

served 7 years as a gunner in World War II, he went to work for Lorene's father, where they first met.

After they wed, they lived on a small farm in Harrisonville, GA, and every day Grover commuted to Hapeville, GA, to work for Ford Motor Co. During this time, Lorene worked at Callaway Mills until she decided to quit in order to raise their three children. In 1975, Grover and Lorene sold the farm and went to work for Milliken Mills until their retirement in the late 1980's.

In addition to working hard and raising a great family, the Hobbsses helped to found the Harrisonville Baptist Church in which, as a church service, they regularly visit the local nursing home.

It is extremely heart warming, Mr. Speaker, to see two people so devoted to church, their family, and of course to each other. Their commitment truly personifies what marriage ought to be. I would like to extend the warmest of congratulations to Grover and Lorene Hobbs for years past and years to come of a happy and healthy marriage on their 50th wedding anniversary.

REPUBLICAN TAX BILL OFFERS BONANZA FOR AFFLUENT, CRUMBS FOR WORKING CLASS

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

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, the Republicans will stand here today and say that they are bringing tax relief to the middle class. They complain that the Democrats are being less than honest about the Republicans' attack on working families. Well, Mr. Speaker, even the Wall Street Journal, no friend of the Democrats, agreed with us.

Here it is in the Wall Street Journal. The Republican bill is, and I quote, "a bonanza for the affluent, crumbs for the working class." It "shamefully short changes the working poor." The Wall Street Journal says that under the Republican plan, Bill Gates will get a \$4,000 tax break for education expenses, while a new police officer making \$23,000 will be denied a tax credit for his kids.

Mr. Speaker, if the Republicans are not listening to the American people and they are not listening to the Wall Street Journal, it seems obvious who they are listening to, to their campaign contributors.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF CONCURRENT RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR ADJOURNMENT OF HOUSE AND SENATE FOR INDEPENDENCE DAY DISTRICT WORK PERIOD

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 176 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 176

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order, any rule of the House to the contrary notwithstanding, to consider a concurrent resolution providing for adjournment of the House and Senate for the Independence Day district work period.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. UPTON). The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 176 provides for the consideration in the House of a concurrent resolution providing for the adjournment of the House and Senate for the Independence Day district work period. All points of order are waived against the resolution and its consideration.

As Members are aware, section 309 of the Budget Act states that the House cannot adjourn for more than 3 calendar days in July if it has not completed actions on all appropriations bills. In addition, section 310 requires that reconciliation legislation if directed by the budget resolution, be completed before such an adjournment.

Ordinarily, these two potential points of order against an adjournment resolution for the Fourth of July District Work Period are waived by unanimous consent. In fact, we attempted to work with the minority to reach an acceptable unanimous consent agreement. When we were in the minority, we consistently allowed these unanimous consent agreements. This year, however, the minority rejected our request.

It is true that the Congress has not completed its work on the appropriations bills and the reconciliation legislation, and I guess I can understand the despondency of the minority. The past few days have not been enjoyable for those who support high taxes and big government solutions.

However, these are extraordinary times for those of us who support the axiom that the Government is too big and spends too much. In fact, I would say that this Congress, more than any other, has led the way in exhibiting fiscal sanity.

No, the appropriations bills and the reconciliation legislation are not yet complete. However, balancing the budget is more difficult than the practice of past Congresses, which simply passed irresponsible debt on to our grandchildren.

America was headed for a future in which interest on the debt would surpass spending on the defense of our Nation, a future in which Medicare would go bankrupt by 2002, and a future which had taxpayers giving more and more of their hard-earned money to support a bloated Washington bureaucracy.

Our Nation could have lost control of its destiny, but this Congress took action to save Medicare, pass a balanced budget and provide massive tax relief for our families. These are truly historic accomplishments.

Independence Day is a time to celebrate the birth of this Nation and the perseverance of the Founding Fathers who fought the heavy hand of government and oppressive taxes. The budget passed by this Congress reduces the oppressive taxes on American families and balances the budget.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution simply allows us to go home to our friends and neighbors to listen to what our constituents have to say about issues that are important to their lives. As we celebrate the birth of our Nation with them, I believe they will be very pleased to celebrate the triumph of lower taxes, less Government and more freedom.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LINDER] for yielding me the customary half hour, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution is one more way for the Republican leadership to go on vacation before their work is done. It is one more way for my Republican colleagues to get out of their responsibilities to the people of this country, and I think it is a bad idea. Normally adjournment resolutions are privileged, but in the rare cases when Congress fails to get its work done, the Budget Act kicks in and exposes these adjournment resolutions to points of order.

According to the Budget Act, Mr. Speaker, the House cannot adjourn for more than 3 days unless it passes all its appropriations bills and unless the reconciliation bill has been signed into law. Mr. Speaker, we all know the appropriations bills are nowhere near finished.

The first part of the reconciliation bill passed the House only last night and the second part of the reconciliation bill will be considered for the first time later today. The Senate has just started debating the reconciliation bill and the conference committee has not even met yet. In other words, Mr. Speaker, if you are waiting for these spending bills to be finished, please do not hold your breath.

Mr. Speaker, the American people sent us to Congress to act responsibly and the Congressional Budget Act gives us some very specific responsibilities. Section 300 requires that Congress complete action on reconciliation legislation by June 15 and pass all 13 appropriations bills by June 30. Mr. Speaker, this Congress has not even come close. The appropriations bills may not seem urgent now, but unless the House does its work and unless the House gives the Senate enough time to do its work, we will be approaching another September 30 without all appropriations bills being signed. If we fail

to finish the appropriations bills and they are not signed into law, the American people could very well see their Government shut down for the third time under the Republican leadership's watch. All because the Republican leadership has not done their work.

That is not the worst of it, Mr. Speaker. What the Republican leadership has done is even worse than what they have not done. This week the Republican leadership unveiled their tax and entitlement package and, Mr. Speaker, it does not look good. Under the Republican bill, the families of 40 percent of American children will get no tax relief because their income is too low.

Let me add, Mr. Speaker, these people are not on welfare. These people actually work for a living. Meanwhile, according to the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, the Republican bill provides 87 percent of its benefits to the richest 20 percent of Americans while the 40 million families with the lowest income may actually lose money.

Even the Treasury Department says that when this bill has been fully implemented, the top 1 percent of taxpayers will get nearly 20 percent of the benefits, and the bottom 60 percent will get only 12 percent of the benefits.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, the Republican leadership is taking from the poor and the middle class and giving to the rich. It is a Robin Hood reversal. It does not stop there, Mr. Speaker. According to today's New York Times, a small provision in this Republican bill will take \$9 million and split it among 1,000 wealthy taxpayers. Some of these taxpayers actually stand to gain \$100,000 each under this bill.

Mr. Speaker, not 5 miles from here are American children who do not get enough to eat during the summer because they have lost their school lunches, but my Republican colleagues still want to hand those enormous tax breaks to the very richest Americans and hand just about nothing to the rest.

Mr. Speaker, the American people do not think millionaires need more money. They think everyone else needs child tax credits and tuition tax credits. The American people do not think the richest 1 percent of Americans need a \$27,000 tax break and certainly not if it is going to cost the poorest 20 percent of American families \$63 apiece to give it to them. But that is exactly what my Republican colleagues want to do.

On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, the House Democrats have put together a bill that gives tax relief to the people that really need it, the middle class, people who are trying to send their kids to college, working families, and family-owned businesses.

I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing this resolution. This Congress should be helping the middle class and not padding the pockets of millionaires.

□ 1030

And we should have finished our work a long time ago.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute to respond to the gentleman from Massachusetts who is so concerned that we have not completed our work.

The same argument came up 1 year ago on this same issue because the Democrats at that time were again not cooperative on unanimous consent. My colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DIAZ-BALART], went back 6 years prior to 1996 and discovered that not once, not once during those 6 years were all 13 appropriations bills passed by the July recess; and indeed, if we go back 40 years, one time, 1988, were all the appropriations bills passed by the July recess.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I take the gentleman's words down calling me dishonest.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I apologize and ask unanimous consent to withdraw the words.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the words are withdrawn.

There was no objection.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman to look at the last year of Speaker Foley when we passed all 13 appropriations bills.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], the chairman of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I will not withdraw my words. I am not going to impugn anybody's integrity. But I am going to talk about two kinds of baloney, two kinds. One is the baloney about why we are not going home this week and why we ought to stay here and work, because that is a lot of baloney; and then I am going to talk about complaining about the tax cuts, and let me tell my colleagues that is a lot of baloney on the other side of the aisle.

Let us talk about it for a minute. First of all, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY], my good friend, and I have the greatest respect for him, I literally love him. He is my ranking member over on the other side of the aisle. He sings little Irish ditties, and he really keeps us in a good mood, so I certainly would never impugn his integrity. But let me just say he mentioned something about how we ought to stay here and deal with this business.

As my colleagues know, back in 1993 the Democrat-controlled House and the Democrat-controlled Senate and the Democrat-controlled White House under President Clinton gave us on October 10 the biggest tax increase in history. Now that was, I beg my colleagues' pardon, on August 10. Now that is several, a couple of months down the road yet, but we Republicans, having taken control of the House and

the Senate, are now giving the American people one of the biggest tax cuts in American history, and we are doing it way ahead of that August 10 date. So boy, we are on line.

So let us just talk for a minute about not having the work done. As my colleagues know, we have just passed the largest spending cut bill in centuries here; OK. Seven hundred billion dollars in entitlement controls; come over here and read them. And we had about 53 good Democrats vote for this yesterday along with the overwhelming majority of Republicans, and the President of the United States, thank goodness, is going to sign the bill over the objections of the big spenders on that side of the aisle.

Now let us talk about the big spenders for a minute because I am going to sit here for the next hour and I am going to keep track of all of the people who come over here and start complaining about this tax cut; OK? Mr. Speaker, I want you to listen. These Members who oppose the tax cuts, keep in mind that every single one of them are going to be on the National Taxpayers Union's list of biggest spenders.

Now why do my colleagues think they want to oppose this tax cut? Because they want to keep the money in the Federal coffers so that they can spend it and the American people cannot.

Now let me tell my colleagues something about this tax cut here. There is a \$500 tax credit for people with children. Now that means a family of 3, and in my Hudson River Valley municipalities all 157 of them, that is about what we are made up with; we are an average of a family with 3 children, and this is going to give them \$500 per child tax credit every year for the next 15 years. Now add that up; that is \$1,500 a year we are putting back into the pockets of that family, 15 years. Quick calculation: that must add up to about \$22,500 a year over 15 years; and if they invest it properly, it is going to be worth maybe \$40,000, \$50,000 or \$60,000 over 15 years. Do my colleagues know what that does at paying college tuitions?

I just put five kids through college. My wife and I had five children in 7 years, and we struggled all those years to raise those children and then to put them through college. Let me tell my colleagues \$65,000 would have been a godsend to us, but we did not have this \$1,500 tax credit at that time; we are going to get it today.

So I want my colleagues to come over here, and I want them to do what is right for the American people. I want them to vote for this tax cut package. But in the meantime we are going to keep track of all of them that come over here, and they will be the biggest spenders in the Congress, and they will have been here for years spending the taxpayers' money. So let us just keep track of it, and then we are going to send it out to all their constituents and let them know that

our colleagues can spend their money better than they can.

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

Mr. Speaker, my chairman of the Committee on Rules and I are very, very friendly, and this debate is strictly on the issue. But actually up in his office, really being ourselves, we really do get along, and actually I was looking forward when he talked about baloney because I thought he was talking about the menu of those people that I represent. As my colleagues know, his people are going to be eating steaks when this tax bill goes through; my people are going to be eating baloney.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO].

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding the time.

I also want to say that I do not think that the American people do believe it is baloney if we stay here and do the work they sent us to do here.

House rules say that we cannot go on vacation until it is finished with appropriations work, and we know that the work has not been finished, otherwise we would not be here asking for a waiver. And the reason why the work is not finished is because what we have seen here is that the Republican majority has spent their time crafting a tax bill that in fact benefits the rich at the expense of average American families. And in fact we have a historic opportunity and the American public has an opportunity to take a look at what is in a Republican tax cut proposal and what is in a Democratic tax cut proposal because the Democrats in fact have a very sound and solid tax cut proposal.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle accuse us of waging class warfare in this debate, but in fact it is the Republican tax bill that is a declaration of war on working middle-class families in America. Under the Republican bill, over half the tax benefits go to the top 5 percent of Americans, those making an average of \$250,000 a year. And quite honestly what this bill does, it gives a \$22 billion tax break to the largest businesses and corporations in the United States by scaling back the alternative minimum tax which was in fact proposed and supposed to ensure that large corporations pay at least some taxes the way that ordinary working families pay taxes in this country every year.

But do not just take my word for it. Let us take a look at this morning's headlines. The Washington Post: No to a bad tax bill. And I quote: "The tax bill will be the great atrocity", is what the Washington Post says this morning. The New York Times, quote: "Break for a few rich, for the rich few, sneaks into the tax cut bill". We are going to see \$9 million a year in lost revenue to the United States to give a bonanza worth thousands of dollars to 1,000 wealthy taxpayers. What about

working middle-class families in this country?

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. DELAURO. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentlewoman asked the absolutely pertinent question here, what about working middle-class families, and it is pointed out in this morning's Wall Street Journal. What we see is people who were earning \$23,000 a year with two children will find that at the end of that year they will not get the benefits of this child's tax credit, they will not get the benefits because the Republicans have decided that the benefits will only go to those individuals at the top levels.

Rather than sharing this tax cut, rather than sharing the money that is now being accumulated because of the efforts to balance the budget over the last 5 years with these middle-class families, they have decided, as the gentlewoman pointed out, that half of the benefits will go to the top 5 percent of the people in this country.

And so people who are going to work every day as law enforcement officials, as fire protection people, as teachers, as oil refinery workers are going to find out that they will not qualify for that.

In fact, in my State of California 56 percent of the children will not be eligible for the child tax credit, and I think that is what is going to happen to working families, and I thank the gentleman for pointing that out.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. DELAURO. I yield to my colleague from New Jersey.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to say I am looking at some figures with regard to New York State, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] who spoke before on the Republican side. It says that tax plans, the child credit, the child credit under the Republican plan would exclude 53 to 56 percent of the children in New York State; 3,183,357 New York kids will be ineligible under the House plan for the child tax credit. This is from Citizens for Tax Justice, a nonpartisan Washington-based research organization that released a study today showing that the proposed child credit in the pending House of Representatives tax plan would exclude 56 percent of New York children. The Senate bill would exclude 53 percent. Obviously the families of New York have been promised a child tax credit for 3 years, but now many of them, the majority of them will actually get nothing.

Ms. DELAURO. That is absolutely right. I just say that there is a Los Angeles Times article this morning: Take from the poor give to the rich. The current Republican tax and entitlement package denies help to 28 million working families.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. DELAURO. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues ought to make clear the basis on which the Republicans are denying these families that participation in the tax cut. They are apparently under the impression that Social Security payroll taxes are not taxes but are a voluntary gift that the lowest earning people in America make to the Government. What the Republican bill does is to say that people who get the earned income tax credit will not be eligible on the whole for this other credit.

Now the earned income tax credit was something that Ronald Reagan thought well of, but the current group has made some of us who believe in moderation nostalgic for Mr. Reagan from time to time because what they say is this. The earned income tax credit compensates people who have families, by and large, who make 20 and 25 and \$26,000 a year and who pay the highest percentage of their income in taxes of any of us because every penny they make is fully taxed under the Social Security payroll tax. And what the earned income tax credit does is offset to some extent the regressiveness of the Social Security payroll tax, and people who get the earned income tax credit, they do not get the earned income tax credit unless they are working or paying payroll tax on all of their income and they are then getting some credit for that less than the aggressiveness. And the Republicans are now saying, "If that's your situation, you're not a taxpayer." They said we cannot give this to people, they do not pay taxes.

Mr. Speaker, if Social Security payroll taxes are not taxes, then I guess we need a new dictionary and that is how it becomes so regressive. What they are saying to people is, "You are paying these very aggressive Social Security taxes," for which, by the way, according to the Senate they have to wait a couple more years to get anything for medical care, "and we are going to deny you as a consequence of that the tax credit."

Ms. DELAURO. I will just say that, if we are Bill Gates we are going to get a tax credit, but a police officer who is making \$23,000 a year who might be happy to get the earned income tax, paying taxes, is going to be denied a child tax credit.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. The argument that we have heard from Republicans, from the Speaker, and others that, "Oh, you shouldn't give the tax credit to these people who don't pay any taxes," they forget to say income taxes or capital gains taxes, that is true. Very few of these people making 23 and \$24,000 a year are paying capital gains taxes. They are paying the Social Security taxes in the most aggressive way; that is the group of people who are getting hurt by this.

Mr. MILLER of California. The fact is many young families starting out with young children pay more in payroll taxes, Social Security than they pay in income taxes. But the Republican plan will not give them the benefit of the \$500 child credit.

What does that mean? That means that these working families making 20, \$25,000 a year are going to find themselves without the benefit of this. They still have two young children. They are still struggling hard. But the Republicans do not understand that because one does not make a lot of money does not mean they do not work hard. They work very hard and they pay the most regressive taxes, and they refuse to give the child credit to those families.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, if the gentlewoman will continue to yield, the gentleman is absolutely right, and I think what we have here is something we can offer up to the dictionary. This is the definition of adding insult to injury. These working people who work in hard jobs at relatively low wages are injured by the Republican bill by being denied the tax credit that everybody else gets. Even if they have two and three children, their children do not qualify, and then they are insulted by being characterized as people who do not work and as simply tax eaters.

□ 1045

I would just close by saying we have this national effort, I thought, to help people get off welfare and into the wage-earning pool. Well, it is precisely the formal welfare recipients who are being told to go to work, who are being required to go to work, who will then be penalized by the way the Republican tax bill is crafted, because they will go to work at the beginning at relatively low wages, will pay a full Social Security tax for every penny they earn, but not get the tax credit.

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. DELAURO. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Speaker, I share my colleague's concern. I too am appalled when I hear the Republicans suggest that the Democratic tax plan amounts to welfare. It is basically tax fairness. They are giving all of the tax breaks to the wealthy. The top 5 percent are getting over 50 percent of the tax breaks under their proposal, and then when we say that the Democratic alternative provides tax relief for the truly working middle class, they suggest it is welfare.

I did a little research and an article in the Wall Street Journal indicated that a police officer in Gwinnett County, GA, incidentally the Speaker's district, makes about \$23,000 a year. Under their program, he is not eligible for a tax break, yet he pays payroll taxes. He is, in fact, the working middle class of people who are excluded by the proposal of the Republicans.

Basically what they are offering us is not tax relief for Americans, it is tax

relief for the rich. My grandmother used to say when I was a kid, the rich get richer, the poor get poorer. I think we are seeing it in action today.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. DELAURO. I yield to the gentlewoman from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. Speaker, if I could just add to that, that police officer making \$23,000 is getting a tax benefit through something called earned income tax credit. The Republican plan is saying, if one is getting one tax deduction, one cannot get a second, meaning the \$500 children's tax credit as we see it.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. DELAURO. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say I have just been handed an item from the Citizens For Tax Justice, which is a nonpartisan Washington-based research group, saying that 897,000 Massachusetts children would be ineligible under the House plan, and 850,000 would be ineligible under the Senate plan. That is 48 percent of Massachusetts' children ineligible under the House plan and 46 percent ineligible under the Senate plan. This is not a good bill for children.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. DELAURO. I yield to the gentlewoman from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. Speaker, if I might just continue in talking about fairness, when we each do our taxes, we use tax deductions. What the Republican plan is saying is if one gets one tax deduction, one cannot get the \$500 children's tax credit; but yet if one makes three times that salary and one gets a lot of different tax deductions, one gets the \$500. That makes absolutely no sense. For those on the upper end who get lots of tax deductions, they ought to be treated the same, or the folks at the low end who ought to get a couple breaks ought to get the same benefit of the \$500.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, the 1,000 families who are going to get some, and it is quoted in the article today, could get up to \$100,000 in that particular tax cut and are probably going to get many others.

I think another area which is important to mention in this debate is that with the Democratic tax cut proposal, we are going to see working families who want to get their kids to school and provide education for their kids; education in this country has been the great equalizer to allow families to be able to have their kids succeed.

The Democratic proposal is for the full \$1,500 tax credit for college students, where the Republican proposal would cut that in half, would not allow working families to realize a HOPE scholarship and provide them with all of the help they might be able to get to get their kids to school.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. DELAURO. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman makes a very good point. Because in fact, the HOPE credit, the HOPE scholarship would be offset, reduced dollar for dollar by the amount of a Pell grant. So here again we have the same situation, where if one gets a Pell grant one cannot get the full benefit of a HOPE scholarship.

It seems to me that this Republican tax bill ought to be judged by two standards. One is fairness and the other is fiscal responsibility. We have talked a fair bit about fairness.

This bill provides 41 percent of its benefits to the top 1 percent of the taxpayers, those whose household incomes are over \$240,000 a year. In contrast, 20 percent of those in lower tax brackets would not receive any benefit. It is simply not fair.

Also, in terms of fiscal responsibility, we look out at the second 10 years, and we are going to be giving up \$500 to \$600 million in tax revenues that is not going to help a balanced budget. We need a balanced budget that we can get to and stay with, and these tax cuts explode in the outyears, they are not fiscally responsible, and they ought to be rejected for that reason as well.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1½ minutes just to respond to some of these remarks we have been hearing.

The liberals have always trotted out liberal so-called nonpartisan organizations to argue against letting people keep more of what they earn, and we are seeing it now. How do these people get wealthy? Let me tell my colleagues how the administration determines who is wealthy.

They determine what one's income is, say it is \$50,000 a year, and then the Treasury Department says, but, aha, if one is living in one's own home and one could rent it for \$10,000, one must consider that as more income, even though one does not get it. If one owns an asset that has appreciated in value and have not sold it, their proposal says, if it has grown in value, one must consider that as part of one's annual wealth. So they have bogused up these numbers to make everybody appear wealthy so they can transfer more money as welfare to the poor. This is an effort to undermine last year's welfare reform.

I would like to also point out that their arguments go against the Joint Tax Committee's argument, which is the only official organ for determining distribution tables. The Joint Tax Committee says the following: Ninety-three percent of the benefits go to people with incomes of less than \$100,000 a year; 76 percent of the benefits go to people with incomes below \$75,000 a year. That simply is a fact. It is not a comfortable fact for liberals, but it is a fact.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SCARBOROUGH].

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, I do not know what it is, maybe it is the summer heat, maybe it is the 50th anniversary of Roswell, but the Democrats, the liberals, actually the radicals that control this party are crawling out from underneath their rocks and once again showing why they were voted out in 1994.

Here we have people that increase the crushing tax burden on the American family from 10 percent when they gain control to something like 50.2 percent, according to NTU, in 1994, lecturing us on taxes. They gave us the highest tax increase in the history of this country a few years ago, and yet they are still talking about how if we actually give tax relief to Americans, that it is going to crush the poor children 5 miles from the Capitol.

I think they have got it backward. The children 5 miles from the Capitol that are suffering are suffering because of higher taxes and bigger Government spending and more regulations that they are going to shove down the American people's throats this summer. I think if they talk about the problems in south central L.A. or in Chicago, it is because government has failed, the big taxing and big spending policies have failed.

Let me challenge every one of these big spenders, every one of these people that have supported taxes over the years, to stand up and tell us how much they care about the children 5 miles from this Capitol when the delegate from Washington, DC begged for tax relief. The gentlewoman from the District of Columbia said please, give us a flat tax. Please cut taxes in Washington, DC. She was abandoned by every single liberal that stands up here today and acts as if they really do care about what happens 5 miles from this Capitol; and no, I am anticipating the gentleman's question, I will not yield. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle all have already put on their side-show.

I want somebody that stood up a few minutes ago talking about how much they care about the residents of this inner city and the residents of inner cities all over the country to stand up and tell me that yes, they do support the tax plan of the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON] for tax reduction in this city.

My colleagues cannot have it both ways. They cannot say sure, we want to help them, and yet every time there is a chance to cut taxes and give tax relief to American people, my colleagues fight it time and time again.

This is not about protecting the poor. My colleagues know that tax relief has helped the poor. History has shown it time and time again. This is about protecting the coffers of the Federal Treasury and keeping more and more money in Washington, DC and not allowing it to get out.

Again, I challenge anybody, and I especially challenge the ranking member who I am sure does sing really good

Irish ditties, and a man that I respect watching him work, I challenge him. I would challenge the ranking member and again, any other liberal that stood up here opposing tax relief talking about how they care about what happens 5 miles from Washington, DC to stand up and say yes, we will support the plan of the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON] for a flat tax in Washington, DC. If so, then I think that is a good start to agree that Americans need tax relief.

Like the Delegate from Washington, DC recognizes herself, big spending, big taxing, big government has failed. What Americans need now is tax relief, and tax relief helps everybody.

My colleagues just cannot have it both ways. They cannot quote liberal columnists like Al Hunt, they cannot quote liberal agencies run by, I believe, Ralph Nader, and then come in here and say they want to help people in the inner cities when they turn their backs on the very delegates from those inner cities who beg for tax relief.

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

I am glad my colleague brought that up. What he is talking about is exactly what I am going to do. The Democratic alternative does help these children 5 miles from here. The Rangel alternative does help these children 5 miles from here, but it does not give those 1,000 people up to \$100,000 additional tax break.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], chairman of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I have some good news for my colleagues. Well, no, it is not good news for the big spenders, because the Supreme Court a few minutes ago, within the last hour, just threw out the case of the opponents of the line-item veto for lack of standing. Whoopee. We won another one.

Now, let us just answer some of the people here that are talking about people with children are not going to get this tax cut, this \$500 tax credit. Again, here we go with the baloney again. Anybody paying Federal income taxes is going to get that tax cut, make no mistake about it.

Now, we are also hearing about this 5 percent, that all of the tax cuts are going to 5 percent of the most rich. Let me state the facts for you. Seventy-two percent of these tax cuts in this bill are going to people with incomes between \$20,000 and \$70,000, and that means people on Social Security as well, who may be working and paying a little income tax as well.

Mr. Speaker, I heard the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK] stand up here and talk about the regressiveness of the Social Security payroll tax. Well, what is the payroll tax and why was it established under Franklin Dela-

no Roosevelt? It was a forced savings account so that the American people, all of them who work, would have to save a little bit for the rainy day so that they would not become wards of the State and the rest of us who did save would have to end up supporting them.

□ 1100

That is what it is all about. Nothing regressive about it. It means that with the first few thousand dollars of your income you are going to put away a little bit of that. That is the way it should be.

Now people are complaining that maybe some people with incomes of \$25,000 do not pay any income tax and therefore they do not get this credit. Let me tell them what we are going to do. In this spending cut bill we are cutting back on Federal regulation.

If Members look at the other taxes they pay in town, city, village, and county taxes and all of the fees, it is caused mostly by this Federal Government, their mandates. We are not going to mandate on local governments anymore, forcing them to raise land taxes.

So come on over here, vote for this tax cut bill, and let us give it to the President. I have a feeling he is going to sign it.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. THUNE].

Mr. THUNE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I was sitting in my office listening to the debate that was going on over here, and I could not help but feel the need to come over and respond. There is a lot of liberal drivel going on in this Chamber right now. I cannot help but get up here and say something in response to that.

If I were on the other side I would be crushed, too, I really would. Because we have worked with their President to balance the budget, lower taxes, and save Medicare. This is an indictment of big Government. We are saying today we are interested in doing something to address a problem that has been around this place for 30 years. We have not had the courage to balance the budget, to lower the tax burden, or to address a bigger and bigger Government in this country.

I cannot help but listen as well and respond to what is being said about trying to somehow gear this thing so that it affects people in lower-income categories.

People in my State, in South Dakota, understand the difference between the income tax and the payroll tax. You pay 6.2 percent of your income when you get a payday, so you will have a security program, a retirement program when you retire. You pay 1.45 percent so you will have a health care program when you retire. You are paying that for a benefit. You cannot have a tax credit if you do not pay taxes.

What this simply says, and I think the distinction, the difference we are

drawing here is that we want to bring tax relief to people who are paying taxes, and they want to increase payments, welfare payments, to people who are not. It is that simple. You cannot have it that way. If you are going to have a tax credit, you have to pay taxes.

I used the illustration last night, if we told people with red hair they were going to get a tax credit, my daughter would qualify. But she does not pay taxes, so she cannot get a tax credit. The Medicare and Social Security payment are retirement programs that people pay into so they will get a benefit later on. They cannot have a tax credit unless they are paying taxes.

I would say to my colleagues here that we have a definition problem. We have a definition problem here, because we have to draw a distinction between a tax credit and a government payment. The earned income tax credit today, 80 percent of it is a payment. It is not a credit. Let us make that very, very clear. So people who are currently getting an earned income tax credit are already offsetting the payroll tax they pay in Social Security and Medicare.

What the gentleman is saying is that he wants to give them another \$500 payment on top of them. That is not a tax credit, that is a government payment. There is an important distinction here which needs to be made. I am getting tired of listening to the rhetoric on the other side.

This ought to be a great day for America. They ought to be working with us balancing the budget, lowering taxes. I was just looking at some statistics from the IRS here. Thirty-seven percent of the taxes are paid by people who make less than \$75,000. The balance, 63 percent, is paid by those who make more than that. Yet 76 percent of the tax relief in this package goes to people who make less than \$75,000.

This is a good day for America, it is a good day for taxpayers. It is a good day for this institution. We ought to be working together to get this job done.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOEHNER].

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I think we need to take a deep breath and all calm down a little bit, because all we are talking about doing is allowing the American people to keep a little more of what they earn so they do not have to send it to Washington.

I understand some of my friends on the other side of the aisle do not really want to do that because they want more Washington spending. I do not denigrate the position that they have taken for 60 years, that Washington has the answers and we have to get this money to Washington so Washington can do great things for us. Most of us in this Chamber, Democrats and Republicans, believe it is time to allow the American people to make more of those decisions on their own.

So this package today that lowers taxes, the first tax cut from Washing-

ton in 16 years, is aimed at American middle-class taxpayers who are bearing the biggest burden today.

What does this plan do? It provides an IRA for parents who pay taxes who want to send their children to college. It lets them save tax-free. It provides a tax credit for parents who are sending their children on to college or other postsecondary education. It provides a \$500 per child tax credit to American families that make under, roughly, \$100,000.

Fourth, homeowners, it allows someone to sell their home, and 95 percent of the American people who own homes are going to be able to sell their homes and not pay any tax on the gain from the sale of their home.

What we are trying to do here is to try to help every taxpayer in the country at every stage of their life. Whether they are parents with children, trying to raise them, parents with children trying to send them to college, whether it is people trying to save for their own retirement, with our cut in capital gains taxes and the cut in the taxes on the sale of their home, we are trying to help all taxpayers. This is good policy.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my colleague, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. NORWOOD].

Mr. NORWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I think for a long time we have been trying to make an effort to let people who pay taxes keep more of their own hard-earned money. Yet all we hear is that all of this is for the rich. Let us talk about what "rich" means.

Mr. Speaker, 2.4 million elementary and high school teachers have family incomes, and they are considered rich; 1.7 million union members have family incomes, and they are considered rich; 8.1 million Federal, State, and local government workers have family incomes, and they are considered rich; 120,000 editors and reporters across the country are considered rich; and 4.2 million mechanics and repairmen and construction workers have family incomes that under the administration's definition of rich, they are considered rich.

I would like to ask, if I might, for anybody on that side to stand up and when they say we are returning money to the rich, define what they mean by rich. If Members believe we should have everybody receive a \$500 per child tax credit, even those who do not pay taxes, they should be honest enough to call it what they are talking about. They are talking about a welfare program.

What we are trying to do is return some of the hard-earned money that working people in this country earn who work every day. If Members want other children and other families who are not paying taxes to have a \$500 per child tax credit, say so, but be honest about it. Call it what it is. It is a welfare program.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE].

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I listened to the gentleman from Georgia, and I want to point out exactly the type of person that the Democrats are trying to help, the person who is out there working.

We mentioned the Georgia policeman. This is from the Wall Street Journal today. This is a starting police officer in Gwinnett County, GA, coincidentally part of Speaker GINGRICH's district. He is paid \$23,078 a year. If his family has two kids, it gets \$1,668 in earned income tax credit, this is the deduction we were talking about before, which offsets his \$675 in Federal taxes, and yields a check for \$993. But that family pays \$1,760 in payroll taxes, and another \$354 in Federal excise taxes. That is even after this deduction that we are talking about.

The out-of-pocket Federal taxes for this family would be at least \$1,121 a year, and in reality, more like \$2,800 a year. What we are saying is that that policeman right now, under this Republican proposal, does not get that \$500 deduction, the child tax credit. That person is paying payroll taxes to the Federal Government, excise taxes to the Federal Government. The gentleman is saying that that Georgia policeman, who is out there every day on the line, is a welfare recipient. That is exactly what the gentleman is saying. That is what the Democrats are saying is not right.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PALLONE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, we are of course back here today to discuss another wreckconciliation bill. We are having another big wreck in Congress, even bigger than the one yesterday; and of course it is true that the liberals in Washington are causing this wreck, those who are so liberal with the truth that they defy reality.

I would ask the gentleman, in light of some of those who had been so liberal in the truth, if he is aware of a time in American history, in the entire history of this country, when a majority party would come to this floor and ask to adjourn for a week or 10 days and not have passed one single appropriations bill, not one? Is the gentleman aware of any time in American history when that has happened?

We are not talking about passing them automatically, but not passing a single bill; but they are leaving, are they not, presenting a present to the limousine crowd in giving them a tax break? I am sure the gentleman from New Jersey, like me, we have nothing against limousines, we have nothing against country clubs. We just think if tax cuts are so good, why not share them with the working families of America and give them a chance to climb up the economic ladder and have a limousine of their own? Is that not correct?

Mr. PALLONE. Exactly. I appreciate that.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PALLONE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, under the original Contract With America, that police officer was going to get that tax credit. But what they decided this year was they wanted to give more money to the wealthy, so they had to cut that police officer out of their tax plan, but that was the original promise in the Contract With America. They just decided they would rather deal with the people on Wall Street instead of the people on Main Street.

Mr. PALLONE. I would add also, Mr. Speaker, that Senator LOTT in his Republican plan early this year, just like the Contract With America, also promised that child credit to that Georgia policeman. So now all of a sudden the Republican leadership has changed its mind, because they want to give that money to the fat cats, to their wealthy contributors.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PALLONE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. Speaker, I find it humorous, as a new Member coming in in January from Michigan, to hear the word "liberal" thrown around all the time. I want Members to know that for someone coming from Michigan who was in the State Senate, I sponsored the State's largest property tax cut as a Democrat. I understand what middle-class tax cuts look like and feel like. This is not it.

As the gentleman knows, we are talking about what we want to see happen for average folks, to put money in their pocket, to send their kids to school, pay for child care, be able to get a tax break when they sell their home, be able to get a tax break on their small business, if someone passes away, be able to get a tax break on their family-owned business and their family-owned farm. What we are talking about here is how we make sure that the majority of the dollars that keep this country going, to create jobs, go directly into the pockets of middle class Americans. Is that not what we are talking about?

Mr. PALLONE. Absolutely. The gentleman pointed out, we were only talking about Federal taxes, payroll taxes, excise taxes. That Georgia policeman is probably paying property taxes. He may be paying other State or local taxes. They are saying he is on welfare.

Ms. STABENOW. Not only that, he probably is investing in a home. Most middle class Americans are investing in savings through equity in their homes, and we want to make sure they are getting the tax breaks; that when you talk about capital gains tax cuts, that he is going to get protected when he sells his home; if he wants to send

his kids to college, he is going to get the maximum tax break, and that if he goes on to invest in a small business at some point, he is again going to get a maximum tax break.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PALLONE. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, our colleagues on the other side are so concerned that a starting police officer at \$23,000 or a young teacher at \$23,000 might get a tax credit for their children, but they are not concerned that the changes they are making in the alternative minimum tax would give tax rebates to large corporations like Texas Utilities, that did not pay a penny in Federal taxes.

The only reason they paid \$19 million on their \$1 billion profit was the AMT, and their repeal of the AMT will give them a tax rebate of \$18 million on taxes they did not even pay, and we do not have a penny for the police officer or a penny for the young teacher. It is outrageous.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PALLONE. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, the question is about choices: are we going to give the policeman a choice of buying his family and kids new clothes for school or having a decent diet, or is somebody going to be able to extend their European vacation going over on the Concorde? Where is this House at? Are we going to help people who have to take care of kids and the basic needs of a family, while the wealthiest Americans are trying to figure out whether they can extend their trip to London for the weekend?

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON].

□ 1115

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, it shows that some people are watching C-SPAN. I just got a call from one of my constituents making \$23,500. He said he hears Members on the Democrat side railing about the excise taxes and the payroll taxes. He said, "Why don't you cut those, JERRY?" I said, I will be glad to. Just let them make these amendments in order, offer them and we will accept them.

We want to cut everybody's taxes, all kinds of taxes, and that is why we have got this bill. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY], the gentleman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO], the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER], the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. WYNN], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK], the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GEJDENSON], the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DEFAZIO], all the bigger spenders in the Congress, according to the National Taxpayers Union.

I include the entire list of big spenders for the RECORD.

NATIONAL TAXPAYERS UNION BIG SPENDERS
OF 1993

ALABAMA

Rep. Tom Bevill.
Rep. Robert E. Cramer.
Rep. Earl F. Hilliard.

ARIZONA

Rep. Karan English.
Rep. Ed Pastor.

ARKANSAS

Sen. Dale Bumpers.
Sen. David Pryor.
Rep. Ray Thornton.

CALIFORNIA

Sen. Barbara Boxer.
Sen. Dianne Feinstein.
Rep. Xavier Becerra.
Rep. Howard L. Berman.
Rep. George E. Brown.
Rep. Ronald V. Dellums.
Rep. Julian C. Dixon.
Rep. Don Edwards.
Rep. Anna G. Eshoo.
Rep. Sam Farr.
Rep. Vic Fazio.
Rep. Bob Filner.
Rep. Dan Hamburg.
Rep. Jane Harman.
Rep. Tom Lantos.
Rep. Matthew G. Martinez.
Rep. Robert T. Matsui.
Rep. George Miller.
Rep. Norman Y. Mineta.
Rep. Nancy Pelosi.
Rep. Lucille Roybal-Allard.
Rep. Pete Stark.
Rep. Esteban E. Torres.
Rep. Walter R. Tucker.
Rep. Maxine Waters.
Rep. Henry A. Waxman.
Rep. Lynn Woolsey.

COLORADO

Sen. Ben Nighthorse Campbell.
Rep. David E. Skaggs.

CONNECTICUT

Sen. Christopher J. Dodd.
Rep. Rosa DeLauro.
Rep. Sam Gejdenson.
Rep. Barbara B. Kennelly.

DELAWARE

Sen. Joseph R. Biden Jr.

FLORIDA

Sen. Bob Graham.
Rep. Jim Bacchus.
Rep. Corrine Brown.
Rep. Peter Deutsch.
Rep. Sam M. Gibbons.
Rep. Alcee L. Hastings.
Rep. Harry A. Johnston.
Rep. Carrie P. Meek.
Rep. Pete Peterson.
Rep. Karen L. Thurman.

GEORGIA

Rep. Sanford D. Bishop.
Rep. George Darden.
Rep. John Lewis.
Rep. Cynthia A. McKinney.

HAWAII

Sen. Daniel K. Akaka.
Sen. Daniel K. Inouye.
Rep. Neil Abercrombie.
Rep. Patsy T. Mink.

ILLINOIS

Sen. Carol Moseley-Braun.
Sen. Paul Simon.
Rep. Cardiss Collins.
Rep. Richard J. Durbin.
Rep. Lane Evans.
Rep. Luis V. Gutierrez.
Rep. Mel Reynolds.
Rep. Dan Rostenkowski.
Rep. Bobby L. Rush.

Rep. George E. Sangmeister.
Rep. Sidney R. Yates.

INDIANA

Rep. Frank McCloskey.
Rep. Peter J. Visclosky.

IOWA

Sen. Tom Harkin.
Rep. Neal Smith.

KANSAS

Rep. Dan Glickman.

KENTUCKY

Sen. Wendell H. Ford.
Rep. Romano L. Mazzoli.

LOUISIANA

Sen. John B. Breaux.
Sen. J. Bennett Johnston.
Rep. Cleo Fields.
Rep. William J. Jefferson.

MAINE

Sen. George J. Mitchell.
Rep. Thomas H. Andrews.

MARYLAND

Sen. Barbara A. Mikulski.
Sen. Paul S. Sarbanes.
Rep. Benjamin L. Cardin.
Rep. Steny H. Hoyer.
Rep. Kweisi Mfume.
Rep. Albert R. Wynn.

MASSACHUSETTS

Sen. Edward M. Kennedy.
Sen. John Kerry.
Rep. Barney Frank.
Rep. Joseph P. Kennedy.
Rep. Edward J. Markey.
Rep. Joe Moakley.
Rep. Richard E. Neal.
Rep. John W. Olver.
Rep. Gerry E. Studds.

MICHIGAN

Sen. Carl Levin.
Sen. Donald W. Riegle Jr.
Rep. David E. Bonior.
Rep. Bob Carr.
Rep. Barbara-Rose Collins.
Rep. John Conyers.
Rep. John D. Dingell.
Rep. William D. Ford.
Rep. Dale E. Kildee.
Rep. Sander M. Levin.

MINNESOTA

Sen. Paul Wellstone.
Rep. James L. Oberstar.
Rep. Martin Olav Sabo.
Rep. Bruce F. Vento.

MISSISSIPPI

Rep. G.V. Montgomery.
Rep. Bennie Thompson.
Rep. Jamie L. Whitten.

MISSOURI

Rep. William L. Clay.
Rep. Richard A. Gephardt.
Rep. Ike Skelton.
Rep. Harold L. Volkmer.
Rep. Alan Wheat.

MONTANA

Sen. Max Baucus.
Rep. Pat Williams.

NEVADA

Sen. Harry Reid.
Rep. James Billbray.

NEW JERSEY

Rep. Robert Menendez.
Rep. Donald M. Payne.
Rep. Robert G. Torricelli.

NEW MEXICO

Rep. Bill Richardson.

NEW YORK

Sen. Daniel Patrick Moynihan.
Rep. Gary L. Ackerman.

Rep. Eliot L. Engel.
Rep. Floyd H. Flake.
Rep. Maurice D. Hinchey.
Rep. George J. Hochbrueckner.
Rep. Nita M. Lowey.
Rep. Thomas J. Manton.
Rep. Michael R. McNulty.
Rep. Jerrold Nadler.
Rep. Major R. Owens.
Rep. Charles B. Rangel.
Rep. Charles E. Schumer.
Rep. Jose E. Serrano.
Rep. Louise M. Slaughter.
Rep. Edolphus Towns.
Rep. Nydia M. Velazquez.

NORTH CAROLINA

Rep. Eva Clayton.
Rep. W.G. Hefner.
Rep. Stephen L. Neal.
Rep. David Price.
Rep. Charlie Rose.
Rep. Melvin Watt.

OHIO

Sen. John Glenn.
Sen. Howard M. Metzenbaum.
Rep. Douglas Applegate.
Rep. Sherrod Brown.
Rep. Tony P. Hall.
Rep. Tom Sawyer.
Rep. Louis Stokes.
Rep. Ted Strickland.

OKLAHOMA

Rep. Mike Synar.

OREGON

Rep. Elizabeth Furse.
Rep. Mike Kopetski.
Rep. Ron Wyden.

PENNSYLVANIA

Sen. Harris Wofford.
Rep. Lucien E. Blackwell.
Rep. Robert A. Borski.
Rep. William J. Coyne.
Rep. Thomas M. Foglietta.
Rep. Paul E. Kanjorski.
Rep. John P. Murtha.

RHODE ISLAND

Sen. Claiborne Pell.
Rep. Jack Reed.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Sen. Ernest F. Hollings.
Sen. James E. Clyburn.
Sen. Butler Derrick.
Rep. John M. Spratt.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Sen. Tom Daschle.

TENNESSEE

Sen. Harlan Mathews.
Sen. Jim Sasser.
Rep. Harold E. Ford.

TEXAS

Rep. Jack Brooks.
Rep. John Bryant.
Rep. Jim Chapman.
Rep. Ronald D. Coleman.
Rep. E. de la Garza.
Rep. Martin Frost.
Rep. Henry B. Gonzalez.
Rep. Gene Green.
Rep. Eddie Bernice Johnson.
Rep. Solomon P. Ortiz.
Rep. J.J. Pickle.
Rep. Frank Tejeda.
Rep. Craig Washington.
Rep. Charles Wilson.

VERMONT

Sen. Patrick J. Leahy.
Rep. Bernard Sanders.

VIRGINIA

Rep. Rick Boucher.
Rep. Leslie L. Byrne.
Rep. James P. Moran.
Rep. Robert C. Scott.

WASHINGTON

Sen. Patty Murray.
Rep. Norm Dicks.
Rep. Mike Kreidler.
Rep. Jim McDermott.
Rep. Al Swift.
Rep. Jolene Unsoeld.

WEST VIRGINIA

Sen. Robert C. Byrd.
Sen. John D. Rockefeller IV.
Rep. Alan B. Mollahan.
Rep. Nick J. Rahall.
Rep. Bob Wise.

WISCONSIN

Rep. Gerald D. Kleczka.
Rep. David R. Obey.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. NORWOOD].

Mr. NORWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to tell my friend from New Jersey, the problem with that Georgia policeman is that he most assuredly will receive some tax relief on this, because you have raised taxes so high over the last 20 years that I guarantee you his wife is having to work, too. So when we combine those incomes, that family will indeed, and I remind you again that 2.4 million teachers are going to get some tax relief, 4.2 million mechanics and repairmen and construction workers are going to get some tax relief. I know you call everybody rich who has a job, but those are the people who are paying into this Government, and it is high time we let them have some more of their own income because most assuredly they can spend it much wiser than we do up here.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE].

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to enter into the RECORD the study from the Citizens for Tax Justice that shows just how many children are excluded from this tax credit and point out that in the State of Georgia, the previous speaker's home State, the Republican tax plan excludes 49 to 52 percent of Georgia kids. The Citizens for Tax Justice study says that the House plan, the Republican plan, would exclude 52 percent of Georgia's children and the Senate tax plan would exclude 49 percent of Georgia's children. They would not receive it, including that police officer.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I just want to refer to a couple of other States here, first my home State of Maine, the Citizens for Tax Justice report indicates that 45 percent of the children in the State of Maine will not get the benefit of this \$500-per-child tax credit. A little bit of that is because of age but almost all of it is because of this income floor.

The gentleman from South Dakota who was speaking earlier should recognize that the number for his State is the same; 45 percent of the children in that State will be ineligible for the \$500-per-child tax credit and it is the same reason. The fact is that this tax

credit, this tax bill is weighted very heavily for the wealthiest people in this society. It provides 41 percent of its benefits to the top 1 percent of taxpayers and those in lower tax brackets, the lowest 20 percent, are expected to pay maybe an additional \$60 a year. They do not get the benefits of this.

I agree with my friend from Florida on one point he said; this is not about protecting the poor. It is not. It is about protecting hard-working middle-income Americans and making sure that they get the benefit, they get some of the benefit of this tax bill, and they are not getting it now.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, we have a statistic here that just shows you that the billionaire, Bill Gates, would get capital gains and estate tax reductions and even a new IRA provision that would let him take a \$4,000 tax break for educational expenses for his kids, but that Georgia policeman making \$23,000 is denied a tax credit for his kids.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Ms. STABENOW].

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. Speaker, I think it is important for people that are watching today, it gets very confusing when we are talking about a lot of different statistics about where the tax relief goes. The reality is that in this, in the Republican proposal, we are talking about the top 5 percent of Americans who make \$250,000 or more. That is what we are talking about in terms of where the bulk of the tax relief goes.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER].

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Atlanta for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say that this has become a very, very sad time for me, having worked since the beginning of this Congress and actually in many previous Congresses on this issue of the capital gains tax cut. I have about 165 Democrats and Republicans who joined as cosponsors of H.R. 14.

The gentleman from Florida [Mr. SCARBOROUGH] has been one of our great fighters on behalf of reducing the top rate on capital gains, knowing full well that it is not a tax cut for the rich. We have been able to successfully throw that us-versus-them class warfare mentality out throughout the debate on capital gains. We got the President in the agreement to acknowledge that reducing the top rate on capital gains will in fact benefit the middle-income wage earner. In fact a study that we did found that the average family of four, if we were to get to a 14-or 15-percent rate, would see their take-home pay increase by \$1,500. Those are the ones who benefit from things like a capital gains tax rate reduction. Yes, there are people today in this country who are unemployed and we need to get capital invested so that we can create job opportunities for them.

So the reason this is a sad day is that many of my Democratic colleagues

who have joined as cosponsors of H.R. 14 have unfortunately now been drawn in by their party to this trap of saying that this is simply a tax cut for the rich. Nothing could be further from the truth. We will hear it time and time again that 76 percent of the benefits go to people earning between \$20,000 and \$75,000. Ninety-three percent of the benefits go to people with incomes of less than \$100,000.

So the fact is, we are there trying desperately to help those struggling middle-income wage earners create greater opportunities, improve their quality of life, and things like a capital gains tax rate reduction will do just that. So I just want to say that it saddens me that we have seen the debate come down to this level.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. BALDACCI].

Mr. BALDACCI. Mr. Speaker, we have been down this road before, where we were offered trickle-down tax cuts in the 1980's, that benefited the very well to do and did not get down to working men and women and those families. Those incomes have been stagnant. They have not gotten any rewards for their work. Their tax rates and tax burdens have increased. What we need to do is to better focus the tax breaks on working men and women, as the Democratic substitute has done, and not to allow trickle-down to happen again. All that happened with trickle-down is the heavy lifting was done by the working men and women and the people who are trying to provide for their families at the expense of those who were getting heavy from their lifting.

If we are going to reform welfare, if we are going to reward work, we are going to need to make sure that working men and women have the opportunities of tax credits for education, tax credits for health care, to make sure that they can provide for their families and not go down through the trickle-down economic theories that we went through in the early 1980's.

They got nothing but debt and deficit and that left people out of work or at very low incomes. So I think the important thing to do is to not support the rule and to not support the proposal that has been put forward.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The people watching this on C-SPAN must be thoroughly confused by now, because according to the comments from the other side, virtually everybody in America is wealthy. They have been quoting all day Citizens for Tax Justice, a so-called nonpartisan think tank which is in fact connected to Ralph Nader. The American people ought to know that.

The fact of the matter is the Heritage Foundation and other studies such as the Tax Foundation have said that the Republican plan covers 11 more, 11 million, the Republican plan covers 11 million more children than the Presi-

dent's plan. Indeed, the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] has been concerned about the children being excluded. The Republican plan in his own district covers 24,735 more children than the President's plan.

The President and the Treasury Department have been simply unfair to this debate because they recalculated wealth. And in fact they included in your income to consider how wealthy you are such items as employer costs such as payroll taxes, fringe benefits, and pensions. Their proposal says that those people must consider that as their income, even though they do not get it, and goes so far as to say that if they could rent their home out, the home they are living in and buying, that 10,000 a year must be considered income also.

Under their calculation of income and who is wealthy, 2.4 million elementary and high school teachers, over half of the teachers in this Nation are considered under their standards rich; 1 out of every 10 union members, 1.7 million of them, under their standards are rich; 8.1 million Federal, State, and local government workers under their measurement are rich. The honest deduction is this, the Joint Committee on Taxation has made it very clear, 93 percent of the benefits go to families with incomes under \$100,000. Indeed the largest part of this package is the child tax credit, the single largest part of the benefit is the child tax credit and that is capped at \$110,000 for couples also and \$55,000 for singles. So this is a fair plan. It is fair for all.

For the rest of this day, those of you watching this debate are going to hear the same class warfare, the same argument that the rich are benefiting when in fact the Joint Committee on Taxation makes it clear that 76 percent goes to people with family incomes less than \$75,000 a year. They are going to be very surprised to discover how wealthy they are tonight.

But when we pass this we will have for the first time in 16 years provided decent, honest, and across-the-board tax relief for all Americans at every stage in life.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that if an electronic vote on House Concurrent Resolution 108 occurs immediately after an electronic vote on another question, then the minimum time for that electronic vote on agreeing to the concurrent resolution may be 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to extend their remarks during the debate on House Resolution 176.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the following:

METHODOLOGY PROBLEMS AND MULTIBILLION DOLLAR ERRORS PRODUCE LARGE DISTORTIONS IN TAXPAYERS UNION RATINGS

The tally of Congressional voting records which the National Taxpayers Union Foundation released today is marred by flawed methodology and multi-billion dollar errors, according to a Center on Budget and Policy Priorities analysis of the NTUF tally.

The deficiencies in the NTUF analysis are sufficiently serious as to make its tally of little value, the Center said. The Center also reported that NTUF's mistakes and methodological errors tend to have a greater adverse effect on members of the minority party than on members of the majority party and that some of its interpretations of its vote tally appear to be marked by partisan leanings.

ENTITLEMENT TREATMENT MAKES MANY WHO VOTED TO REDUCE SPENDING LOOK LIKE THEY VOTED TO INCREASE SPENDING

The NTUF tallies are dominated by entitlement spending. But the NTUF entitlement spending figures are flawed. Most notably, the cost of federal entitlement programs will automatically rise \$54.5 billion between FY 1995 and FY 1996 because of such factors as the annual cost-of-living adjustment in Social Security, veterans, and other benefits, the increase in the number of Americans reaching age 65 and qualifying for Social Security and Medicare, and normal year-to-year increases in doctor and hospital fees. NTUF charges all Members of Congress with voting to increase entitlement spending by this \$54.5 billion, although no such votes occurred. This distorts the NTUF tallies.

One hundred fifty-one of the 172 House Democrats, the one House independent, and the one House Republican who NTUF says voted to increase spending in 1995—as well as all 28 Senate Democrats and the one Senate Republican who NTUF said voted to raise spending—should have been tallied as voting to decrease spending. These are the members whom the NTUF rating shows as voting to increase spending but by less than \$54.5 billion. When the automatic increases that occurred without any vote and that were due to factors such as the Social Security COLA are put to the side, these members voted to lower spending.

Most citizens who hear about the NTUF tally will assume these members voted to make programs more costly than they would otherwise be. Few will understand that NTUF is charging these members with voting to increase spending merely because the member did not vote to cancel Social Security cost-of-living adjustments, deny Medicare benefits to those newly turning 65, or make cuts yielding equivalent savings.

NTUF EXAGGERATES SIZE OF SOME SPENDING CUTS

Those members whom NTUF shows as voting to reduce spending would be given credit for reducing spending by a larger amount if this \$54.4 billion in automatic entitlement spending were not counted against them. At the same time, NTUF gives many of these same members more credit than they are due for reducing spending in other areas because of mistakes in counting votes for various bills the House and Senate passed.

When a member voted both for an authorization bill and an appropriations bill that cover the same programs, NTUF is supposed to make an adjustment to avoid a double-

count. But it sometimes neglects to do so. It incorrectly gives members who voted for the Amtrak reauthorization bill and the transportation appropriations bill credit twice for the same Amtrak cuts. This also is true of cuts in the Interstate Commerce Commission.

NTUF also overstates the cuts in the FY 1996 agriculture appropriations bill by \$5 billion due to an error involving farm price supports.

Still other problems in NTUF's methodology stem from the fact that NTUF counts votes for authorization bills for discretionary programs as votes to increase or decrease spending even though authorization bills do not cause discretionary spending to increase or decrease. Only the discretionary spending caps and appropriations bills do that.

LARGEST DEFICIT REDUCTION PLAN NOT GIVEN APPROPRIATE CREDIT

While NTUF sometimes presents its vote tally as a measure of fiscal responsibility, this is not accurate. NTUF ignores many votes to reduce or increase the deficit.

NTUF does not count votes to increase or decrease government subsidies that are provided through the tax code, which many experts, the General Accounting Office, the Joint Tax Committee, and individuals such as Alan Greenspan call "tax expenditures." If a member votes to cut health programs to fund a corporate tax subsidy without reducing the deficit, NTUF rates the member as voting to cut spending. A member who votes against such a measure does less well in the NTUF rankings.

This approach adversely affects the rankings of a substantial number of House and Senate members who voted for the "Coalition" budget. The Coalition budget, developed by a group of House Democrats, reduced the deficit more than the Republican reconciliation bill. While the Republican plan cut programs more, it also contained large tax cuts, including expansion of a number of corporate and individual tax expenditures. By contract, the Coalition budget contained no tax cuts and reduced some tax expenditures. Although the Coalition budget reduced the deficit more, members voting for it fare less well in the NTUF rankings than members voting for the Republican budget.

Particularly serious is NTUF's mischaracterization of "Blue Dog" Democrats who supported the Coalition budget as being opponents of cuts in discretionary spending. Many House members voted against various appropriations bills that would cut discretionary spending because of "riders" attached to these bills that would weaken environmental protection and health and safety standards—or because the members disagreed with where the discretionary spending cuts were being made—not because the members opposed cutting discretionary spending.

In fact, a number of members who voted against various appropriations bills voted for the Coalition budget, which contained binding discretionary spending caps that would force more than \$300 billion in discretionary spending reductions over seven years. NTUF fails to count votes to lower the binding discretionary spending caps as votes to cut spending, an egregious error. This affects all members who voted for budgets that would reduce the caps.

NTUF'S REMARKABLE SCORING OF VOICE VOTES

NTUF "scores" a number of voice votes, even though not all members may have been in favor of the measure in question. In this area, NTUF has altered its methodology since 1994.

Even members who were out of town and missed the vote altogether are scored as hav-

ing voted to increase or reduce spending on voice votes.

The NTUF methodology on these voice votes has a more damaging effect on Democrats than on Republicans. NTUF scores voice votes on amendments to some bills. If the members voted for final passage of the bill, NTUF then cancels out the voice vote. But if the member voted against final passage, NTUF leaves the voice vote in its tally. If you are in the minority, you are more likely to be charged with the cost of voice vote amendments that add spending, as most of the amendments that NTUF counts did, since you are more likely not to vote for final passage of the bill.

NTUF's use of voice votes is different now than it was in 1994. At that time, it did not score voice votes on amendments.

The Center on Budget and Policy Priorities is a nonpartisan research organization and policy institute that conducts research and analysis on a range of government policies and programs, and specializes in issues related to fiscal policy. It is supported primarily by foundation grants.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, if those extensions of remarks on this debate are admitted to the Record, must they be on the subject which is the resolution under consideration, or can they be on the tax bill?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It would be on this subject.

Mr. LINDER. They must be on this subject, or they would be out of order?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The request specified that it covered the subject of the resolution.

Mr. LINDER. On the subject of the resolution.

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, is that saying that anyone submitting remarks in the context that they have been offered during the last hour would not be permitted or that someone would be trying to censor them in order to get them into the RECORD?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The issue before the House is on the propriety of the resolution making in orders a fourth of July recess beginning today. Under House rules, any remarks that are relevant to the rubric of that resolution would be in order and would come within the unanimous-consent request and printed in distinctive style.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 230, nays 194, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 242]
YEAS—230

| | | |
|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| Aderholt | Gillmor | Pappas |
| Archer | Gilman | Parker |
| Army | Goodlatte | Pastor |
| Bachus | Goodling | Paul |
| Baker | Goss | Paxon |
| Ballenger | Graham | Pease |
| Barr | Granger | Peterson (PA) |
| Barrett (NE) | Greenwood | Petri |
| Bartlett | Gutknecht | Pickering |
| Barton | Hansen | Pitts |
| Bass | Hastert | Pombo |
| Bateman | Hastings (WA) | Porter |
| Bereuter | Hayworth | Portman |
| Billbray | Hefley | Pryce (OH) |
| Billirakis | Herger | Quinn |
| Bliley | Hill | Radanovich |
| Blumenauer | Hilleary | Ramstad |
| Blunt | Hobson | Redmond |
| Boehrlert | Hoekstra | Regula |
| Boehner | Horn | Riggs |
| Bonilla | Hostettler | Riley |
| Bono | Houghton | Rogan |
| Boswell | Hulshof | Rogers |
| Brady | Hunter | Rohrabacher |
| Bryant | Hutchinson | Ros-Lehtinen |
| Bunning | Hyde | Roukema |
| Burr | Inglis | Royce |
| Burton | Istook | Ryun |
| Buyer | Jenkins | Salmon |
| Callahan | Johnson (CT) | Sanford |
| Calvert | Johnson, Sam | Saxton |
| Camp | Jones | Scarborough |
| Campbell | Kelly | Schaefer, Dan |
| Canady | Kim | Schaffer, Bob |
| Cannon | King (NY) | Sensenbrenner |
| Chabot | Kingston | Sessions |
| Chambliss | Klink | Shadegg |
| Chenoweth | Klug | Shaw |
| Christensen | Knollenberg | Shays |
| Coble | Kolbe | Shimkus |
| Coburn | LaHood | Shuster |
| Collins | Largent | Skeen |
| Combest | Latham | Smith (MI) |
| Cook | LaTourette | Smith (NJ) |
| Cooksey | Lazio | Smith (OR) |
| Crane | Leach | Smith (TX) |
| Crapo | Lewis (CA) | Smith, Linda |
| Cunningham | Lewis (KY) | Snowbarger |
| Davis (VA) | Linder | Solomon |
| Deal | Livingston | Souder |
| DeLay | LoBiondo | Spence |
| Diaz-Balart | Lucas | Stearns |
| Dickey | Manzullo | Stump |
| Dixon | McCarthy (NY) | Sununu |
| Doolittle | McCollum | Talent |
| Dreier | McCrery | Tauzin |
| Duncan | McDade | Taylor (NC) |
| Dunn | McHugh | Thomas |
| Ehlers | McInnis | Thornberry |
| Ehrlich | McIntosh | Thune |
| Emerson | McKeon | Tiahrt |
| English | Metcalf | Trafficant |
| Ensign | Mica | Upton |
| Everett | Miller (FL) | Walsh |
| Ewing | Molinar | Wamp |
| Fawell | Moran (KS) | Watkins |
| Foley | Morella | Watts (OK) |
| Forbes | Murtha | Weldon (FL) |
| Fowler | Myrick | Weldon (PA) |
| Fox | Nethercutt | Weller |
| Franks (NJ) | Neumann | White |
| Frelinghuysen | Ney | Whitfield |
| Gallely | Northup | Wicker |
| Ganske | Norwood | Wolf |
| Gekas | Nussle | Young (AK) |
| Gibbons | Oxley | Young (FL) |
| Gilchrest | Packard | |

NAYS—194

| | | |
|--------------|------------|------------|
| Abercrombie | Brown (CA) | Davis (FL) |
| Ackerman | Brown (FL) | Davis (IL) |
| Allen | Brown (OH) | DeFazio |
| Andrews | Capps | DeGette |
| Baesler | Cardin | Delahunt |
| Baldacci | Carson | DeLauro |
| Barcia | Clay | Dellums |
| Barrett (WI) | Clayton | Deutsch |
| Becerra | Clement | Dicks |
| Berman | Clyburn | Dingell |
| Berry | Condit | Doggett |
| Bishop | Conyers | Dooley |
| Blagojevich | Costello | Doyle |
| Bonior | Coyne | Edwards |
| Borski | Cramer | Engel |
| Boucher | Cummings | Eshoo |
| Boyd | Danner | Etheridge |

| | | |
|----------------|---------------|---------------|
| Evans | Lewis (GA) | Rodriguez |
| Farr | Lipinski | Roemer |
| Fattah | Lofgren | Rothman |
| Fazio | Lowey | Roybal-Allard |
| Filner | Luther | Sabo |
| Foglietta | Maloney (CT) | Sanchez |
| Ford | Maloney (NY) | Sanders |
| Frank (MA) | Manton | Sandlin |
| Frost | Markey | Sawyer |
| Furse | Martinez | Schumer |
| Gejdenson | Mascara | Scott |
| Gephardt | Matsui | Serrano |
| Goode | McCarthy (MO) | Sherman |
| Gordon | McDermott | Sisisky |
| Green | McGovern | Skaggs |
| Gutierrez | McHale | Skelton |
| Hall (OH) | McIntyre | Slaughter |
| Hall (TX) | McKinney | Smith, Adam |
| Hamilton | McNulty | Snyder |
| Harman | Meehan | Spratt |
| Ramstad | Meeke | Stabenow |
| Hastings (FL) | Menendez | Stark |
| Hefner | Millender- | Stenholm |
| Hilliard | McDonald | Stokes |
| Hinchey | Miller (CA) | Strickland |
| Hinojosa | Minge | Stupak |
| Holden | Mink | Tanner |
| Hooley | Moakley | Tauscher |
| Hoyer | Mollohan | Taylor (MS) |
| Jackson (IL) | Moran (VA) | Thompson |
| Jackson-Lee | Nadler | Thurman |
| (TX) | Neal | Tierney |
| Jefferson | Oberstar | Torres |
| John | Obey | Towns |
| Johnson (WI) | Olver | Turner |
| Johnson, E. B. | Ortiz | Velazquez |
| Kanjorski | Pallone | Vento |
| Kaptur | Pascrell | Visclosky |
| Kennedy (MA) | Payne | Waters |
| Kennedy (RI) | Pelosi | Watt (NC) |
| Kennelly | Peterson (MN) | Waxman |
| Kildee | Pickett | Wexler |
| Kilpatrick | Pomeroy | Weygand |
| Kind (WI) | Poshard | Wise |
| Klecicka | Price (NC) | Woolsey |
| Kucinich | Rahall | Wynn |
| LaFalce | Rangel | Yates |
| Lampson | Reyes | |
| Lantos | Rivers | |
| Levin | | |

NOT VOTING—10

| | | |
|---------|----------|--------|
| Bentsen | Flake | Rush |
| Castle | Gonzalez | Schiff |
| Cox | Kasich | |
| Cubin | Owens | |

□ 1149

Mrs. ROUKEMA and Mr. MCINTOSH changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the resolution was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE FROM THURSDAY, JUNE 26, 1997, TO TUESDAY, JULY 8, 1997, AND RECESS OR ADJOURNMENT OF THE SENATE FROM THURSDAY, JUNE 26, 1997, OR THEREAFTER, TO MONDAY, JULY 7, 1997

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 108) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 108

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the House adjourns on the legislative day of Thursday, June 26, 1997, it stand adjourned until 12:30 p.m. on Tuesday, July 8, 1997, or until noon on the second day after Members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first; and that when the Senate recesses or

adjourns at the close of business on Thursday, June 26, 1997, Friday, June 27, 1997, Saturday, June 28, 1997, or Sunday, June 29, 1997, pursuant to a motion made by the Majority Leader, or his designee, in accordance with this concurrent resolution, it stand recessed or adjourned until noon on Monday, July 7, 1997, or such time on that day as may be specified by the Majority Leader or his designee in the motion to recess or adjourn, or until noon on the second day after members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first.

SEC. 2. The Speaker of the House and the Majority Leader of the Senate, acting jointly after consultation with the Minority Leader of the House and the Minority Leader of the Senate, shall notify the Members of the House and the Senate, respectively, to reassemble whenever, in their opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUPREME COURT LETS LINE-ITEM VETO LAW STAND

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD the entire text of the Supreme Court decision throwing out the challenge to the line-item veto by a vote of 7 to 2.

SUPREME COURT LETS LINE-ITEM VETO LAW STAND JUSTICES RULE SENATORS LACKED STANDING TO CHALLENGE THE LAW

WASHINGTON (AllPolitics, June 26).—In a victory for line-item veto supporters, the Supreme Court ruled today that a group of senators who challenged the law did not have legal standing to do so. The law will likely face a second constitutional review, but for now it stands.

The line-item veto, approved by Congress in March 1996, allows the president to strike individual spending items from larger measures.

A group of congressional lawmakers, led by Sen. Robert Byrd of West Virginia, opposed the law and sued the Clinton Administration on grounds that the law usurped congressional authority to write the nation's laws.

"After Congress, made up of 535 individuals, passes a law and sends it to the president, he signs it into law," Byrd said. The line-item veto "would allow him to change that law unilaterally and that's not constitutional, that's not right, that's wrong," he said.

But with today's decision, the Supreme Court decided the lawmakers lacked the standing to file such a suit. The case is *Raines vs. Byrd*, 96-1671.

It's usually risky to read too much into the justices' questions during oral argument. But when the case was heard, some of them wondered out loud whether lawmakers on the losing side had standing to sue, or whether someone affected by an actual exercise of the line-item veto would have to claim an injury for the case to move forward. So far, Clinton has yet to exercise the new power, because no spending bills have reached him yet.

"Practically, it is a majority of Congress that has caused this injury, not the president," Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg said during oral arguments. "They are only injured by their own folly."