxpayer. Or should I say offer condolences? Because at long last, today, May 7, is tax freedom day.

We have heard a lot of talk, a lot of playground taunts about the gas tax and repealing the Clinton gas tax. That would be but a modest first step, a reasonable first step.

Let me put it in perspective, Mr. Speaker. One of my constituents stopped by my Washington office this morning and told me in the wake of Bill Clinton's tax increase, the largest in American history, including retroactive taxes, her tax bill increased 213 percent.

That is compassion? That is common sense?

Mr. Speaker, in the words of my colleague from Ohio, beam me up.

A REAL MOTHER'S DAY TRIBUTE; PASS CHILD SUPPORT ENFORCEMENT REFORM

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

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, Mother's Day is just a few short days away, and I have a great idea for the congressional leadership and President Clinton.

For all the mothers of America, let us enact tough new child support enforcement reforms.

Last year this Congress voted to give the States the tools and the teeth to enforce child support orders when it passed the welfare reform package. Unfortunately, the President vetoed that bill, and the child support reforms along with it, and since that time child support has been tangled in the larger welfare reform debate.

Mr. Speaker, enough is enough. No more excuses, no more delays. The

children are suffering. Let us pass this legislation now. No one expects the welfare reform dispute to be settled for months, if at all. Yet we all agree on a bipartisan basis on the reforms to strengthen our child support system.

Child support evasion is a national disgrace. Each year millions of families are denied billions of dollars to which they are legally and morally entitled. First the children are the victims and, second, the taxpayers. Let us pass this legislation.

GIVE THE TAXPAYERS A BREAK—REPEAL THE CLINTON GAS TAX

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

Mrs. SEASTRAND. Mr. Speaker, the Clinton crunch is hitting the American people hard. The most conspicuous evidence of the Clinton crunch right now is the soaring gas prices all over our Nation. Back in 1993, President Clinton enacted the largest tax increase in our Nation's history. And included in this tax package was a \$4.8 billion tax increase on gasoline. This Clinton gas tax is hitting all consumers right where it hurts—in the wallet.

Mr. Speaker, the American people want to keep more of what they earn, not continue to give more and more of their hard-earned money to the Federal Government. I call on my Democrat colleagues to support a repeal of the Clinton gas tax. While \$4.8 billion may not seem like much money to some of the Clinton Democrats, it's considered a whole lot of money to the majority of the American people.

Give the taxpayers a break. Repeal the Clinton gas tax.

LET US BE FAIR

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

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, we read in the Washington Post this morning that Leader ARMEY is taking the leading role in defining the remainder of this Congress' Republican revolution. Apparently the revolution he wants to bring about is to cut education so that we can go about reducing the gas tax without any promise, any commitment that that will actually be passed through to consumers.

While oil companies are profiting, and obviously many are based in his home State of Texas, we seem to think the only way we can help people who are suffering from incredible increases at the pump would be to cut programs that will help their children.

This is the same leader who indicates we ought not to have a minimum wage, let alone an increase in it, that would take it, in real dollars, from 1950 to 1960.

It seems to me if we are going to address the issue of cutting taxes on gasoline without passing them through to

consumers, we certainly ought to be willing to take up the issue of a minimum wage for those people who struggle each day to put food on the table for their families. That would be a fair way to lead this institution.

□ 1430

SUPPORT ELIMINATION OF THE GAS TAX

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

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from California, who just spoke, was not on the big spenders list every year, then those folks would have more money in their pocket instead of increasing the deficit so much.

Mr. Speaker, they said, Do we want to repeal the gas tax? Yes. Do we want to repeal the Social Security tax that the 1993 Clinton tax package put on our senior citizens? The President promised a middle-class tax cut. Instead, he increased the marginal rate on the taxes for the middle class.

The Democrats want to protect the power, the power to tax you, to bring money to Washington, DC, to support a big bureaucracy, and then turn that money back around and give it to you for education, as low as 23 cents on a dollar, so they can fund their big Federal bureaucracy. If they want to help education, look at Haiti, look at Somalia, look at Bosnia: Billions of dollars for the President to send our troops. And guess what? Aristide is still there, Aided is still there, and in Bosnia it is going to cost \$10 billion. If they want to help education, cut out the foreign expansion. Support elimination of the gas tax.

WHITEWATER INDEPENDENT COUNSEL SHOULD FOCUS ON THE JOB AT HAND

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

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, the calls for Whitewater Independent Counsel Kenneth Starr to address concerns over his outside legal practice continue to mount. This weekend, former independent counsels—both Democrats and Republicans—added their voice to the chorus of concerned citizens questioning the judgment and independence of Mr. Starr.

Lawrence Walsh, former judge and independent counsel for Iran Contra, said: "The one excuse for an Independent Counsel is his independence * * * he can't be involved with anything that impairs his freedom of action."

And Gerald J. Gallinghouse, another Republican who investigated President Jimmy Carter said, "He should either get in or get out."

Mr. Starr's investigation is now almost 2 years old and is costing the taxpayers about \$1 million a month. At