

REPUBLICAN TAX PLAN TO BENEFIT WALL STREET

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

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post reported that the deficit will be \$45 billion this year, and maybe balance next year. How did it happen? In the 1993 Democratic budget agreement the Democrats were right and Republicans were wrong. The Democrats' 1993 budget set us on the road to a balanced budget without one Republican vote.

Thanks to Democrats, we can give the American people a tax cut and a balanced budget. The only question is, who will benefit. Republicans want to help Wall Street and the richest among us. Democrats want to help Main Street and working families.

Even U.S. News & World Report says Republicans want to help their wealthy friends. Let me quote: "The reality is closer to the Democrats' view. The best independent estimates of the bill are that about half the benefits of the Republicans' tax relief plan would go to the richest 10 percent."

Mr. Speaker, we must reject the Republican irresponsible tax break for Wall Street. Join Democrats and cut taxes for working Americans.

THE TAX PLAN AND RESPONSIBILITY

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

Mr. THUNE. Mr. Speaker, all this week we have heard a lot about the phony baloney Treasury analysis that manipulates and skews the numbers on this tax bill. All this week we have been hearing about how we need to give bigger government checks to people who do not pay income taxes because we need to wipe out all Social Security and Medicare taxes.

The people in South Dakota know one thing; that is, you cannot have something for nothing. There is no free lunch. If we want retirement and health care benefits, then we pay for them in Social Security and Medicare taxes. If Members want a culture that is free from responsibility, then the Democrat proposal makes sense. They tell people who pay no income taxes, we will give you a Government check. If you want a culture that takes responsibility for their own actions, then you want our plan. It is a plan that is pro-working American, it is pro-family, it is pro-middle class, it is pro-jobs, pro-investment. It is a plan that improves the quality of life for all Americans.

DEMOCRATS REPRESENT WORKING PEOPLE AND WORKING FAMILIES IN AMERICA

(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, sometimes I feel sorry for the American people who have to sit and watch and listen to the rhetoric that comes from this Chamber. I believe the American people are troubled and sometimes ask themselves, who can we believe? Who can we believe, when people stand and give such contradictory conclusions?

The fact is, in 1993 this country was facing nearly \$300 billion in annual deficits. This year, the deficit is likely to be less than \$50 billion. That is because a Democratic President and a Democratic Congress did what needed to be done. That is why we can talk about a balanced budget today. That is why we can talk about giving the American people a tax cut.

We now know that there will be a tax cut. The argument that we have in this Chamber is what part of the American family community will benefit. My district has a median income of \$22,000. My responsibility is to represent the working people and the working families in this country.

THE TREASURY DEPARTMENT MIGHT BE A GOOD PLACE FOR THE PRESIDENT TO CUT SOME SPENDING

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

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to quote from a famous news anchor: "Finally, a few words about Federal taxes and what some of the great minds in the U.S. Treasury are thinking about.

"The Treasury likes to calculate American people's income on the ability to pay taxes, based not on how much money we have but on how much we might have, or could have had. For example, a family that owns a house and lives in it, the Treasury figures that if the family did not own the house and rented it from somebody else, the rent would be \$500 a month, so it would add that amount—\$6,000 a year—to the family's so-called imputed income. Imputed income is income you might have had but don't. They don't tax you on that amount. The IRS does not play this silly game. Instead, the Treasury calculates how much they could take away from us if they decided to.

"If that were the system, consider the possibility. How about being taxed on Ed McMahon's \$10 million magazine lottery? You didn't win it, you say. But you could have.

"The Treasury must have something better to do. If not, there is a good place for Clinton to cut some spending." David Brinkley, ABC news, February 28, 1993.

THE REPUBLICAN PROPOSAL CON- TAINS A GOOD MIDDLE-CLASS TAX CUT

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

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, we need to talk about exactly who is paying for the cost of Government in Washington, DC, and what effect that will have after we pass our tax cut. We have heard a lot of talk about this being so-called tax cuts for the rich.

Mr. Speaker, this chart I have next to me is based on data from the Joint Economic Committee, and the data that they obtained from the Treasury Department. They break the American public into five categories. The lowest 20 percent of earners are now paying, in the yellow, 1 percent of the cost of big Government. After the tax package is passed they will continue to pay 1 percent of the cost of Government in Washington, DC.

The next 20 percent are currently paying 4 percent, and they will be paying, after this tax cut package, 4 percent.

I would like to draw the attention of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to the upper 20 percent. They are now, today, in America, picking up 63 percent of the cost of Government in Washington. Guess what? After the Republican tax cut, they will continue to pay 63 percent of the cost of Government in Washington.

I appeal to my colleagues, this is a good middle class tax cut.

DEMOCRATS MUST COME TO- GETHER TO DO THE RIGHT THING: PROVIDE TAX RELIEF FOR ALL WORKING AMERICANS

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

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, there seems to be an unsettling frustration and even a palpable consternation on the other side of the House. My Republican colleagues do not seem to be able to accept the fact that we Democrats support tax relief, and tax relief for all working Americans. I think it is a historic moment here in this House when people on both sides of the aisle can come to that consensus.

The problem or the issue or the dilemma, Mr. Speaker, is that Democrats seek to provide tax relief to all working Americans. I would agree that wealthy Americans deserve a tax cut. But do they deserve the bulk of the tax cut and the tax relief? The American people resoundingly reject that, I say to my Republican colleagues.

We are living in a time where 80 percent of all jobs in the next century will require some form of computer literacy. Seventy-five percent of all jobs will require some form of postsecondary education. I would appeal to my

Republican colleagues that at this historic moment, as a new Member of Congress, let us forge a new beginning as we move into this next century. Let us find common ground for all working Americans.

One would think that they would have learned from the disaster aid relief bill that they were wrong. One would think they would learn from the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight with the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] that they were wrong.

Do the right thing for the American people, provide tax relief for working Americans. Let Democrats come together and work on behalf of American families.

THE REPUBLICAN TAX PLAN PROVIDES NO BREAKS FOR THE RICH, JUST EQUAL TREATMENT

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

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, this is really a pretty simple debate we are in. Let me just refer to this chart once again. I want particularly the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. FORD] who just spoke to understand this.

Mr. Speaker, this is a chart which shows who pays taxes in America and what the Republican plan will do to various categories of people who pay taxes. It is important to point out that in the top 40 percent of the taxpayers in America, those people pay 84 percent of all the money we have here to spend, I would say to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. FORD], the top 40 percent of the taxpayers in America pay 84 percent of all the money that comes to Washington to spend.

So when the Republican tax plan gets ready to change things, do we change things for that group? This chart shows we definitely do not. As a matter of fact, the top 20 percent today under the Clinton tax hike plan pay 63 percent of all the money that is paid to Washington, and under the Republican plan we do not change that at all. They still pay 63 percent.

The next 20 percent today under the Clinton tax hike plan pay 21 percent, and under the plan that we propose, they continue to pay 21 percent; no breaks for the rich, just equal treatment.

WHO WILL BENEFIT FROM THE PROPOSED TAX CUTS?

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

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, the issue is who benefits from the tax cut. Quite frankly, the Republicans' data distorts the effects of their bill. They only analyze the first 5 years of what is a 10-year plan.

That said, Democrats in fact have designed a tax proposal to give every

working man and woman a shot at the American dream, and the right to quality education has always been an essential part of that dream.

Republicans decide to skimp on education tax breaks to pay for their tax breaks for the wealthy. The Republican plan provides only half of the \$1,500 tuition credit for the first 2 years of college, does virtually nothing for college juniors and seniors, and actually raises taxes on some graduate students.

The Democratic proposal has offered an alternative that includes the full \$500 HOPE credit for the first 2 years of college, plus a 20-percent tuition credit for subsequent years.

The American people are watching this budget debate and wondering, who is on my side? Sixty-one percent of them have concluded that the Republicans are out of touch with the people in this country. It is differences like the education issue that makes it clear. Republicans are on the side of the wealthiest Americans, Democrats are fighting for the middle class.

□ 1045

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GILLMOR). Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I, the pending business is the question of the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal of the last day's proceedings.

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

Mr. ROGAN. 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 364, nays 49, answered "present" 1, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 256]
YEAS—364

Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Bachus
Baesler
Baker
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Berry
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich

Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Cardin

Carson
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cook
Cooksey
Cox
Coyle
Cramer
Crapo
Cubin
Cummings
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)

Davis (VA)
Deal
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
Dellums
Deutsch
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Furse
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green
Greenwood
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefner
Herger
Hill
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Hookey
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly

Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kim
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McGovern
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Metcalfe
Mica
Millender
McDonald
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Ortiz
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pappas
Parker
Pastor
Paul
Paxon
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn

Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Redmond
Regula
Reyes
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ryun
Salmon
Sanchez
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer, Dan
Schumer
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Adam
Smith, Linda
Snowbarger
Snyder
Solomon
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Stump
Sununu
Talent
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tierney
Torres
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Walsh
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Wexler
Weygand
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates
Young (FL)