

nine additional B-2 bombers over the next 20 years could cost over \$27 billion.

□ 1345

Let me read a variety of editorials that have appeared in the papers around America.

Stuart News, Port St. Lucie, FL, "U.S. Must Get Maximum Bang for Military Bucks."

The cost of these programs is staggering, especially considering the strategic fact that the threats that they are designed to counter do not now exist or, like the B-2 bomber, are designed to attack countries that no longer exist.

They are urging we look at first providing for military pay, for military housing, for the readiness of troops, rather than expensive technological equipment that the Air Force and the Pentagon themselves do not support.

The Atlanta Constitution: "Pentagon is Not a Welfare Agency."

There is, however, one notable exception to that trend. Last week, the House Appropriations Committee approved a defense budget for 1997 of \$245.8 billion, \$11 billion more than the Pentagon says it needs, and the Pentagon is not known for underestimating its needs.

Unfortunately, each additional dollar that we spend on defense is a dollar not available for schools,

for infrastructure, or for deficit reduction.

While other nations invest their wealth in those areas, we build B-2 bombers.

"Don't Sacrifice Military Readiness," by the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

Another case is the \$2.2 billion for each B-2 bomber, which, again, the Pentagon doesn't want, but which Members of Congress do, to keep weapons contractors and jobs alive in their district. President Clinton himself insists on yet another *Seawolf* submarine to keep the production lines open to build other submarines in the future. Meanwhile, maintenance on helicopters, tanks, trucks, and warships is being deferred. Military pay raises are paltry, and the quality of housing for men and women in uniform isn't as good as it should be.

No; because we are spending billions on a B-2 bomber that the Pentagon does not want.

Milwaukee Journal Sentinel: "Bring Military Budgets Back to Earth."

In fact, Congress in recent years has actually padded the military budget

for projects like the B-2 bomber,

that are relics from the cold war and pork-barrel goodies for hometown military contractors.

The evidence against the B-2 is overwhelming. The debate really needs to be about helping people in uniform have decent pay so they are not on food stamps, living in decent housing, like most Americans would like them to live in.

So we have a choice this week, to support the continued expenditure of massive dollars to weapons systems that we no longer need, or we can clearly change direction and focus on priorities that would make this Nation militarily sound and safe.

I urge my colleagues tomorrow to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. DELUMS], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FOLEY] to strike the B-2 bomber from funding, to close the production line, to allow the military to continue to have its 20-some B-2 bombers, but clearly understand since the end of communism and Soviet dominance in the cold war, the need for the B-2 bomber has been significantly reduced. Significantly reduced.

Let us look forward to helping make the military strong by supporting their good intentions, and not give them things they have chosen not to ask for.

THE DEMOCRATIC TAX CUT PROPOSAL RESTORES FAIRNESS TO THE AMERICAN TAXPAYER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CHAMBLISS). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Indiana [Ms. CARSON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. CARSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about justice and fairness. When we were children our parents instilled in us a sense of fairness. We were taught to be equitable and impartial and truthful when dealing with others. We were taught to aid those in need. Obviously, all of us in this body took that to heart, and that is why we are here as we pursue public service on behalf of the public.

Let us consider the budget amendment in general, however. Rather than stay within the parameters of the balanced budget agreement which passed the House overwhelmingly, the Republican framers of the tax cut have decided not to play fair, and to abandon the agreement. The original agreement contained a provision to provide at least \$35 billion in tax credits for college education. Yet, the Republicans have offered us only \$22 billion in education tax credits, in direct violation of the budget agreement.

It seems as though this sense of fairness has been lost on those framing the tax cuts, because they are attempting to undercut the agreement that was made with the President, and will deny American taxpayers \$13 billion in tax relief. We should at least play fair and restore this provision of the tax cut.

According to the Department of the Treasury, two-thirds of the Republican tax cuts go to families making beyond \$100,000 a year. The majority of constituents in my district, Indianapolis, IN, of which nearly 50 percent make less than \$25,000 a year, they certainly will be not happy, they will be unhappy to learn the fact that the Republican tax cut will go to families making over \$100,000 a year, for the most part.

I rise to support the Democratic alternative to the Republican tax cut package. Unlike the Republican proposal, the Democratic proposal restores some fairness to the American taxpayer and stays within the parameters of the budget agreement.

In general, the Democratic tax proposal will target its cuts to those making less than \$100,000 a year, not the other way around. Seventy-one percent of the Democratic tax cuts will go to nearly 91 million families across the United States that make under \$100,000 a year. Twenty-three percent of the Democratic tax cuts will target the most vulnerable of our society, those making under \$21,000 a year.

The Democratic alternative will truly allow families to stretch their budget further and provide true tax relief, rather than just smoke and mirrors. I am particularly pleased with the education tax cut initiatives in the Democratic proposal. If we are going to truly effect positive change in our society, provide our young people the chance to improve our Nation's future, we must provide them with the opportunity to access the best education possible.

The Democratic alternative provides more money for the HOPE scholarship, provides incentives for employer-provided educational assistance, and provides a source of cost-free capital for desperately needed school construction; at least \$37 billion worth of tax cuts for education. It provides \$15 billion more education initiative than the Republican plan does.

Under the Democratic proposal, HOPE scholarship tax credits are provided at a rate of 1,100 for 1997 through 1999, increasing to \$1,500 per student after the year 2000.

At Indiana University at Indianapolis, tuition costs \$2,400 a year. At Ivy Tech State College, it runs \$1,500 a year. The Democratic HOPE tax credit will provide for nearly 50 percent of the tuition at those two referenced universities.

I would encourage, Mr. Speaker, this august body to consider what is fair and adopt the Democratic alternative, so we will truly be providing both HOPE and fairness for our constituents.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about fairness. When we were children, our parents instilled in us a sense of fairness. We were taught to be equitable, impartial, and truthful when dealing with others. We were taught to aid those in need. Obviously, all of us in this body took this message to heart. Otherwise, we would not have chosen a life of public service. Yet I am sad to say that in examining the recent Republican tax cut initiative, some of my colleagues have abandoned these principles.

First, consider the budget agreement in general. Rather than stay within the parameters of the balanced budget agreement which passed in the House overwhelmingly, the framers of the Republican tax cut have decided not to play fair and to abandon the agreement. The original agreement contained a provision to provide at least \$35 billion in tax credits for college education. Yet the Republicans have offered us only \$22 billion in education tax credits, in direct violation of the Budget Agreement. It seems as though this sense of fairness has been lost on those framing the tax cuts, because they are attempting to undercut

the agreement struck with the President, and deny American taxpayers \$13 billion in tax relief. We should at least play fair and restore this provision into the tax cut package.

Yet the skewed sense of fairness on the Republican side does not end there. The tax cut package as a whole will benefit a small percentage of middle class Americans. Let's go to the numbers. According to the Department of Treasury, two-thirds of the Republican tax cuts will go to families making over \$100,000 a year. The majority of constituents in my district in Indianapolis, of which nearly 50 percent make less than \$25,000 a year, will not be happy to learn this fact. The Republicans have promised in this Congress and the last that middle-class tax relief was their top priority, to allow those who work hard to take home more of their pay. Instead, middle-class taxpayers get the same old tried and true Republican tax cuts that benefit the wealthy, a Robin Hood in reverse for the majority of Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support the Democratic alternative to the Republican tax cut package. Unlike the Republican proposal, the Democratic proposal restores fairness to the American taxpayer and stays within the parameters of the budget agreement. In general, the Democratic tax proposal will target its cuts to those making less than \$100,000 a year, and not the other way around. Seventy-one percent of the Democratic tax cuts will go to the nearly 91 million families across the U.S. that make under \$100,000 a year. Twenty-three percent of the Democrat tax cuts will target the most vulnerable of our society, those making under \$21,000 a year. The Democratic alternative will truly allow families to stretch their budget further and provide true tax relief, rather than smoke and mirrors.

I am particularly pleased with the education tax cut initiatives in the Democratic proposal. If we are truly going to effect positive change in our society and provide our young people the chance to improve our Nation's future, we must provide them with the opportunity to access the best education possible. The Democratic alternative provides more money for the HOPE scholarship, provides incentives for employer-provided education assistance, and provides a source of cost-free capital for desperately needed school construction. At \$37 billion worth of tax cuts for education, it provides \$15 billion more education initiatives than the Republican plan does.

Under the Democratic proposal, HOPE scholarship tax credits are provided at a rate of \$1,100 for 1997-99, increasing to \$1,500 per student after 2001. The Republican is half this amount at \$600 per student. In addition, families could receive the credit for 4 years of postsecondary education, rather than only 2 years as provided in the Republican proposal. In my State of Indiana, \$600 does not seem like much in accessing postsecondary education. But if we provide double that amount, it will go a long way in reducing the average cost of education in my district in Indianapolis. At Indiana University-Purdue University of Indianapolis, tuition costs \$2,400 a year; at Ivy Tech State College, tuition runs at \$1,500 a year. The Democratic HOPE tax credit would provide for nearly 50 percent of the tuition at IUPUI, and nearly all of the cost at Ivy Tech. These are the two largest colleges in my district, with over 23,000 students attending the two institutions. By providing the HOPE schol-

arship at the levels provided for in the Democratic alternative, we will truly be providing HOPE for many of my constituents.

Yet another education related initiative in the Democratic proposal that I applaud is the school construction assistance provision. Schools in my district are dilapidated and crumbling. Indianapolis Public Schools recently approved drastic cuts in programs to rein in spending in their budget. With the Democratic proposal, schools in either empowerment zones or enterprise communities could enter into a partnership with private businesses that would make contributions to school improvements and would issue special bonds to finance school improvements. This would go a long way in communities such as Indianapolis to ensure that our children are not learning in deathtraps, and that we could bring our schools into the 21st century in terms of facilities by the next millennium.

Mr. Speaker, President Clinton addressed this body 4 months ago in his State of the Union address. In it, he laid out an ambitious agenda for education which I, along with the majority of Americans, applauded. The President's vision for our young people and ensuring they receive the best education in the world should not be lost in the budget wrangling that occurs in this House. I urge my colleagues to adopt the Democratic alternative to the tax bill and give our working families, especially our children, the break they deserve.

THE EDUCATION AT A CROSSROADS PROJECT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mrs. NORTHUP] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. NORTHUP. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the House's attention the visit last month of the Education at a Crossroads Project. I have had, as the mother of six children, a great interest in education and in the education of each of my children. For that reason, in the 9 years that I was in the Kentucky General Assembly I was very involved in the education program, in working to implement the new Education Reform Act that was implemented by Kentucky in 1990. That act is often pointed to by departments of education around the country as an example of education and education progress.

The implementation of that bill has been very challenging in our State. It is not universally acclaimed and it has not had universal success, but it has made a dramatic difference in the education opportunities for many children. I would like to talk today about some of the basis of that program that I think is accepted and is believed has made the most difference.

The program is based on the fact that each child, each community, each faculty in a school face unique challenges to succeed and have unique talents to address those challenges. It was not believed that at the State level, and certainly, Mr. Speaker, not at the Federal level could we fashion an educational system that would meet all the differing needs of each neighborhood, each community across our State.

So we put in place a program where each State, based on the parental involvement, the teacher involvement, have site-based decisionmaking. They have the ultimate responsibility for each child achieving at a higher level. Yes, we expect each child can learn at a higher level, can achieve high academic success if our expectations are high.

In each of our schools, Mr. Speaker, we have site-based decisionmaking that assesses what the challenges are: what are the programs that are needed, what are the extended day programs, what are the after-school programs, the Saturday learning opportunities, the year-round schools; the challenges that are most needed so each child has the best opportunities for success?

Each school is given the resources so they can determine themselves how to use those resources to meet those needs. As the Federal Government ponders how we make an impact in school, I think looking at Kentucky, as this administration so often does, is a good point of reference.

Rather than fashioning programs that are going to be the same across the country, we need to designate our schools as the front line of education opportunity and make sure that they are not bound by more regulations, by more constraining programs, by programs that tie their hands, tie the teachers' hands, and tie their abilities to uniquely address the challenges that exist in that school.

I have been proud to work with education in Kentucky, and I was thrilled that the Education at a Crossroads came to Kentucky, because it gave them an opportunity to see the Cane Run Elementary School that is in one of the most high-risk neighborhoods of Jefferson County, and the success they have achieved; the children whose grades and their achievement scores have gone up so dramatically, the parents who come to school every morning to that school so they, too, can get their GED and go on to better welfare-to-work opportunities.

The Cane Run Elementary School has dramatically changed the opportunities not only of children who are in that school, but also of the mothers and fathers who are in that district, so their opportunities are better and improved too. There is such a sense of accomplishment, such a sense of achievement, such a sense of joy in that school for the achievement that has been realized.

I think it points to the example of where, on the front lines, the school that is empowered to make the decision to use the money in block grant form to address its needs, the success it can achieve.

They also visited Southern High School, that has a model program, school-to-work. It is helped by the private sector. They have invested a million dollars of equipment and energy to make sure that those students have the high-tech opportunities to learn, so