

THE REPUBLICAN TAX BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I am certainly glad tonight to have an opportunity to discuss this tax bill with my Democrat colleagues and Republican colleagues. Tomorrow we are going to vote on the first tax relief bill in 16 years. It is a bill that gives capital gains tax relief and a \$500 per child tax credit, it gives death tax relief, a college scholarship or deduction, the HOPE scholarship, and the American dream IRA. Make no mistake, this tax bill is not perfect by any stretch of the imagination, but it is the first tax bill that we have had in over 16 years.

We are hearing a lot from the Democrats that this tax bill, or it is kind of interesting to hear it coming from some of the speakers, that for the first time they are saying, it is not a question of tax relief.

I do not understand that. They have had this Chamber for 40 years. They have never passed tax relief until Ronald Reagan shoved it on them. But they have been passing lots of tax increases, and what they are saying is, well, we want tax relief, but not this. Does that sound familiar?

If you are a watcher of politics, you will know this is the same thing they have always said on the budget: Of course we want to balance the budget, but not here, not now, not this bill. It is the same old thing.

Let us talk, Mr. Speaker, let us talk about who benefits from this, because we keep hearing that this is a tax cut for the wealthy. If Members will look at this chart, I invite my colleagues to see, this is a chart with information by the nonpartisan Joint Economic Committee. It shows that the tax relief, the bulk of it, will go, and this is about 76 percent, to families with a combined household income of \$20,000 to \$75,000. Over here is the \$75,000 to \$100,000. This area right here on this chart is 91 percent of the tax relief.

Now, will somebody who is wealthy get a little bit of tax relief? Yes, they will. I know that the Democrats hate folks who have succeeded. They just seem to love class warfare and they are not about to do it. So to keep their continuation of the debate on this rich, evil American, and it is interesting, sometime when you are working, maybe go out there and look at the person who is creating the jobs, and ask yourself, is this a mean, evil person?

But to show the low degree to which they will stoop in order to prove their point, what they have done is they have taken a household that makes \$49,000 a year. Then they charge you rent on your own house that you may or may not be paying a mortgage on, but let us just say it is a \$100,000 house. What the Democrats do is say that is worth \$1,000 a month in rent. To your \$49,000 they are going to add \$12,000 in

rent. If you have a parking space at your job they are going to charge you \$30 or \$40 a month in rent, and they are saying that is what it is worth, and they are going to add that to your income, and also gains on your pension plan, anything that is a benefit.

So when you are through with the Democratic tricks, the \$49,000 income is worth \$93,000. So if you are represented by a Democrat, I would invite you to write him or her and ask him, how did you come up with these numbers? And then ask yourself if you would really want somebody who understands math like that to represent you, and maybe you may want to think about qualifying for the job yourself.

This is the reality of taxes, which Democrats hate. That is that 95 percent of the taxes in America are paid by the people in the top 50 percent bracket. Why do we give middle class tax relief? Because those are the folks who are paying the taxes. What the Democrats want to do, if you are middle class, they want to take your \$500 per child tax credit that you as a taxpayer are paying and give it to somebody who does not pay taxes. Think about this. A single woman with a 14-year-old and a 16-year-old, under the Republican plan, will get \$1,000 in tax relief. Under the Democrat plan she will get zero. Yes, that is compassion, to the middle class.

Where will that money go? It will go to somebody who is not paying taxes. Does that make sense? Is that compassion? Is that what Members want? Just because this woman, this single mother of two is out there working and just because her children are over 12 years old, she is not going to get any tax relief, but the person who is not paying taxes will get that \$500 per child tax relief.

In my district there was a young man, he is 30 years old. He was bragging to the newspaper the other day that he has fathered 30 kids. He has 30 children. I want to say this to him, more power to you as long as you pay for them. But the fact is he is not paying for them, you are paying for them. Under the Democrat plan the tax relief will go to him as a non-taxpayer.

I am telling the Members, it is a fraud. Vote for middle class tax relief. Vote for the Republican plan, and do not listen to the phony baloney that the Democrats are pushing.

□ 1845

THE LIFE OF MS. JEWEL LAFONTANT MANKARIOUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TIAHRT). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAVIS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as the Chicago Sun Times put it, "A jewel has died." That is Jewel Lafontant Makarious. I rise to pay tribute to a great woman, a great lady, a great Chicagoan, an accomplished

lawyer, civil rights advocate, a great American, friend of Presidents and mother of John Rogers who is President of the Chicago Park District and President of Ariel Mutual Funds.

Active in Republican politics, Mrs. Mankarious was a close friend of Presidents Eisenhower, Nixon and Bush. She was a longtime civil rights activist and broke down barriers for blacks and women in both government and corporate America.

During the Eisenhower administration, she was assistant U.S. Attorney, the first black woman to hold that post. She was a good friend of Richard Nixon and seconded his nomination for President at the Republican National Convention in 1960. In 1972, she became the Deputy Solicitor General in the Justice Department and later served as U.S. Ambassador at Large for 4 years in the Bush administration and finished her government career as Coordinator of Refugee Affairs.

Her longtime friend, George JOHNSON, founder and chairman of JOHNSON Products, described her this way:

She gave her legal services to the down-trodden people who could not fight for themselves. She fought for people who could not fight the system. She was a wonderful woman of great accomplishments.

Mrs. Lafontant was a trial lawyer, recognized for being one of the best. She was a founding member of the Congress of Racial Equality, participated in demonstrations and sit-ins. By 1969, she had sat on the board of 15 major corporations, including Jewel Foods, Mobile Oil and Trans World Airlines. She held office in the NAACP and was on the board of the American Civil Liberties Union.

I express my condolences to her son, John Rogers, and his family, and to her husband, Mr. Naguib Mankarious.

The Chicago Sun Times is indeed correct, she was indeed a jewel. America has benefited greatly from her life and her contributions. The annals of history will always remember the impact of Jewel Lafontant Mankarious.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. EHLERS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. EHLERS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

THE POLICE STATE COMETH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PAUL] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, in a police state the police are national, powerful and authoritarian. Inevitably, national governments yield to the temptation to use the military to do the heavy lifting. Once the military is used for local police activity, however minor initially, the march toward martial law with centralized police using military

troops as an adjunct force becomes irresistible.

Throughout our history, law enforcement in the United States has remained for the most part a local matter. In recent history, especially since the 1970s, the growth of Federal agencies to enforce tens of thousands of regulations, not even written even by Congress, has changed our attitude toward the proper use of police power as established under the Constitution. While this is annoying to many Americans, many of whom are voicing their resentment, the principle of a centralized police power has become acceptable and unchallenged by our political leaders today.

The emotional frenzy surrounding the war on drugs has allowed Federal police powers to escalate rapidly into the areas of financial privacy, gun ownership, border controls and virtually all other aspects of law enforcement. Many see this trend as dangerous to our liberties while doing little or nothing to solve the problems of violence, gang wars, deterioration of the inner cities or the decline of the public educational system.

The declared justification for military intervention at Mount Carmel, although never substantiated, was that the Branch Davidians were manufacturing amphetamines. This provided the legal cover for army tanks to use the poisonous gas which apparently resulted in the devastating fire in what was a military operation to enforce the law, something which in ordinary times would have been strictly a local law enforcement matter.

Despite the legitimate concerns surrounding nationalization of the police force and using the military to enforce local laws, the House just recently and overwhelmingly approved the use of 10,000 military troops to patrol U.S. borders, none of whom, however, expect to be deployed on the northern border. Rather than addressing the incentive of welfare benefits to legal and illegal aliens, Congress instead reinstated the funding to aliens which was struck in last year's budget welfare reform. The House evidently in its infinite wisdom believes that 10,000 troops will solve many of our social problems.

If this Nation's drug laws are not reconsidered, the tremendous incentive for quick profits will prevent any success that might otherwise result from more and more armed border agents.

But it is also the psychology behind this effort that so often allows the enforcement process to get out of hand, whether at Ruby Ridge or Waco. So far the military on our southern border has not exactly done itself proud.

In January of this year, the army shot and wounded an illegal immigrant near the Rio Grande Valley. Initially the Army said the alien fired twice at the soldiers and had been involved in a robbery. These facts, however, were never substantiated. Even worse, though, is the case of an 18-year-old exemplary high school student and U.S.

citizen named Ezequiel Hernandez who on May 20 was shot and killed after being tracked for 20 minutes. He was wounded but then was allowed to bleed to death. What is more, now that more evidence regarding the shooting has become available, the soldier pulling the trigger is the subject of an ongoing investigation. Perhaps to some, these are minor incidents but the issue of using military troops for routine law enforcement is indeed a serious matter.

According to an article by Thaddeus Herrick in the June 22 issue of the Houston Chronicle, changes in the law permitting the military to be used for law enforcement occurred during the Reagan administration and expanded steadily during the Bush and the Clinton administrations. Currently, about 700 troops are being used for law enforcement, mainly for the purpose of enforcing drug laws. However, with the new legislation working its way through Congress, the numbers could grow substantially. This does not include the 6,000 border control agents already manning the borders, a number which is slated to increase to 20,000 over the next 10 years.

Lawrence Korb, former Assistant Secretary of Defense under Reagan was and remains critical of the trends toward using military troops in this manner. His argument according to Herrick is that soldier's "whole mindset is to go to war. They try to perform law enforcement but at some points their instincts may take over." This is a good warning which could be equally applied to our troops being used as civil policemen in foreign countries under the United Nations banner, such as has done recently in Haiti, Somalia and now as well in Bosnia. Korb has consistently opposed using the military on our borders.

The Clinton administration, in continuing the process begun by Reagan, defends his doing so. Don Maple a spokesperson for the National Drug Control Policy stated, "We believe there will always be a role for the military in law enforcement."

When the Mexican Government ignored the Mexican Constitution in the 1830s and used the military to enforce civil law in Texas, the Texas settlers would have no part of it. The Texans' strong objection and resistance to military law eventually led to the Battle of San Jacinto. Military law in the colonies led to a similar result. Congress must be more careful in ignoring this principle.

Until Congress addresses the failed policy of a national war on drugs and welfare state incentives which draw aliens across the borders in ever-increasing numbers, this unconstitutional national, centralized police state can only result in more loss of liberties in a never-ending battle fought at the expense of the American taxpayer.

CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GEJDENSON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, we are close to July 4, and it was not that long ago the President asked us to come to the Congress with a campaign finance reform bill that we would vote on by July 4, get it through the House, the Senate, and bring it to the President's desk.

There has been virtually no action on campaign finance reform. I think I know the reason. There is a fundamental difference between the majority of the Republicans and the majority of the Democrats. Enunciated by the Speaker, Speaker GINGRICH says, "One of the greatest myths of modern politics is that campaigns are too expensive. The political process in fact is underfunded, it is not overfunded."

Now, it is interesting because my colleague, the Speaker in particular, seems to say in almost every other category that there is too much money. If it is feeding children, he says there is too much money. We cannot throw money at the problem. If it is education, he does not want to throw money at the problem. But when it comes to campaigns, he thinks there is not enough money.

I find it very hard to grasp this concept. And if we take a look at what has happened here, things like low-income energy assistance has been cut by 50 percent since 1978. We have had community development banks have gone up 27 percent. Maternal and child health block grants have gone up 91 percent from 1978. Congressional campaigns have gone up 294 percent. It does not indicate a shortage of cash.

What it indicates is in reality that we spend way too much time raising money. And if one is running for the Senate in California, the last race was \$14.4 million. In 1992, there was a cheap race for 10.4 million. And we come to an average of about \$12.4 million. A winning candidate must raise \$39,744 over the course of the 312 weeks to make sure they have the money for that race.

Now, there is a reason why the Republicans basically exercise their class warfare not just in the tax bill and not just in the budget authority and where they want to spend money, but why they want wealth to be represented in the political process, because they have a tremendous advantage.

So when one talks to the Speaker and he says he thinks you need more money, well, they have already got about a \$200 million-some advantage in the campaign funding system that we have here today. I do not know how much more of an advantage he wants to have.

My belief is that the democratic institutions we have here ought to represent people and not just a way to funnel money into the political system. Candidates spend too much time raising money. The American people no