

just spoken about. That amount of money does not go far enough to help those families struggling to send their children to college.

The Democratic substitute, however, offers a better plan for lower and middle income families. In HOPE credits, they get \$1,100 in tax relief. Estate tax relief is more in keeping with the realities of family-owned businesses. It is phased in at a faster rate and not over a 15-year period. And working families could still take advantage of the \$500 tax credit. You do not deny poor working families that which you allow all other families to have.

In addition, the Democratic substitute sets a cap on capital gains. Most people want capital gains. But again a reasonable and a prudent approach given our budget goal is what is needed. And it does not index capital gains to inflation.

It is clear, Mr. Speaker, under close inspection, that the Democratic substitute is far more favorable to low and middle-income working families than the tax bill that will soon be before us that we will vote on tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, working families in America indeed need tax relief. They want it and they should have it. But they need it now and they need a fair one. I submit that the Democratic substitute provides that necessary relief. The tax bill does not.

MFN FOR CHINA, AID TO BOSNIA IN FLOOD RELIEF BILL, AND DISNEY BOYCOTT

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to mention three very important but unrelated topics. One is the vote yesterday to grant most-favored-nation status to China. Last year 141 Members voted against MFN status for China. Yesterday 173 voted against this status. This is an issue that is not going to go away and the opposition will continue to grow if the Chinese do not make major reforms and start doing better in relation to human rights. The Chinese should not take yesterday's vote as some type of endorsement of their very repressive policies. This is particularly true in relation to the horrible persecution of millions of Christians going on in China right now.

Michael Horowitz, a leader in speaking out against this persecution and who happens to be Jewish, said in a recent interview with Chuck Colson the following. He said, "I am speaking out on behalf of persecuted Christians precisely because I am a Jew in the most deeply rooted sense. I see eerie parallels between the way the elites of the world are dealing with Christians—who have become the scapegoats of choice for the thug regimes around the world—and the way the elites dealt with the Jews when Hitler came to power. Another parallel is the tongue-

tied silence of the Christian community in the face of this persecution. A similar silence was evident in the years leading to the Holocaust. Silence, anybody's silence, in the face of persecution is deadly. So for me," Mr. Horowitz said, "sparking our campaign for awareness and action is the most important thing I expect to do. What thugs did to Jews, they are doing now to Christians. I put it to you, Chuck," Mr. Horowitz said, "Christians are becoming the Jews of the 21st century."

Also, the Chinese must start treating us more fairly in regard to trade. We have a trade deficit with China now at 40 to \$50 billion, depending on whose estimate is used. Economists say conservatively that we lose 20,000 jobs per \$1 billion. This means we may be losing as many as 1 million American jobs this year to China and we are losing even more to Japan. We cannot continue these huge trade deficits and resulting huge job losses, Mr. Speaker, for much longer without doing great harm and irreparable harm to this Nation. Already while our unemployment rate is very low, our underemployment rate is terrible. As I have said before, we are ending up with the best educated waiters and waitresses in the world precisely because we are sending so many good jobs to other countries.

Secondly, and briefly, Mr. Speaker, it was unconscionable to require us to vote for \$2 billion more for Bosnia on the so-called flood relief bill. We sent far more to Bosnia than we did to North Dakota. There is no threat to our national security in Bosnia. There is no vital U.S. interest there. We cannot settle these centuries-old ethnic conflicts even if we pour our entire treasury into Bosnia. We need to put our own people first. We do not need our soldiers and sailors doing international social work. We need to bring our troops home now. I was very disappointed that yesterday we voted down the Hilleary amendment to bring our troops home by December 31. The President originally promised we would have our troops out after one year at the most and that was many months ago.

Third, Mr. Speaker, and lastly, the Hill newspaper reported today that no Members were willing to publicly support the Southern Baptists in their boycott of the Disney Company. Well, I know this boycott will not be successful against this extremely rich corporation. However, I for one, and I am a Presbyterian, not a Baptist, admire and respect the Southern Baptists for standing up for their beliefs and for trying to do what they and millions of people believe is morally right. We need much less sex and violence on television and in our movies and the Disney Corporation is not upholding family values as it once did.

TAXPAYER RELIEF ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentle-

woman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because we are about to take up a bill called by the Republican the Taxpayer Relief Act. If you look closely at this bill, a better name would be "The Rich get Richer Act."

This is no secret, Mr. Speaker. It's in all the newspapers, it's Republican payback time. It's no secret who the members on the other side of the aisle represent. More than half the benefits of the Republicans tax plan go to people who make an average of \$250,000 a year. The next 25% of their tax breaks go to those making more than \$75,000.

And who gets the crumbs, Mr. Speaker. Who is shortchanging the American working families? As is the usual case when the Republicans talk about relief, they talk about helping their wealthy friends. They are now working to cut taxes on the profits made from the sale of stocks and bonds beyond the amount of taxes paid on wages, they are working to end the corporate alternative minimum tax, they are working to give IRA tax preferences to the top 20% of taxpayers, and they are working hard to cut the taxes on estates that would benefit the top 2% of estates.

Mr. Speaker, the numbers are clear for the Republicans. Help the high incomes, help those in the highest tax brackets and the Republican know that they can help themselves. They know that the big corporations will help them if they end the alternative minimum tax so some of our largest corporations can avoid paying any taxes again. We closed this loophole some time ago and now they want to open it up again. It is no secret who is dancing with the Republicans, where their bread is buttered.

This is the party that cuts out working Americans making less than \$15,900, 15 million working, tax paying wage-earners who the Republicans say are getting welfare if they are given the same \$500 per child tax credit that Republicans say their friends making more than \$250,000 should get.

Let's do the Republican math-make less than \$15,900 and you don't need a \$500 per child tax credit-make more than \$250,000 and you do need the same tax credit. It doesn't take a rocket scientist to see where the Republicans are coming from.

In my own district, in the 18th Congressional District in Texas, the median household income is about \$22,000 a year. Will the Republican bill help most of them? Will the tax cuts they are proposing help the majority of my constituents? Will the Republican cuts help the majority of American? How much do the Republicans think the American people will stand for?

This is where the American people can see the clear differences between the Democrats and the Republicans. The Democratic plan—the plan authored by the distinguished Ranking Member of the Ways and Means Committee, Representative CHARLES RANGEL—is a plan that gives tax relief where it is need-to working families, hard working taxpaying families.

The Democratic alternative calls for three-quarters of their tax breaks going to people making less than \$58,000 a year. There are tax cuts for small business owners, there are tax credits for the parents of all of our children, there are tax breaks for families that are trying to send their children to college. Sure,

the Republicans have their education tax plan, but it wouldn't help those going to our community colleges much.

Democrats have a fairer plan for capital gains cuts—the Republican plan now means that for wealthy investors, they will pay a lower effective rate on the profits of the sale of their stocks than a moderate income family pays on their wages. Democrats would allow those who are forced to sell their home at a loss some tax relief—the Republicans don't. Democrats target a fairer capital gains cut for small businesses and farmers. Our estate tax relief is aimed at giving families who want to pass on their small businesses a break rather than the well off who don't really need these kinds of tax cuts.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for the American people to draw the line in the sand. It is time for the working families out there to be heard. It is time to stand up and be counted. Who does this House of the People stand for? There is nothing more basic than taxes and the difference between the Republicans tax package and the Democratic tax package is plain for Americans to see. It is time to stand up and really be counted.

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

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

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

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

□ 1930

OPPOSITION TO THE TAX AND SPENDING PORTIONS OF THE RECONCILIATION BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TIAHRT). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. MEEK] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I oppose both the tax provisions and the spending provisions of the reconciliation bill. I want to say why, Mr. Speaker.

The spending cuts that the House approved today fall mainly on the weakest members of our society, on the sick and on the elderly. Tomorrow we will be voting on tax cuts that mainly favor the wealthy. Today the House voted to rob from the poor so that tomorrow the majority can help the rich.

I think that is wrong, Mr. Speaker, and I oppose both parts of this strategy.

According to the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, the poorest 20 percent of families, those with an average annual income of only \$9,200 will get \$63 less because of the majority cuts in Federal spending and changes

in taxes. Think of this, Mr. Speaker. The wealthiest 1 percent of the families, those with an average annual income of \$442,000 come out as big winners. They will have \$27,000 more. That means that the extra money they get under this majority bill exceeds the total income of the poorest in this Nation.

I represent many of those people, Mr. Speaker. I seek an appeal to the Congress to look at this bill that has these tax cuts that will not help the poorest of the poor.

The majority here in the House wants to pay for these unfair tax cuts by squeezing large public hospitals like my public hospital in Miami, Jackson Memorial. It helps the poor and that is probably one of the few hospitals that must take the poor.

The Republican majority cuts the Medicare payments to hospitals by \$38 billion over 5 years. The reported bill, Mr. Speaker, is one that will certainly rob from the poor. I think that it is wrong, and certainly I oppose this strategy because it does fall on the weakest members of our society. It also cuts for hospitals like my public hospital the disproportionate share payment to hospitals like Jackson Memorial by another 13 billion over 5 years.

You know who is going to take up that cost? The taxpayers, the middle income, the upper income, the poor; someone has to pay that share that no longer will the government assist in sharing enough to help hospitals like Jackson. That is a \$51 billion hit on these kinds of hospitals.

These hospitals treat the poorest in our communities. It is the poor who would end up getting less health care.

Yesterday I tried to improve on part of the reconciliation bill by asking the Committee on Rules to make in order my bipartisan amendment to give supplemental security, which we call SSI, the Supplemental Security Income, and the Medicaid to 147,000 legal immigrants who have been living in this country who were in the country last August, but they are not covered by the reported Ways and Means proposal.

You know who is going to have to take care of them and give them the health care? You are, Mr. Speaker, and I and those of us who are able to pay for that because, if you were not poor or elderly or disabled when this bill passed last year, then you are still in this country, and now when you get to be 64 years old and you become disabled and elderly, you are not covered.

I offer this amendment with my dear colleague from Florida [Ms. ROSLEHTINEN] and we also offer a way to pay for this, Mr. Speaker, for these needy people, but the Committee on Rules refused to let the House vote on our bipartisan way of improving the bill.

Mr. Speaker, we all would like to cut taxes. We know that the time has come that we can no longer spend where there are no resources. We understand

that. We know that this is a time of belt tightening. We know that this is a time, as we go into the year 2000, that we must balance the budget. Well, you have decided to do that; the budget agreement has been cut. But this is not the time, not when we are asking the poor and the elderly to pay for the tax cuts.

There is a fair way to cut taxes, but the way of the leadership is the wrong way. It worsens the spread between our wealthiest citizens and our poorest citizens. No one is here to say that poor and middle class people are not supposed to pay taxes, but I am saying that if there is a gap, it should be one that is equitable and that the rich will pay their share as well as the middle income and the poor.

TAX CUTS SHOULD BE FAIR

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

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the staff for putting in yet another late evening here on behalf of the people of America.

Mr. Speaker, I support a balanced budget. I strongly support it and all the things it can do for the business climate in this country. I voted for the budget deal and was one of the two-thirds of the Democratic side that did vote for the budget deal for a balanced budget, and as we know here that includes a tax cut over the next 5 years totaling \$135 billion.

Tomorrow we are going to make a choice about what type of tax cut we want, what type of tax cut do we think America would benefit from. And Mr. Speaker, I consider this to be the good side of partisanship, that there is going to be a choice we make tomorrow between the Republican plan and Democratic plan; and we are in the minority party, but we have an alternative that we think is better.

For me the issue comes down to what is the best tax cut plan for Arkansas. That is where I am from. What is going to be best for the working middle class families of Arkansas, for farmers, for self-employed, for the small business folks of Arkansas, for those American who play by the rules, work hard and pay taxes? Let me deal first, Mr. Speaker, with the child tax credit.

I am going to protect last names here, but this is Judy and her two lovely children, constituents of mine in central Arkansas. Judy makes \$7.50 an hour. That works out to a total of \$15,000 a year.

Now under the Republican plan because she qualifies for the earned income tax credit, a credit that has been supported by every President including Ronald Reagan since Ronald Reagan; because she takes advantage of that earned income tax credit, under the Republican plan, she will not qualify for the \$300 or \$500 per child tax credit.

Now the argument we hear is that, well, she does not pay income tax, that