

paying taxes, more revenues are coming in, and it is easier to balance the budget that way.

But there is a part of that argument that I think is overlooked if we look at just first glance. What I am speaking of is, if we give people tax relief, we are going to have economic growth, we are going to have more jobs, more people working, more people paying tax revenues, and this growth will decrease the deficit faster than just mere cutbacks in spending. We need to have both, but spurring economic growth is the key part of deficit reduction.

Let us look at the picture of taxes. In the 1950's, the average middle-class Federal tax burden was about 6 percent. In the 1970's, it was 16 percent. In 1994, it was 23 percent. But by 1995, the total tax burden was up to 39 percent, 24 percent of that being in Federal income tax alone. That is up from 5 percent in the 1950's.

□ 1530

Members can see what a huge portion of family income taxes take. Mr. Speaker, I believe that the higher the tax rate of middle-class Americans, the less time they have together as families, because when we had a 39-percent tax burden, what that is saying is that the second income of the family just goes to pay taxes. Mom and dad are both working. The second income goes to pay the taxes, 39 percent. Do your own math in your own house.

The tax relief that we are trying to get passed and we are working on a bipartisan basis with the President on it, gives tax relief to people who earn between \$20,000 and \$75,000. Seventy-six percent of the tax relief package goes to middle-income families making between \$20,000 and \$75,000. Of that, 90 percent of it goes toward education, the HOPE scholarship to make it more affordable through a deduction program and a tax credit program to send kids to college. Then \$150 billion of it goes to the \$500-per-child tax credit. There is a big disagreement at this point with the President on it. We are trying to work out our differences. The President wants to give that \$500 tax credit to people who do not pay Federal income taxes, whereas the Republican plan says now you only give tax relief to those who pay income taxes.

It is a very important thing; because if you take a woman, say a single mother named Susan, she has a 14-year-old and a 16-year-old, under the Republican plan, Susan would get a \$1,000 tax relief check from the government, \$1,000 less in taxes. Under the Clinton plan, she would get zero, because the President's proposal is to say that once the child turns 12, no tax relief.

But what is worse is if you had a man out there who had three or four kids and he was not paying Federal income taxes, he could get \$2,000 or \$2,500 worth of tax relief even though he is not paying the taxes. He still, if he is eligible, is going to get all kinds of

welfare-type benefits, like Medicaid and public housing and welfare cash benefits from the DFACS or temporary assistance to needy families. He will get food stamps, WIC, and so forth. But the check comes from Susan and her 14-year-old and her 16-year-old. That is not fair to single working women around America.

If you want to know more about this tax program, I would recommend that you look it up on the International Web. Get beyond the Republican versus Democrat debate. The Democrats have a web page, too. I do not know what their web page number is, but this is the Republican web page. If you will look it up, it is <http://hillsources.house.gov> and you can figure out what the tax relief would be for you.

Again, why is it important to give middle-class Americans tax relief? Because if you have more money in your pocket because we as a Federal Government have confiscated less of it, what Susan will do with her \$1,000 is she will buy more shoes, go out to eat more, maybe buy more clothes, do whatever, she will have more consumable income. When she does that, because 58 million Americans will be able to do that, businesses will expand, jobs will be created, less people will be on welfare, more people will be paying taxes and just like Kennedy and Reagan proved, tax cuts actually increase the revenue because of the economic growth.

SUPPORT THE SPACE PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROGAN). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. WELDON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise this afternoon to speak about our space program and the recent successes that it has had. They really, truly have been spectacular. They have drawn the attention of the whole world. As all of us know, there are some risks associated with going up into space. It is not a business for those who are risk averse but the payoffs are tremendous and we have seen that with all the tremendous breakthroughs in science and technology that came from our Apollo program and Mercury and Gemini programs. Those were really the pioneers, those were the men and women who first got involved, led the race to the Moon and we learned a great deal, a tremendous amount.

Then we were able to follow on from all that with the current reusable launch vehicle that we have, the space shuttle program, a program that has shown and demonstrated its tremendous durability and its tremendous versatility with the ability to go up into space and retrieve satellites and fix those satellites and then redeploy them back out into space.

Of course, right now we are currently involved with the shuttle-Mir program.

We all know there are some serious concerns about the Mir and its ability to survive, but we have learned a great deal from men in space, from the cooperative effort there.

But really what I did want to talk quite a bit about and acknowledge the tremendous work of NASA and particularly the people at JPL and everybody that was involved in this program, the tremendous success of the Mars Pathfinder program. Indeed, I think it has captured the imagination of men and women, young and old all around the globe. I just wanted to share with my colleagues today some of these tremendous photographs that have been made available to me by NASA officials.

This is a photograph taken by the rover after it went off the ramp there. You can see here these tracks in the Martian soil. You can look back and see the Pathfinder vehicle right there on the surface of Mars where it landed. Then this is a shot taken by the Pathfinder of the Sojourner vehicle. It is really a tremendous photograph, tremendous detail. You can see the tremendous detail in the soil and in the rocks.

There is our little rover, Sojourner. An amazing vehicle. It survived very nicely the landing on Mars and it has been roving around using solar power. These are the solar panels on the top of the Sojourner and it collects solar energy and it is able to travel around on the surface of Mars, analyzing rocks. It is really going to provide our scientists a tremendous amount of information about Mars, Mars history, and it is already revealing that Mars may have at one time had a climate much more similar to Earth's than what it is right now.

I would also like to share, Mr. Speaker, with my colleagues here an artist's rendering of our international space station, something that we definitely need to get up in space soon to replace the Mir with all its associated problems. But this is going to be a great, tremendous opportunity for people from Europe and Japan, and hopefully if the Russians can get it together, they will be able to stay involved in it, and where people from all over the world will be working together doing tremendous scientific research.

Where do we go from there is the question. We all want to see the space station up there and flying in space, but what is next? We need to go on from there. We do not want to just stop at that point. Here I have for you some artist's renderings of some very exciting concepts. This would be for a lunar base and the possibility of having something like this in the future truly does exist. For example, one of the potential uses of going back to the Moon is to actually collect solar energy on the surface of the Moon and beam it, using microwaves, to the Earth. This would be an inexhaustible source of solar energy that could be used well into the future. It would eliminate fossil fuel usages and nuclear power

plants. Definitely a cheap and inexhaustible source of energy.

But this is really what I wanted to spend a little bit of time talking about today, and, that is, maybe someday the possibility of going on to Mars with a manned mission. There are people within NASA as well as within the American space society talking about ideas of how we could someday send men and women to Mars. This shows a Mars base and a return vehicle there as well as a little greenhouse. This is what it could someday be. I encourage all my colleagues to support NASA and support our space efforts.

JUSTICE FOR FARRIEL BRITT

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

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I stand before my colleagues today, immensely frustrated and troubled by the judicial system in Costa Rica and the lack of enforcement authority by the United States of America. One of my constituents, a father from Southern Pines in the Second Congressional District of North Carolina, has been waiting patiently for years for justice to be done. He is awaiting the return of his 6-year-old daughter, Holly Dantzler, from the country of Costa Rica.

Many people watching today may know Mr. Farriel Britt's story. He was the subject of a "Prime Time Live" story that was aired in May of this year because his daughter had been kidnapped by his ex-wife, Terry Dantzler, and taken to Costa Rica. The State of North Carolina and the State of South Carolina, where Mr. Britt's ex-wife lived, both agreed that Mr. Britt should have custody of his daughter and both States have granted him custody of his daughter. But Mr. Britt's ex-wife kidnapped her and fled to Costa Rica where she has thus far escaped American justice.

Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Dantzler has an international kidnapping warrant outstanding against her. An international kidnapping warrant. One would think that the State Department would be working night and day to make sure that this woman is arrested and her child returned to her father in the United States, but apparently the United States of America is powerless in the face of one Costa Rican judge.

Mr. Speaker, I am frustrated because Mr. Farriel Britt turned to me for help when he could not fight this fight alone anymore. I have to say, I thought the fact that I was a U.S. Congressman, elected by the people of the Second District of North Carolina, would be of some help to him. But I have since learned that while I may get my phone calls returned by the State Department more quickly these days, the State Department apparently is powerless because they have not responded to my needs nor Mr. Britt's.

Our State Department issued a request for extradition to the Costa

Rican Government. That means that Mrs. Dantzler was supposed to be arrested by the Costa Rican Government and sent back to the United States. Mr. Britt flew to Costa Rica because Holly would need someone to care for her when her mother was arrested and taken into custody. As my colleagues may expect, Mr. Britt thought his daughter would soon be returned to him. He waited during the weekend of Father's Day on June 17. I cannot imagine the agony of waiting in a hotel room during Father's Day for the return of a daughter whom you have not seen for 3 years. But he waited to no avail.

While Mr. Britt was waiting, the judge in Costa Rica was meeting behind closed doors with Mrs. Dantzler's attorney. They met not once but twice. Some sort of deal was worked out so that Mrs. Dantzler could keep her child and only be held under House arrest. House arrest is a sham in the country of Costa Rica. There is no method of enforcing house arrest in Costa Rica. No officer is assigned to guard Mrs. Dantzler's door, no one watches her house, so she is able to come and go as she pleases.

If that is the case, I wonder what exactly prevents her from fleeing Costa Rica and going to some other destination.

Mr. Speaker, I am troubled that a judge charged with enforcing an extradition order from the United States of America is flaunting her authority in the face of this country. This is a criminal case and she would be, in this country, removed from office. The State of North Carolina already decided the custody case. As far as this judge is concerned, Mr. Britt should just wait indefinitely for his daughter to be returned to the United States, but Mr. Britt has been waiting for his child. Mr. Britt has been waiting for 3 long years. Now that he has finally located her in Costa Rica, why should he be subjected to the whims of one judge in Costa Rica?

The U.S. Department of State has asked the Government of Costa Rica to arrest this woman and send her home so that Holly Dantzler can be returned to her father. This simple justice is being subverted by one judge in Costa Rica who is flaunting the law.

Today I request that the State Department demand the Government of Costa Rica to remove this judge from Mr. Britt's case and enforce this extradition order so that this child can be returned to the United States of America and be reunited with her father as the law demands.

I thank the Speaker for allowing me this time to speak in behalf of a father who is being unjustly denied the companionship of his daughter.

□ 1545

DON'T GIVE UP THE SHIP

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

tleman from Tennessee [Mr. DUNCAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, John Paul Jones, the great American naval officer, once said, "Don't give up the ship." But unfortunately, it looks like that is exactly what the United States is doing. Foreign-flag cruise lines are abusing American taxpayers by not paying taxes on billions of dollars of business from Americans and are slowly driving our domestic ships out of business.

Now, these same foreign-flag cruise lines are calling for repeal of the Passenger Services Act. This repeal would be horrible for the domestic cruise line industry. It could result in the loss of thousands of American jobs and millions, if not billions, of dollars in tax revenues.

The Passenger Services Act requires that all passenger vessels in the United States and the U.S. trade must be 100 percent American. They must be built and registered in the United States, owned by U.S. citizens and crewed by American seamen. If a vessel servicing a U.S. port fails to meet these standards, it must stop at a foreign port before it brings its passengers back home.

Mr. Speaker, almost every cruise line operating out of the United States today skirts the requirements of the Passenger Services Act by registering its ships in foreign countries like Panama and Liberia and docking in foreign ports before coming to America. As a result, these foreign cruise vessels can use poorly-trained, low-paid, Third World crews even though 90 percent of the passengers on their ships are Americans. Instead of repealing the Passenger Services Act, we should be talking about a very different question: Should foreign-flag cruise ships be allowed to unfairly compete with U.S. flag vessels?

I realize that we live in a world economy, and I certainly do not oppose free trade. Our trade with other nations has produced many jobs for Americans, and I have nothing whatsoever against people from other nations. But I also believe very strongly that our trade laws should be fair, and quite simply, Mr. Speaker, in the vacation cruise line industry the current trade rules are not fair to domestic or American cruise lines.

For example, foreign-flag operators generate billions of dollars in revenue from American travelers, but pay no U.S. corporate income tax. Let me repeat that. Foreign-flag operators generate billions of dollars in revenue from American travelers, but pay no U.S. corporate taxes.

Currently, the largest cruise line in the world reported nearly \$2 billion in revenues in 1995, primarily from North American vacationers. How much U.S. corporate income tax did Carnival pay on those earnings? Zero. That is right, zero on \$2 billion in revenues.

What about labor costs? Foreign-flag cruise lines employ Third World labor and pay Third World wages. In the