

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

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

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

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

NORTH AMERICAN FREE TRADE AGREEMENT

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this moment to talk about something that is near and dear to the hearts of many Americans, and that is the North American Free Trade Agreement, otherwise known as NAFTA.

When the United States enters into trade agreements, the objective should be to advance the standard of living for working families in our country and abroad.

Just like the average family in Illinois' 7th Congressional District who are impacted by this trade agreement whether they like it or not, my hope is for them. They want what we all want, to provide to the best of their ability for their loved ones.

My hope is for the people in the district, so that they can obtain a living wage, a wage that allows workers to lead a dignified life while working in a safe and healthy environment, an environment that respects their needs as a worker. Their struggles and desires are not so different from mine and my colleagues. They want to put clothes on their children's back, they want to put food on the table, have access to reliable transportation, live in adequate housing, and afford child care for their children. Their issues need to be taken account of and they want to be an active part of the debate.

I hope for a trade agreement that will help to broaden our economy, help eradicate poverty, while bringing jobs and a decent quality of life to all of those involved. However, based upon recent reports, NAFTA, the trade agreement and trade model, has not met its promises. Therefore, I believe that any standard of trade, based on the NAFTA model, will further threaten the standard of living for working families, not only in the United States but in other countries as well.

The growing trade deficit with Canada and Mexico since NAFTA was passed is well-known. As this trade deficit has developed, thousands of United States jobs have been lost.

"Free traders" often state that those opposed to NAFTA need to get on with

the times, often asserting that we are opposed to this treaty out of fear for the future. I pronounce that this is just simply not the truth. As a matter of fact, those individuals and unions who are opposed to NAFTA do so as a result of their great desire to create a different kind of future, a future that says that the standard of living in this country ought to be spread throughout the world, a future that says we do not believe that further reducing the standard of living in Third World developing countries is the way for America to rise.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would hope that this country would object, reject, extricate itself from the concept that America can advance by allowing its businesses and industries to flow away seeking a different kind of labor pool, seeking a labor pool that is willing to work because of the difficulties that it has had, that is willing to work by undercutting and undermining the standard of living that the American society has become accustomed to.

We need to make sure that people all over the world can subscribe to the idea that they ought to be paid for the work which they provide; that is, they ought to be paid a livable wage that affords them the opportunity to seek the very best of what the world has to offer.

I am grateful for the opportunity to share these thoughts and ideas with my colleagues and the American people and suggest that NAFTA is not good for America.

TAX RELIEF TO THE MIDDLE CLASS IS MORE IMPORTANT THAN EVER

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

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, what if we were to go on a 6-month diet to lose 30 pounds and we got to the 4th month and we had already lost 28 pounds? Would we quit exercising and quit dieting because we were so far ahead of schedule? We had not reached our goal yet but we were way ahead of the game.

The United States Congress and the American people are in that situation right now with deficit reduction. An article today in The Washington Post shows that the deficit, the projected deficit may go down to \$45 billion, which is way lower than the expectation. Now, what this means is that Congress and the American people may not have to wait until the year 2002 to see a balanced budget. We may see it a lot sooner, even potentially as soon as next year.

So how do we react? Well, all over America people will be very pleased to hear this. But how do certain big-government liberal types in Washington react? Hey, we are ahead of schedule; that means we can relax and we do not have to cut so many programs and we

can spend more money. We can have more pork back home. It is very good news to some of them.

I would say to my colleagues that, if we change from the path of having fiscal responsibility and lower spending, then we will get back into the hole that we are just now digging out of. A balanced budget to the folks back home is not about numbers, it is about opportunities, it is about lower interest rates. Lower interest rates on a home mortgage of \$75,000 over a 30-year period means we would pay \$37,000 less. On a \$15,000 car loan, lower interest rates means that we would pay about \$900 less. It means that college education is more affordable because student loans are lower. Also, Mr. Speaker, it means taxes are lower because we do not have to spend so much on deficit spending.

Now, the Republican plan to lower and give middle class tax relief is very simple. Under that, 76 percent, and I have a chart, Mr. Speaker, but 76 percent of the tax relief goes to people, households, making below \$75,000 a year. This is what a middle class tax cut is all about.

Now, a lot of folks say, well, this tax cut only benefits the rich. Well, that is true if the definition of rich is people who make below \$75,000. And incidentally, the interesting way the Clinton administration and some of the liberals get there is by playing games with paychecks, by adding to it, for example, the rental value of a house. So if a person makes \$45,000 a year, under the Democrat liberal formula that individual is making over \$75,000 a year, so they can say this tax cut does not apply to them.

I would say this. If we go try to get a loan or buy a house based on the numbers the President tells us we are making, it will not work.

Ninety percent of this tax relief goes to families and to education. I am from Georgia. We have the HOPE scholarship. The HOPE scholarship is for students who make a B or above in State schools, and they have their tuition paid for. The national HOPE scholarship is not as generous as the Georgia HOPE scholarship, but it is still very good, because if students and children want to compete in the world today, they have to have a college education. The Republican plan makes college education more affordable.

Tax relief at this time is proper. Why is tax relief important? Because the more money Americans have in their pocket, because the Government is taking less out of it, the more shoes they will buy, the more clothes they will buy, the more shirts, the more cars, and so forth. And when Americans do that, small businesses respond by expanding. When businesses expand, more jobs are created. When more jobs are created, more people go to work, less people are on welfare, and more people are paying taxes.

Is tax relief consistent with deficit reduction? Absolutely. It certainly is,

Mr. Speaker, and that is why we need it. Because the easiest way to balance the budget is to have economic growth.

COMMEMORATION OF THE LIBERATION OF GUAM

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

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I take the opportunity to come to the floor to just simply commemorate an event that is very important to the people of Guam, and that is the liberation of Guam from the hands of the Japanese during World War II.

The actual liberation of Guam occurred on July 21, 1944, with the landing of troops from the Third Marine Division and the First Marine Provisional Brigade and the 77th Army Infantry. We paid tribute to this event yesterday at Arlington National Cemetery with about 200 people from the local Guam community as well as various officials from the Federal Government. We laid a wreath at the Tomb of the Unknowns, and joining with me in laying this wreath was General Krulak, the Commandant of the Marine Corps.

Of course, this is entirely appropriate because it is in fact the Marines who were the shock troops of the landing which occurred 53 years ago on Guam. Among the Marines that landed on Guam on that day were Capt. Louis Wilson, who won the Congressional Medal of Honor and who, unfortunately, could not be with us yesterday, but he won the Congressional Medal of Honor on Guam. Captain Wilson later went on to be Commandant of the Marine Corps.

Also, last year, in commemorating this event, someone who joined in commemorating this event with us was former Alabama Senator Howell Heflin, who was wounded on Guam on July 21, 1944.

The island of Guam was devastated by this conflagration, and the men in uniform, as liberators from the sea, deserve our gratitude and certainly the gratitude from the people of Guam for a job well done and for the honor of a sacred mission that was fully completed.

But there were also liberators from within. There were also the people of Guam who suffered and who sacrificed and endured much hardship while awaiting their deliverance, but displaying all the while their courage and their capacity for survival, their ingenuity and their indomitable spirit.

There are many dates in this month, in July, which testify to the intensity of the emotions of the Chamorro people and the endurance of the Japanese occupation. On July 12, the date in 1944, some 9 days before the arrival of the American troops, the Japanese ordered a massive roundup of all civilians and had a forced march into the interior of the island.

□ 2145

July 12 is also the date on which four men were beheaded, including Father Duenas, in a place called Tai. Father Duenas was beheaded for his continual insistence and protestations to the Japanese authorities that his people be treated fairly. And the same day that the Japanese decided to round up the entire population of some 20,000 Chamorro civilians and force them into camps into the interior of the island, was the day that they also beheaded Father Duenas.

On July 15 there was the massacre of some 16 villagers on the southern end of the island in the caves of Tinta Malesso, and July 16 the massacre of 30 other villagers at Faha, which is also in the village of Malesso. And on July 20, one day before the arrival of the Americans, the brave actions of some young men who were armed only with one rifle and several homemade spears under the leadership of Tonko Ayes of Malesso, overcame a squad of Japanese soldiers in Malesso in fear of their lives.

So as we reflect upon this, certainly for the people of Guam there were numerous other beheadings, executions and beatings, but the people of Guam persevered because of their faith in the American flag and belief in their abilities. Today we pay respect to those who liberated Guam in 1944, from within, from without, from the sea and from the hills. The people who came from places like Kansas and Florida and North Carolina, but certainly also people that came from the interior of Guam, we honor all of you.

It is important to remember that Guam was the only American territory which was occupied during World War II with civilians in it, and is in fact the only American territory occupied since the war of 1812.

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

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from Guam [Mr. UNDERWOOD] on the special order that he is conducting here this evening. When I visited some of the battlefields in Guam and saw the activities and learned of the heroic activities of the Guamanian people, I was moved and impressed.

I think we have not given the Guamanians the recognition they really deserve, so I appreciate the gentleman's offer on behalf of his constituency tonight.

FAMILY ECONOMIC INCOME

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

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, about a month ago, when we were leading up to the debate that we had and the successful passage of the tax reform bill, the

treasury department kicked off a major debate in this country by releasing some statistics, suggesting that the congressional tax relief bills were tilted toward the rich. In other words, the tax relief bill that we were passing was going to give larger tax breaks to the rich than it was to the middle class.

And, of course, Secretary Rubin made a big point that we were not doing enough to take care of the less well off. As we began to look into it, and this is not new news anymore, but as we began to look into the situation, we found out that one of the things Secretary Rubin did was to fail to report his findings in a fashion that the American people could understand.

And I guess I would have to conclude that Secretary Rubin did that on purpose. Because instead of talking about family income in a way that we would all normally talk about it, either in someone's annual salary as it is reported, when somebody comes home and they are sitting around the family dinner table and their little boy or girl says to dad, "How much do we make?" and dad says, "Well, my salary is \$40,000," or "My salary is \$55,000," or whatever it is, we all understand that. Or we can also understand that when we fill out our income tax form each year, we get some deductions and we get down to what we really pay taxes on under the current tax code. That is called adjusted gross income. The American people and I and everybody else can understand what that is.

But Secretary Rubin computed family income by using a term called family economic income. That means he took the gross salary that everybody made, not adjusted gross income, but the total amount, and added in a number of other income factors to that which Americans do not normally relate to as income to their family.

For example, let us say a family makes \$60,000 and let us say they live in a house that is worth \$150,000. Well, the economic rental income of that house, now remember they have a mortgage and they are paying the mortgage and they are paying their taxes on the house, but if it is worth \$150,000 and the rental value of that house if it were on the market for rent would be maybe \$1,200 a month, Secretary Rubin took \$1,200 a month and multiplied it by 12 and said, OK, let us see, that is \$12,000 plus another \$2,400, that is \$14,400 a year that the family has in family economic income. So you take the salary level that the family earns, say it is \$60,000, and add \$14,400 to it and that is part of family economic income.

And if you are like most people have some kind of retirement plan, the buildup of money in the retirement plan also became part of family economic income. And so, as was pointed out by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON] just a few minutes ago, a family that had an income of \$50,000 or \$60,000 could look at Secretary Rubin's charts and find out that they