

for some surprising news, and this news flatly refutes the Democrat catch phrase: Tax cuts for the wealthy.

According to a recent stock market survey, stock ownership doubled over the past 7 years to 43 percent of the adult population. Forty-seven percent of all investors are women. Fifty-five percent are under the age of 50. Fifty percent are not college graduates.

So let us think about that and compare it to the absurd stereotypes perpetuated by the liberals. Almost half of all American adults own at least one share of stock. Slightly under half of all shareholders are women. More than half of all investors are not yet 50, and half of all those with a stake in investments are not college graduates.

Are the liberals really against helping these people? Are they sure that cutting taxes on savings and investments only helps the rich? Maybe it is about time the liberals updated their stereotypes.

REPUBLICAN BUDGET FAILS TO PROVIDE HEALTH COVERAGE FOR MOST CHILDREN

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

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, over 10 million American children lack health insurance. They lack the ordinary means to gain access to the health care system.

Unfortunately, Texas leads the Nation with 46 percent of our children, almost one in two, lacking health insurance. These are the kids that do not see a doctor when they are sick, unless they get so sick they have to be rushed to the hospital emergency room. They are the children of the working parents who are struggling to make ends meet but get no health insurance at their job.

Some 5 million of these kids were supposed to be covered by this great Republican budget bill that we have heard ballyhooed here this morning.

Well, last week the Congressional Budget Office that this Republican crowd hired reported that they left off a zero in their great plan; they are only going to cover 500,000, not 5 million new kids in America.

In politics they say half a loaf is better than no loaf at all, but for those many kids who need health care and health insurance the Gingrich Republicans are only providing a heel.

A BRIGHT FUTURE FOR AMERICA

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

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning to call attention to what is happening in Washington out here. We are about to conclude legislation that balances the budget, restores Medicare, and reduces taxes on the American people.

The front page of the Washington Post this morning says that the budget may be balanced as soon as 1998, and they credit a robust economy, but they forget to mention that in addition to a robust economy we have a new group of people in Washington that is curtailing the growth of Government spending. When the government spends less, that means they have a lower deficit, and that means they borrow less money out of the private sector. More money available in the private sector means the interest rates stay lower, and when the interest rates stay lower, people buy more houses and cars, and of course people have to go to work to build those houses and cars, and that means they leave the welfare rolls and they go into the work force and that creates a strong economy.

That is what is going on in this country today, a balanced budget, Medicare restored, lower taxes on the American people. That is a bright future for America. That is a bright future for our children and our grandchildren.

CHILD TAX CREDIT DENIED WORKING FAMILIES

(Mr. BONIOR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, it is wrong to deny tax relief to America's working families, and what we are seeing here again is the Republicans and their rich and wealthy friends bashing working Americans and their families. Compared to the President's proposal, the Republicans' proposal, 4 million working families will be largely denied a child tax credit under their plan. These are people who make between \$20,000 and \$30,000 a year.

An example: Consider a family of four with two children, living in a medium-sized southern city. The father is a rookie police officer. He makes \$23,000 a year. Mother takes a few years off to take care of the kids. What happens under their plan? Zero. Zero for that family. Under the President's plan, \$767.

They take their credits and they give it to the wealthy in the form of tax relief on corporate minimum tax, a \$22 billion giveaway. They give it to relief with respect to capital gains and indexing, \$650 billion that explodes in the outyears.

They are bashing working people, and they are doing it to take care of their wealthy friends. It is wrong, it is outrageous, and we need to stop it.

TAX REDUCTION FOR THE MIDDLE CLASS

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

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Speaker, I do not usually get up here and talk, but there is a lot of absences that we did not hear just a minute ago, a lot of things that were left out.

There are 4 million people today who are receiving Federal income money who earn no money. It is called the earned income tax credit. It is 36 percent of the claims for that are fraud. It is the most abused system that we have.

It is not about leaving those people out. It is about creating an opportunity for them to join the rest of America through a tax reduction that is for middle class America. They are already granted earned income tax credits.

What we are saying is, if they work and pay taxes, they ought to get a tax cut. If they do not work and we are already giving them a payment, maybe we should not give them more so we can encourage them to work.

SURVIVAL OF THE FITTEST?

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

Mr. STRICKLAND. Mr. Speaker, in all due respect to the previous speaker, only people who work qualify for the earned income tax credit. This is not money going to people who do not work. If they do not work, they do not qualify.

Sadly, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle seem to embrace a survival of the fittest mentality. If people are wealthy, if they are healthy, they are deemed to be good and worthy. If they are old or sick or poor, somehow they do not deserve a part of the American dream. They do not deserve a tax break.

We are going to get a tax bill, but I hope the American people are watching us, because this tax bill must be a fair bill. Under the Republican bill, if a family has four children and makes \$18,000 a year, they will get nothing, nothing under the child tax credit provision. But if a similar family makes \$80,000 a year, they will get \$2,000. Nothing for the poor family; \$2,000 for the well-to-do family.

The Republican bill takes care of the well-to-do. We have got a responsibility to stand up for America's working families.

TAX CREDITS FOR TAXPAYERS

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

Mr. KINGSTON. Well, Mr. Speaker, it is only 10:30 and the Democrats are already confused. No surprise, but usually they make it to 11 o'clock.

Here is the idea of nothing for the poor. Let us examine the case of a person who is poor who does not work. Their children get WIC, their children and they get food stamps, they get Medicaid, they get public transportation, they get college education, they get free housing.

Now on top of that the Clinton Democrat liberals want to take \$500 per

child tax credit from a single working woman with a 14-year-old and 16-year-old, and instead of giving that single working woman a \$1,000 tax credit for her 14-year-old and 16-year-old, they want to say no, she does not get any of it, and give it to somebody who is not working and who is not paying taxes.

There is no discussion here about the poor not getting anything. What we are discussing here is taking the money from middle class working people and giving it to those who are not paying taxes. This is a tax credit. Tax credit goes to those who pay taxes.

We are not debating taking away public assistance benefits which are secure, which will continue to go to the poor.

□ 1030

MIDDLE-INCOME AMERICANS SHOULD GET TAX CUTS

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

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, in 1993, when President Clinton took over, the deficit was over \$250 billion. In 1993, with the President and all the Democrats in the Congress, not one single Republican voted on a deficit reduction plan. Today that deficit is \$45 billion. The deficit is indeed coming down.

This Congress voted for an \$85 billion tax cut. That tax cut goes only to people who are working and who pay taxes. That is the Democratic plan. The question is, who will get those tax cuts? We believe that middle-income Americans ought to get those tax cuts; that they ought to receive deductions for education for their children, that they ought to receive child tax credits. The Democratic plan says that.

Do not be confused. The facts are simple. Who should get the tax cuts? Democrats and the President believe those tax cuts ought to go to middle-income people for deductions for their children's education and for child tax credits. Check the facts. Members should know what they have before them. We believe that \$5 billion ought to go to hard-working Americans and yes, people must work to get the tax credit.

REPUBLICANS ARE COMMITTED TO TAX CUTS

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

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, while liberal Democrats are busier than a White House shredder coming up with excuses why they are against tax cuts, Republicans in Congress remain committed to passing the first tax cuts in 16 years. Let us recall that Congress would not even be talking about tax cuts were it not for the Republicans in control. After all, prior to

1994 the Democrats were in power for decades. They had their chance to give average families tax relief. They chose instead to pass President Clinton's tax increase, the largest tax increase in U.S. history. Now I hear the other side making claims that they really are for tax relief, only they are not for the Republican tax package.

With all due respect, those claims are about as credible as the White House claims that no one can remember who hired Craig Livingstone. No, the sad truth is that Democrats have not stood for tax relief since President John F. Kennedy. The proof is in the pudding.

REPUBLICAN PLAN BENEFITS THE WEALTHY

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

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, according to all of the news services, the public understands very well what is going on. Sixty-one percent of the American people now understand that the Republican tax bill gives most of the benefits to wealthy corporations and to wealthy individuals.

What is the Republicans' response to this fact? The response is to go out and hire a new public relations firm to try to tell a new story about their tax bill. It is not to change their tax bill, to take care of working families, it is not to change their tax bill to take care of the children of working families, but it is to change the public relations firm.

What the Republicans ought to do is start sharing some of the benefits of that tax bill with people who wake up every morning and go to work and work hard but do not make a lot of money. They, too, would like to take care of their children. They, too, would like to be able to educate their children. But the Republicans do not do that. They decide in fact that corporations should no longer have to pay the alternative minimum tax. They decide in fact that people who clip coupons should pay 15 percent of taxes while people who go to work should pay 28 percent on their taxes.

DEMOCRATIC TAX PLAN IS WELFARE

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

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, well, the liberals in this place have finally done it. After 40 years of building the welfare state, the liberals have finally come up with the ultimate welfare policy. They have discovered a way to try to turn a tax cut into a welfare program. Under the Republican plan, 75 percent of the tax cuts go to people who make less than \$75,000. Liberals want to give welfare to people who are not paying any taxes at all and then

call it a tax cut. Welcome to liberalism in the 1990's.

Taking money from the taxpayers and giving it to people who do not pay any taxes at all is not a tax cut at all. That is welfare. Let us call it what it really is. In fact, it is so ridiculous that I dare anyone on the other side to try to come and explain it to my constituents with a straight face. Good luck.

TAX CUTS

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

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, while the gentleman is here who just spoke, the President's proposal would give a child credit only to those who work and pay Federal taxes, income or withholding, Social Security, period. So do not come here and distort the truth.

Second, in 1993 I voted for that package. I am proud of it. We have now a deficit that may be disappearing. Why? Because we Democrats had the guts in 1993 to stand up.

Third, this 75 percent figure going to those who earn under \$71,000, it is a 5-year analysis at best. Give us a 10-year analysis. They do not give it to us because it will show that most of the tax cut would go to very wealthy families, and I would say here to Mr. Kies of the Joint Committee on Taxation, today come up with a 10-year analysis. He does not because he hides the fact who will benefit, and that it would explode the deficit after 5 years.

STRENGTHENING FEDERAL LAWS AGAINST CRIMINALS WHO COMMIT CRIMES AGAINST CHILDREN

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

Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Joan's Law Act of 1997. This legislation will reflect the recently enacted New Jersey Joan's Law.

I introduced this bill on behalf of the family and friends of Joan D'Alesandro, a 7-year-old Hillsdale, NJ, girl who was raped and murdered in 1973. Joan's murderer, who lived across the street and participated in the family's search for their daughter, was sentenced to 20 years in prison. Now eligible for parole, he has twice sought release since his incarceration.

Mr. Speaker, my bill states that any person who is convicted of a Federal offense defined as a serious violent felony should be sentenced either to death or imprisonment for life when the victim of the crime is 14 years of age or younger and dies as a result of the offense. This bill sends the strongest possible message to anyone who would take the life of a child: If you do so, you will either forfeit your own life or live out all your remaining days in a Federal prison.