AFTER THE ACRIMONY IS OVER

(Mrs. MEEK of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say to the American public, when all of this acrimony that you hear on the floor is over, let me tell you what is going to happen. You are going to end up with an enormous ache in your heart and also in your pocketbook.

Today the Republicans will bring to the House floor a bill that cuts programs that serve average Americans to pay for huge tax cuts. Do you know what the message is? The message is that the spending policies here center around sharp cuts in programs that serve average Americans like you, notably education, and to pay for huge tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans.

Think about where you come in. The President and the Democrats want to target tax relief to middle income Americans. The Republicans' bill will give 20 percent of its benefits to the top 1 percent of American families.

Think about it, when the acrimony is over, think about where you stand. All told, the tax cuts that the Republicans would bring today would give away $31.3 billion in tax breaks.

Once again, the Republicans are looking to the past for answers to the future.

[Ms. NORTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

WHAT IS THE RUSH?

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Speaker, what is the rush?

I stood on the House floor last evening and asked the same question and, unfortunately, have gotten no answer. We come today, on April 5, 1995, to ask the American people to accept what some would call a tax cut.

I would simply share with you that the tax cut goes to those earning $200,000 and over, 58.1 percent of the cut to those earning that amount. This morning we had a phony vote on the journal, not because we needed to vote on it, ladies and gentlemen, but simply so the Republicans could count the votes. What is the rush?

This tax cut is not going to impact citizens filing their 1994 taxes. And everywhere you go across this Nation, the statistics say that the American people want us to cut the deficit, not cut taxes.

This is supposed to be the crown jewel. We have editorials saying ''it is more paste than jewel.'' Then we have got those saying ''Congress fiddles with tax code while deficit burns.''

I would simply say to you that there are some things worth discussing: the adoption credit, the elderly care credit, the spousal IRA's are worth talking about, the small business credits, the home office deduction.

Why can we not take the gloves off, come together and talk about a reasoned response to the America's deficit? Why are we fighting each other and counting votes so we can have a crown jewel; which really is nothing more than costume jewelry held together with paste. Why do we not stand for the American people, stop cutting, let us stand for what is right and make sure we reduce the deficit so that young people will have a future.

□ 1245

THE TRUTH ABOUT TAX CUTS

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

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, Gilbert and Sullivan once said in one of their operas ''Things are seldom what they seem.'' We have been talking a lot about the protests, and that maybe the tax cuts are unfairly divided between rich and poor.

I think it is important that we remind ourselves what is in this legislation. In this legislation what we are going to be voting on is $100 billion of spending cuts. That is $23 billion out of discarding needless bureaucracy, $24 billion cut in the area of eliminating duplication and waste, $10,900,000,000 cut from foreign aid, $7,500,000,000 attacking corporate welfare, $22 billion in setting empowerment, and an $11 billion spending cut.

Also what this bill does, it says none of these tax reductions take effect until we cut an estimated another $400 billion in spending and get on that glide path toward a balanced budget, which is our goal.

CHARGES RELATING TO TAX BREAK FOR RUPERT MURDOCH ARE LUDICROUS

(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, for the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means to come up here a few minutes ago and to suggest that a junior Senator in the minority party in the other body is responsible for a multimillion dollar tax break for Rupert Murdoch is ludicrous. Democrats have not been able to win one vote in committee in this body and in the other body since January.

Newspaper accounts report that the Republicans supported the tax break after learning that Murdoch was the beneficiary of the legislation, and after consulting the Speaker of this House, according to six sources involved in the negotiations. However, if Republicans want to act on behalf of working middle-class families in this Nation, and on behalf of small businesses, and against a multimillion-dollar break for Rupert Murdoch and his taxes, they just need to ask the President of the United States ''Pull the bill back, support the concurrent resolution, and do away with this outrageous billionaire boondoggle.''

SUPPORT THE TAX RELIEF BILL

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

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to strongly support the rule and to strongly support the tax relief bill that the House will be debating. This, I think, is the most critical feature of the Contract With America, and there is nothing more important in this tax relief provision than what we offer the American family. We have told the American family time and time again ''Your time will come.''

Every study, every evaluation of the American family says we need to have a tax credit for children, and yet it has been delayed and delayed and delayed. Over 70 percent of the benefits of this tax cut will go to families making less than $75,000 a year who pay only 45.6 percent of all the income taxes. A mere 12½ percent will go to Americans who earn over $75,000, and they pay 54.4 percent of the income tax burden.

This is an eminently fair provision. It is progressive. The contract's $500 per child tax credit treats all of America's children equally. That is the way they should be treated. We need to pass the rule today and we then need to give relief to the American family.

THE AMERICAN PEOPLE CAN HANDLE THE TRUTH ABOUT TAX REDUCTIONS

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

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I want to stand today in opposition to the rule that has been proposed. First and foremost, this is a rule that I went before the chairman of the committee and he agreed that we ought to be including some additional services for adoptive parents that are in dire need of assistance to be able to adopt children in this country. We have got over 3 million abused children, we have 450,000 kids in foster care, and we desperately need to provide adoption services to those children.

Most importantly, I oppose this rule because I do not think that this is a period of time that we ought to be talking about tax cuts for the American people. The fact of the matter is we need to bring the deficit of this country down. We ought not to be at this

time pandering to the American people, we ought to be tough. The American people are tough. They can handle a tough choice.

The fact of the matter is that we are standing there telling the American people ''We can have tax deductions, tax reductions, at the same time that we are going to be facing $200 billion a year deficits.'' It is not right. The people can handle it, and we ought to say the truth.

REPEAL THE ONEROUS TAX INCREASE ON SENIOR CITIZENS' INCOMES

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

Mr. COX of California. Mr. Speaker, I hope it is not considered pandering to the American people, as the previous speaker suggested, to permit our senior citizens who are receiving Social Security benefits to keep something of what they earn.

In 1993, in the context of the largest tax increase in American history, President and the then Democrat Congress imposed a 70-percent income tax rate increase on senior citizens who work. An important part of the bill that we are now bringing to the floor is going to roll that back.

It was criticized as a tax increase on seniors who are rich, on rich retirees, on rich Social Security beneficiaries. In fact, the 70-percent income tax rate increase on Social Security benefits started for senior citizens who work and who make as little as $30,000 a year. They are not, in my book, the rich. I do not think they are anywhere else in America. I hope all of us will take this opportunity to repeal that onerous tax increase.

THE TAX BILL AND CUTS IN PROVISIONS FOR EDUCATION BENEFITS

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

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Speaker, the question before us today is what kind of tax relief are we going to give the American people. The difference could not be clearer. The Republicans' tax break would benefit 76 percent of those families earning $100,000 or more. If you look at the Citizens for Tax Justice, they say 71 percent of the total capital gains tax breaks go to those making in excess of $200,000.

Who pays the bill? It is young people who pay the bill. It is those who want to go out and get those well-paying jobs that the Republicans talk about. However, how can we expect them to get those well-paying jobs if they cannot first afford the higher education that they are going to need to get if they are to land those jobs?

Mr. Speaker, it was wrong to repeal the interest deduction on student loans in the 1986 tax reform bill, and it is worse that the Republicans have rescinded the amount of the money for subsidizing those student loans that allow them to get an education, and not have the interest on those student loans accrue until after they graduate. That is not right.

Members know that the cost of higher education is going up, and we should not make it more difficult for students.

THE TAX BILL WILL STRENGTHEN AMERICAN FAMILIES

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

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that American people are going to have with this Contract With America $180,000,000,000 in deficit reduction, $190,000,000,000 in spending cuts, and Mr. Speaker, the tax reduction bill is the third part that the American people are waiting for.

The Republican majority is offering a $500-per-child tax credit. We believe one of the most important things Government can do for American families is to take less of their earnings. Republicans recognize the profoundly positive impact stronger families can have on our Nation.

We believe the basic family unit can be stronger if it is able to keep more of its own earnings and make its own decisions about how those earnings should be spent.

We also respect the contributions of our senior citizens and their right to continue being a productive partner in building a better America. That is why this week Republicans will remove the tax burden placed on Social Security earnings last year by the Democrats.

Finally, Americans believe in the future. We know America's future depends on America's being able to save more and invest more in new jobs and new productivity. That is why we will reduce the capital gains tax cut, which will help all Americans.

Seventy-five percent of the tax cuts will benefit those with incomes less than $100,000. Please vote for the bill.

A BETTER CAPITAL GAINS DEAL FOR THE WEALTHY

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, the reason we are still doing 1-minutes is because the Republican leadership is twisting the arms of their caucus to try to get the votes for this tax giveaway, the same arms that they did not twist last week when term limits was on the floor.

There was a shameful time in this country in the mid-1980's when the largest, most profitable corporations in the land paid no income taxes, and we are about to turn back the clock. This bill repeals a modest income tax on the largest, most profitable corporations in this country, so they can go back to paying zero.

People who earn over $200,000 a year, they can get capital gains at 14 percent. That is half of the tax bracket for middle income Americans. Is it not a great country when people, Members of Congress earning $133,000 a year, can vote themselves a wonderful juicy tax break, because they are in a big enough tax bracket to take advantage of it?

When the dust settles, average Americans are going to get it stuck to them again, and the rich are going to be drinking champagne and eating caviar.

REPUBLICANS READY TO INTRODUCE TAX LEGISLATION

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, responding to the previous speaker, I would just like to announce that I do not believe anybody on our side asked him to take a 1-minute, or anybody else over there to take a 1-minute. We are ready to go. We are ready do the Nation's business on the rule.

The minute the 1-minutes are over, we will be very happy to proceed.

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

Mr. GOSS. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, we are so excited to bring up this last of the contract promises. Let's go.

Mr. GOSS. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, I would point out that the sooner we start, the better prospects are, the sooner we will get out.

THE $63,000 TAX GIVEAWAY TO RUPERT MURDOCH

(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, I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, I have the opportunity now to respond to some of the charges that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER], chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, raised previously.

It is just absolutely absurd. There is not one person in this building, in this district, in this country that believes Senator BRAUN on her own was able to provide the obscene, sleazy $63 million gift to Rupert Murdoch. It just defies credibility.

There is an expression that I have used, and I think everyone in this country has heard previously. It is look like a duck and it smells like a duck and it walks like a duck and it talks like a duck, it is probably a duck. To