

directly to the decline of transit and in some communities its demise by refusing to allow fares to increase with inflation and for capital investments to keep the systems healthy.

While the money from the road funds is perhaps the most visible, there were also huge subsidies for overseas defense to protect oil supplies and public ownership of oil and gas supplies. There were dramatic subsidies for public safety, for policing related to the automobile, and the removal of huge tracts of land in the tax rolls and for roads and road right-of-way and, of course, parking and tax subsidies. All of these combined to tip the playing field in favor of the automobile. Consumers responded rationally for themselves but in ways that very much skewed the pattern of transportation development.

Now, these clear transportation subsidies are but a small portion of the overall government interference in the market system. Our investments in public housing concentrated poor minority populations in central cities. We dramatically subsidized utility rates and sewer and water expansion that routinely hid the profits, from providing service to local inner cities, from increased costs associated with expansion into suburbs and greenfields. It resulted in many central city residents paying more for their own utilities and subsidizing lower rates for people outside the cities.

The most direct and obvious interference in the market was the emergence of single-use zoning in metropolitan areas where we made it illegal for the family owning, say, a restaurant or a drugstore from living or having their clerks live above that activity. People were zoned out of mixed-use neighborhoods and literally forced into their cars since the drastic separation of uses forced many Americans to rely increasingly on automobiles, and again that was very rational behavior.

The list goes on and on: flood insurance, water supply, brownfields programs, the Federal Government's own policy of locating facilities out further and further from concentrated uses, or the post office refusing to obey local land use laws and zoning codes. These are all examples of the government's own activities to destabilize neighborhoods in our central cities and our older suburbs.

It is hard for me to imagine any rational observer being able to characterize what has transpired in American communities over the last three-quarters of a century as benign, neutral, inevitable market forces. The challenge today for those who would have livable communities is not to overcome market forces but allow the market forces to work. This is an appropriate use of the political process. It is not a trivial point, as critics attempt to paint efforts for promoting livable communities on the part of the administration, those of us in Congress, or the vast grassroots efforts around the country as somehow social engineering

or forcing people to do what they do not want to do.

It is essential to give legitimacy to the aspirations of thousands of activists in hundreds of communities across the country that are trying to promote livable communities. Just as we have established a pattern of unplanned growth for dysfunctional communities and regions, we can level the playing field to promote livable communities. I look forward to this Congress and this administration taking steps to be partners to promote these more livable communities.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 10 a.m.

Accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 27 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess until 10 a.m.

□ 1000

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PEASE) at 10 a.m.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Remind us, O gracious God, that we are to be doing the works of justice and mercy in our communities and in our world. And as we seek to do the works of justice remind us again that we are not the message, but we are the messengers of reconciliation and peace and righteousness. We admit that we can become so involved in what we do that we promote ourselves and we become the focus instead of pointing to the way of truth and promoting the good works of justice for every person.

May Your blessing, O God, that is new every morning be with us until the last moments of the day, abide with us this day now and evermore. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. PITTS led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 144. Concurrent Resolution urging the United States Government and the United Nations to undertake urgent and strenuous efforts to secure the release of Branko Jelen, Steve Pratt, and Peter Wallace, 3 humanitarian workers employed in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia by CARE International, who are being unjustly held as prisoners by the Government of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.

THE VALUE AND NECESSITY OF A STRONG MINING INDUSTRY IN AMERICA

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

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, over the next few weeks I will be bringing to our colleagues and the Chair's attention the value and necessity of a strong mining industry in our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, nearly everything we eat, touch, wear, use, or even live in is made possible by the mining industry. Minerals comprise the basic necessities of life. Mineral-based fertilizers make possible the food we eat and the natural fibers in our clothes. From the concrete foundation, to the wallboard, pipes, and wiring, all the way up to the shingles on the roof, the construction industry utilizes minerals for building our homes.

Mr. Speaker, minerals, made possible through the mining industry, are essential for agriculture, construction, and manufacturing. The United States is one of the world's leaders in the production of important metals and minerals, and it is imperative that we maintain a strong mining industry, and remain competitive with other nations for scarce investment of capital.

Many investors have already left the United States for Latin America and Asia, where they are not faced with endless delays regarding Federal proposals, permits, expensive fees, and all sorts of other bureaucratic red tape.

Mr. Speaker, it is in our Nation's best interests to keep our mining industry strong.

OUR COUNTRY'S UNBELIEVABLE POLICY ON STEEL

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, after World War II we gave tours of our steel mills to Japan and Germany. We let them take pictures. We gave them blueprints. We even gave them foreign aid so they could build their own steel mills.

Today Japan and Germany have steel mills. America has photographs. If that

is not enough to tarnish our stainless, Japan and Europe at this very moment keep dumping illegal steel into America while in Pittsburgh, the once steel capital of the world, they just demolished another steel mill.

Beam me up. This policy on steel is not only unbelievable, it is stupid. I believe, Mr. Speaker, we could do with less think tanks and styrofoam and a few more factories and steel.

THOSE PAYING 96 PERCENT OF TAXES SHOULD GET TAX RELIEF

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

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, here is a fun trick we can play on our liberal friends, especially the ones who never tire of saying that the rich do not pay their fair share.

In fact, this is a fun trick that we can play on most Democrats, with few exceptions. Ask them how much the rich pay in Federal income taxes. After they begin to look pale and ask, what do you mean, ask them what percentage of Federal income taxes are paid by the top 50 percent of income earners and what percentage of the taxes are paid by the bottom half.

Our liberal friends will not answer that question. Of course, they do not have any idea what the answer to the question is, and of course, even if they did, they would never tell us. They would be very embarrassed to have to admit that the top 50 percent of income earners pay 96 percent of all taxes, 96 percent. The bottom 50 percent pay a whopping 4 percent.

Those same liberals then will rant and rave and feign moral indignation that those paying 96 percent of the taxes, those who are carrying almost the entire load, should get any tax relief at all.

THE DEBATE OVER TAXES IS A DEBATE ABOUT FREEDOM

(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, we are going to hear a lot of speeches this week, countless speeches, in fact, about taxes. We will hear that the debate over taxes is about fairness, about special interests, about the struggles of the middle class, about the American dream, about compassion, and about justice.

Yes, this debate is about all of those things, but principally the debate about taxes is about freedom. It is not a difficult concept. It is not an idea that requires advanced degrees or lengthy training. It is simply this, that if we let people keep more of their own money, people will have more freedom to live their lives as they see fit, not as the government sees fit.

Letting people keep more of what they earn will allow Americans to save

more, build a better future for themselves and their families, and realize their dreams. So this week let us have a true discussion. Let us talk about finally cutting taxes in this country.

RETAIL RESPONSIBILITY—WAL-MART

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

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I learned recently that two large retail chains in middle America can truly make a difference when it comes to keeping violence and filth out of our young kids' minds.

I think both Wal-Mart and K-Mart should be commended for their recent stance on culture within the marketplace. These superstores may not be perfect, but they are taking an active role in not selling some of the extraordinarily violent and offensive music that could be lining their shelves and raking in the cash.

Some of the music they chose not to carry is climbing up the charts, but since so many parents have objected to its profanity and reference to suicide, these stores have pulled some albums from the shelves.

Mr. Speaker, do not get me wrong, these are mega-marts, not mega-moms or mega-dads, but they are proving that taking a small stand in the marketplace against the increasingly corrupt culture can be done, even if it means foregoing an influx of cash.

WE NEED POLICY INSTEAD OF PREENING, POSTURING, AND POLITICS

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

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, it is interesting when we return from district work periods where we have heard the wisdom of the people. Lincoln said, the American people, once fully informed, will make the correct decision.

I heard some very interesting things from my constituents this week. I would refer this House, Mr. Speaker, to the comments of the President of the United States and one of the more senior Members of this institution from Massachusetts.

The President of the United States earlier this year in Buffalo, New York, said, "We could give it, the budget surplus, all back to you and hope you spend it right, but," "but." Mr. Speaker, that speaks volumes, because given a choice, our president, sadly, believes that Washington bureaucrats need our hard-earned money more than we do.

Then, a senior Member, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK), yesterday said, speaking of the liberals, "It is not our responsibility to legislate anymore. It does not make sense for us to compromise."

Mr. Speaker, a legislator refusing to legislate? I hope we do not see a lot of preening and posturing and politics instead of policy.

TAX CUTS ARE AN ISSUE OF FREEDOM

(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 have to really hand it to the Democrats. They already have their line memorized and ready to repeat over and over again.

Republicans propose tax relief that largely excludes upper income people from benefiting; again, tax relief for everyone except the rich. And what are the Democrats saying about it already? Yes, "Tax cuts for the wealthy."

Any tax relief, tax relief at all, is immediately labeled by the other side as tax cuts for the wealthy. It is an insult to the millions of middle class taxpayers who would benefit from tax relief to be demonized by liberals who oppose tax relief everywhere and anywhere.

Of course, it is an insult to those who are carrying most of the load, the people who are paying the most in taxes.

In America, the issue is not whether upper income people need a tax cut. Of course they do not. But in America, it is an issue of freedom. It is their money. It does not belong to the government, and it does not belong to liberal politicians in Washington who want to spend it on more wasteful government programs.

DEMOCRATS HAVE NO INTENTION OF WORKING WITH THE REPUBLICAN MAJORITY

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

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, just listen to this quote taken from yesterday's Washington Post: "It is not our responsibility to legislate anymore. It doesn't make sense for us to compromise."

"It doesn't make sense for us to compromise?" These words come from a leader of the Democrat party, the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK).

It appears that the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) has let the cat out of the bag. The Democrats had no intention of working with the Republican majority. They will block all legislative efforts, and then turn around and blame Republicans, attacking the do-nothing Congress.

But the always fair and balanced media of course will help them in that effort. Then they will attack Republicans for Republican extremism, a charge we heard thousands and thousands of times since 1995 when Republicans took over the majority in the Congress.