

President Clinton's man in Haiti is systematically destroying democracy there. Unfortunately, this comes at the expense of the American taxpayer. Members will remember that \$3 billion of democracy building we just provided? What, we have to ask, is the White House going to do about their man in Haiti? Is the Clinton White House backing democracy in Haiti, or is it backing another darling of the left strong man? Is this Papa Doc all over again? We need an answer.

THE REPUBLICANS ARE OUT OF TOUCH WITH REAL PEOPLE IN THIS COUNTRY

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

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, the Republicans are desperately out of touch with real people in this country. First, they try to hold up disaster relief to flood victims. Then they say that people trying to move from welfare to work are not entitled to the minimum wage or basic workplace protections.

Now the Republicans are trying to push through a tax bill that gives huge tax breaks to millionaires and provides almost no relief to the people who need it the most, middle-income and working families. The bulk of their tax cut will go to those families making over \$237,000 a year. That is wrong.

What message are the Republicans sending to hardworking Americans? They want to give a \$10,000 tax deduction to upper-income families who can already afford to send their kids to college. Yet they propose a \$500-per-child tax credit that penalizes working mothers with children in child care.

Mr. Speaker, right now parents are forced to take two and three jobs just to feed their families. These are the people who need tax relief. Instead, the Republicans have loaded this tax bill down with gifts to their wealthy friends. It is wrong, Mr. Speaker. It is wrong, and we will not allow it.

THE CHOICE IS CLEAR: PASS TAX CUTS AS PART OF A BALANCED BUDGET

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

Ms. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, politics is all about choices. One of the biggest choices facing lawmakers is the direction of the U.S. economy. We can go down the path of higher taxation, more welfare benefits, and more regulation. This is known as the European path. It is also the path chosen by liberal Democrats.

The European path is a lot of fun for politicians. They can play Santa Claus, but it is not so much fun for the people. Just ask the people out of work in Germany or France, where the unem-

ployment rate is twice the jobless rate here in the United States.

The other path is a path in just the opposite direction: lower taxes, less regulation, welfare reform. That is the direction we want for the U.S. economy. That is the direction we want for Americans looking for a job, Americans looking for a better job, Americans looking for higher-paying jobs.

This is the time to choose directions. This time the choice is clear. We must pass the tax cuts as part of a balanced budget. Choices, Mr. Speaker, that is what politics is all about.

THE DEMOCRATIC ALTERNATIVE: TARGETED TAX BREAKS TO THE MIDDLE CLASS, NOT TO THE VERY WEALTHY

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

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Speaker, I rise this afternoon to call for tax fairness, a simple proposition. Democrats have supported balanced budgets and Democrats support reasonable tax cuts, but not tax breaks exclusively for the wealthy.

The American public needs to know that under the Republican approach to tax cuts, the top 35 percent, people making over \$247,000 a year, will get two-thirds of the benefit. There is a Democratic alternative. We take a more Robin Hood approach to tax cuts. We suggest that two-thirds of the tax benefits ought to go to the middle class, people who make \$40,000 and \$50,000, people who make \$20,000 and \$30,000.

So the proposition is really very simple. It is not a question of whether we want tax cuts. We want tax cuts. What we want are fair tax cuts that benefit most of the Americans in this country. That is the Democratic alternative: Targeted tax breaks to the middle class, not to the very wealthy.

A HISTORIC TAX CUT FOR AMERICANS

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

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, I join the ranks of Republicans who are proud to tell our constituents that this Congress is giving them the first tax cuts they have had in over 16 years. I agree with those who call this budget historic, but it is historic for a lot more than just the \$85 billion that we will be returning to the pockets of working families over the next 5 years. History is going to show that 1997 marked the year when American leaders began to redefine what is and is not income.

Through these tax cuts we have taken the first step in announcing to the American people that income is not the money they carefully saved through their lives and left for their

children and their grandchildren. Income is not the assets of their family businesses they built with pride and nurtured over the years and just happened to be there when they died. Income is not the increased valuations of their homes.

I believe these tax cuts are the first step toward a simplified tax system that fairly and honestly taxes income, and a move away from a system that punishes savings and investing in our children, in our future, as our current system does.

COMMENDING THE PRESIDENT'S INITIATIVE ON RACE

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

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, this weekend I traveled with President Clinton to San Diego, CA. There the President announced his initiative on race: One America in the 21st century.

The President has appointed a commission of highly respected Americans to examine this issue and call for a year-long dialog to take place across our Nation. In the address, the President stated, "We must be one American community, based on respect for one another and our shared values."

Mr. Speaker, I could not agree more. There is no issue more important to the future of our country than building the bridge of trust and understanding between people of all religions, all nationalities, and all colors.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend President Clinton for launching this bold initiative. Not since Lyndon Johnson has a President so directly and sincerely addressed the important issue of race. There are those who have criticized the President's initiative, who would use any opportunity to attack the President. I hope and pray that the President's critics will cease their attacks. This issue is too important to the future of our Nation to be exploited for political gain.

Thank you, Mr. President, for your inspiring words this weekend, and for beginning the process of healing and bringing our Nation together.

LET US PASS THE REPUBLICAN TAX CUT AS PART OF THE BALANCED BUDGET AGREEMENT

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

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Speaker, the more Government taxes, the more it discourages people from doing productive work. The more Government taxes, the more it discourages business from increasing output and creating jobs. The more Government taxes, the more it discourages people from saving and investing. The more Government taxes, the harder it is for families to make ends meet, the harder it is for

people to get ahead, the harder it is for individuals to realize their dreams.

Mr. Speaker, these commonsense truths apply, whether or not the Federal budget is in deficit or surplus. They apply, no matter what part of the business cycle the economy is in. They apply to those in industries and all sectors of the economy.

Quite simply, taxes are a drag on the economy, and an obstacle to people who are pursuing their dreams. Let us make it easier for people to make ends meet, get ahead, and save for the future, create new jobs, and pursue their dreams. Let us pass the tax cut plan as part of the balanced budget agreement.

GAO CONCLUSION ON PERSIAN GULF WAR ILLNESS NEEDS RE-ASSESSMENT

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

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, according to the New York Times, a GAO report to be released later this week "harshly criticized the Pentagon and a special White House panel over their investigation of the illnesses reported by veterans of the 1991 Persian Gulf war, and has found that there is substantial evidence linking nerve gas and other chemical weapons to the sorts of health problems seen among the veterans."

Frankly, as a member of the Subcommittee on Human Resources of the gentleman from Connecticut, Mr. CHRIS SHAYS, which has been studying this issue for several years, the GAO conclusion is no surprise to me. Our committee has heard time and time again from scientists and scholars who believe very strongly that a major cause of Persian Gulf war ills is the synergistic effects of chemicals that our soldiers were exposed to, as well as drugs they were given as preventative measures, such as pyridostigmine bromide.

Mr. Speaker, the Presidential Advisory Committee on Gulf War Illnesses was wrong when it concluded in December 1996 that chemical exposure was not a cause of Persian Gulf illness, and that stress was the major factor. That error has delayed and deflected necessary research and treatment for tens of thousands of veterans who are suffering today.

Mr. Speaker, I am circulating a letter that I hope my colleagues will sign, asking the Presidential Advisory Committee to reassess its findings.

DEMOCRATS WANT THE GOVERNMENT TO TAKE MORE OF TAXPAYERS' MONEY

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

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, in the immortal words of Ronald Wilson

Reagan, there you go again. We have been hearing claims of class warfare, of how the rich are somehow going to be soaking the poor, but the fact of the matter is that for 40 years Washington, DC has been soaking everybody, getting more and more tax revenue up to Washington, DC.

It was Democratic Senator BOB KERREY that ran an Independent Entitlements Council, and determined that in 30 years, our children, my 9-year-old boy when he is 39 years old, will be paying Washington 89 percent of every dollar that he makes in Federal taxes.

Yet, we bring tax relief to this floor, and time and time again it is the liberals, and some would say radicals, that are against it. They want Washington to have more and more and more, and what we in the Republican party are saying is government needs to have less and less and less, and let the people keep more and more of their money.

A TAX PLAN WHICH WILL ULTIMATELY BENEFIT ONLY THE RICH

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

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, the gift horse of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER], his tax cut plan, looks good now, but in the long-term only the rich will benefit. Those are not my words, but the words of the Philadelphia Inquirer, which pointed out the bogus nature of the Republican tax plan. As this chart clearly points out, 57.9 percent of the benefits of the Republican plan will go to the top 5 percent, those making over \$247,000 a year.

□ 1430

Average Americans would be the biggest winners, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER] says. I do not think so. Again, sounds nice, but it is bogus.

What the Republicans unveiled this week ought to be called Tax Relief for the Monied Class Act. Its focus on people trying to make ends meet lasts only for a few years. Over the long term, most of the tax savings flow to taxpayers whose incomes are much higher than the national average. If the Republican Party wants to stand or fall on that ground, waxing eloquent about a tax code that rewards risk taking, so be it. The elections in 1998 and 2000 could be a referendum on tax efficiency and fairness.

Mr. Speaker, I urge our colleagues to look carefully at who benefits from this tax proposal. Let us have tax fairness. Support the Democratic alternative.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GIBBONS). Pursuant to the provisions of

clause 5 of rule I, the Chair announces he will postpone further proceedings today on each motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 4 of rule XV.

Such rollcall votes, if postponed, will be taken after debate has concluded on all motions to suspend the rules but not before 5 p.m. today.

ANDREW JACOBS, JR. POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill—H.R. 1057—to designate the building in Indianapolis, IN, which houses the operations of the Circle City Station Post Office as the "Andrew Jacobs, Jr. Post Office Building," as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1057

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. DESIGNATION.

The building in Indianapolis, Indiana, which houses the operations of the Indianapolis Main Post Office shall be known and designated as the "Andrew Jacobs, Jr. Post Office Building".

SEC. 2. REFERENCES.

Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the building referred to in section 1 shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Andrew Jacobs, Jr. Post Office Building".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MCHUGH] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FATTAH], each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. MCHUGH].

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1057 was introduced by the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON], and, as required by the committee policy, supported by the entire Indiana delegation.

Mr. Speaker, the original bill designated the Circle City Station Post Office as the "Andrew Jacobs, Jr. Post Office Building." However, the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight approved the amendment proposed by the Subcommittee on Postal Service designating the facility housing the operation of the Indiana Main Post Office as a more appropriate building to bear the name of "Andrew Jacobs, Jr."

Mr. Speaker, as most of our colleagues in this House know full well, Andy Jacobs is and has always been a product of Indianapolis. After finishing high school in 1949 in that city, he entered the U.S. Marine Corps and served in the Korean conflict. He returned thereafter to his home State and received his B.S. degree from Indiana University and his LL.B. from Indiana University School of Law. He practiced law in that State and in that city, and