

shows. The Treasury Department this week released an analysis demonstrating that Republican tax breaks for the wealthy explode in cost in the out-years, posing a serious threat to the balanced budget which Republicans pretend to care so much about. The Treasury analysis found that the GOP tax package doubles in cost in the second 10 years to a staggering \$790 billion, with nearly three-quarters of the tax cuts going to the wealthy.

It is time, Madam Speaker, for Republicans in Congress to come clean with the American people about their priorities and admit that their plan delivers tax relief not to the hard-working middle-income families who deserve it, but to the wealthy contributors who helped them win control of this Congress.

LONGSTANDING CAMPAIGN DEBTS REASON FOR MISTRUST OF MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

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

Mr. COBLE. Madam Speaker, it has recently been reported that a former Presidential candidate still has a campaign debt that was incurred in the 1980's, years ago.

At the conclusion of my first campaign for a seat in the Congress, I was saddled with a campaign debt. I promptly borrowed money and paid those to whom my campaign was indebted. To have done less, Madam Speaker, would have been inexcusable and without defense. Responsible people simply do not casually ignore debts.

Campaign reform is consistently discussed on Capitol Hill. Perhaps the time has come to direct attention to the propriety of paying off campaign debts rather than ignoring them.

Frequently we ask incredulously why the American people do not trust Members of Congress. Longstanding campaign debts that remain unpaid and ignored is one glaring reason.

ALBANIA COULD BECOME THE NEXT BOSNIA

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Madam Speaker, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia is in turmoil. A new law limits the flying of the Albanian national flag. Infuriated Albanians gathered by the thousands in protest. In Macedonia police opened fire on their crowds, killing 4, wounding 70, and they have locked up 400 Albanians that have yet to be accounted for. Macedonia's actions are a clear violation of international law, and after all this the State Department has turned and looked the other way.

Shame on the State Department.

Albanians are being systematically persecuted. Albanians are subject to the next possible killing fields of the world. Madam Speaker, Albania needs help. Albania could become the next Bosnia.

The State Department should do its job, and I urge Congress to pass House Concurrent Resolution 36 sponsored by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

STOP TWISTING THE TRUTH ABOUT TAX RELIEF

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

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Madam Speaker, David Gergen writing in this week's U.S. News & World Report says, and I quote, and David Gergen is a former Clinton administration adviser, he says it is time for the left to stop twisting the truth about tax relief.

Why is that important and why do we agree? And let me explain, because seniors in my district are starting to become confused because our liberal friends are talking about this imputed income scheme where we can take people with one income level and impute their income up to a different level.

Let me give my colleagues an example of a couple in my district. Their real income is \$8,700 a year, but their home is paid for; of course they could rent that home out. They also have accrued value and some pension plans and other things, but they are living on \$8,700 a year. Using the imputed income scheme of the Democrats we can take their income up to about \$40,000 a year. So the question they have is if the Democrat tax plan passes, will they pay taxes on \$40,000 a year or will they pay on \$8,700 a year?

Madam Speaker, there is a big difference. Seniors are confused. We owe them the truth. I hope that we can pass our plan.

CAUSAL CONNECTION BETWEEN NO ACTION ON CAMPAIGN FI- NANCE REFORM AND FAST AC- TION ON TAX BREAKS FOR THE WEALTHY

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

Mr. FARR of California. Madam Speaker, I rise today to point out something that I think is pretty obvious around here, and that is the President was here earlier this year asking that this House deliver a campaign finance reform bill to him by July 4. We did not do it. We have had no hearings, we have had no votes, we have had no discussion; we have had a lot of effort to try to get a campaign bill on the floor.

Yet at the same time the tax bill, which gives incredible breaks to very wealthy people, moves through here

like a knife through butter. Why is that? Why do we not move for campaign reform for the people but we can move very quickly for tax breaks for the rich? I think there is a causal connection.

Madam Speaker, just wait and see this next election period why we have not passed campaign reform under the Republican leadership and why there are big tax breaks for the rich under the Republican leadership.

THOSE WHO PAY 80 PERCENT OF THE TAX BURDEN SHOULD GET SOME TAX RELIEF

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

Mr. HEFLEY. Madam Speaker, when was the last time that we heard a liberal talk about who pays what share of the tax burden?

Now let us think about that for just a minute. I am very curious to know if anyone can think of a single instance in the past 84 years where a liberal Democrat has talked about who pays what share of the tax burden.

According to the IRS, and C-SPAN viewers can check these figures for themselves, the top 1 percent of income earners in this country pay 29 percent of the income taxes. Again, the top 1 percent pay 29 percent of the income tax burden.

How about this one? The top 25 percent of income earners pay 80 percent of the income taxes.

Madam Speaker, I leave it to my colleagues to decide. Are the wealthiest Americans paying their share? And do my colleagues think that maybe those who pay 80 percent of the tax burden ought to get some of the tax relief? My colleagues should decide.

□ 0915

WORKING AMERICANS DESERVE THE CHILD TAX CREDIT

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

Mr. STUPAK. Madam Speaker, the other day I talked to a hard-working woman in my district. Sue has two children under the age of 18. Unfortunately, she is divorced and her ex-husband is not too reliable on his child support payments. Sue is a hard-working woman with a full-time job. She made \$200 a week on her first job, and then got a better job that paid her \$7 an hour, where she grosses \$14,500 a year.

Every payday Sue pays her State taxes, Federal taxes, and her Social Security, FICA. When she filed her taxes, she received the earned income tax credit. She said the EITC helped her get caught up on her bills. It also in 1 year allowed her to buy tires so she could drive back and forth to work.

Sue has never received public assistance. Because Sue received the earned

income tax credit, and would receive the \$500-per-child credit under the Democratic tax cut plan, Republicans say she is looking for welfare. Republicans say she should not receive the \$500-per-child tax credit. Democrats see Sue as a hard-working American, and we will stand with her and her two children and give her the \$500-per-child tax credit.

A STIFLING TAX BURDEN

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

Mr. RYUN. Madam Speaker, the great historian, Will Durant, wrote, and I quote,

A great civilization is not conquered from without until it has destroyed itself within. The essential causes of Rome's decline lay in her people, her morals, her class struggle, her failing trade. . . her stifling taxes.

Madam Speaker, as in ancient Rome, our tax burden is stifling, and instead of working to reduce taxes, just as Members have heard, the Democrats are trying to promote class warfare. We should not be arguing over who is rich in this country; we should provide a \$500-per-child tax credit for all Americans who honestly pay an income tax.

There are more than 130,000 children in my second district of Kansas whose families need this tax cut. These Kansans deserve relief from a crushing tax burden and an oppressive government that undermines the family unit.

Madam Speaker, when we balance the budget for the first time in 30 years and cut taxes for the first time in 16 years, we will come a step closer to the America envisioned by our Founding Fathers, where we have freedom, faith, and families that prosper.

A REPUBLICAN CONGRESS THAT HAS COMPASSION FOR BILLIONAIRES

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

Mr. GEJDENSON. Madam Speaker, I must be missing something. One of the great things about this country was that we have been a compassionate country. My Republican friends seem to have incredible compassion for billionaires.

Let me explain the difference to Members about the concerns. When we cut taxes for the top 1 and 2 percent, yes, they can get their new Mercedes a couple of months earlier. They have to make choices. When we cut their taxes, they are able to make choices about yachts and trips and Mercedes.

When we talk about the people who work for a living and are at the bottom of the economic ladder, those people who we deprive of the \$500-per-child tax credit because they pay other taxes, not just income taxes, these are people who are making decisions about put-

ting clothes on their children's backs, feeding them nutritious meals, keeping the family together under a roof, and staying warm in the winter.

So it seems to me the compassion ought to start with those with the greatest need, not with the greatest greed.

PROVIDING FOR THE CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2209, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1998

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I call up House Resolution 197 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 197

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2209) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. Points of order against consideration of the bill for failure to comply with section 302 or 308 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule and shall be considered as read. Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 or 6 of rule XXI are waived. No amendment shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each amendment may be considered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment except as specified in the report, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against amendments printed in the report are waived. The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may: (1) postpone until a time during further consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on any amendment; and (2) reduce to five minutes the minimum time for electronic voting on any postponed question that follows another electronic vote without intervening business: *Provided*, That the minimum time for electronic voting on the first in any series of questions shall be fifteen minutes. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommend with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mrs. MORELLA]. The gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. PRYCE] is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Madam Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the

customary 30 minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for purposes of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on this resolution, and that I may be permitted to insert extraneous material into the RECORD following my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Madam Speaker, House Resolution 197 makes in order the bill H.R. 2209, the fiscal year 1998 legislative branch appropriations bill, under a modified closed rule.

At the outset I would like to commend the chairman, the gentleman from New York, Mr. WALSH, and the ranking member, the gentleman from New York, Mr. JOSÉ SERRANO, and the rest of my colleagues on the Subcommittee on Legislative of the Committee on Appropriations for their hard work in bringing what has historically been a difficult bill to the floor.

During this year's bill, we will not be free of controversy, I am afraid. I am sure we will hear from our friends in the minority about their concerns. Unfortunately, the bill has been hampered by issues that are outside the control of the Committee on Rules. But given that there may be some folks who would go so far as to recommend zero funding for the legislative branch and send us all home to get jobs in the real world, I believe this is a very responsible rule for a responsible bill.

As the Reading Clerk has described for us, the rule waives a limited number of points of order against the consideration of the bill to permit timely consideration and to address some technical requirements with regard to the Congressional Budget Act, and transfers of funds within the bill.

The rule makes in order four amendments printed in the Committee on Rules' report to accompany this resolution, to be offered only in the order printed in the report, by the Member specified, and debatable for the time specified in the report. The amendments are to be considered as read and are not subject to amendment or to a demand for a division of the question in either the House or in the Committee of the Whole. In addition, all points of order against the amendments are waived.

Furthermore, the rule provides that the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may postpone recorded votes on any amendment and that the Chairman may reduce voting time on a postponed question to 5 minutes, provided that the vote immediately follows another recorded vote, and that the voting time