about are people earning about $50,000 a year. On the other hand, when they talk about giving a tax cut to working families, they really mean giving a tax cut to people who do not pay any Federal income taxes.

The choice is simply this: We can support the Republican proposal that affirms the right of working families who pay taxes to keep more of the money they earn. Or, we can support our friends on the Democrat side, who tell those same families they are wealthy, and want to give tax money to people who do not pay taxes.

LONG-TERM EFFECTS OF REPUBLICAN TAX PROPOSALS

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

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to rise today to express some concern that I have about the tax cut. We have heard a lot of discussion about who is going to benefit from the tax cut. I want to give a different perspective. That is the perspective of my son, Jonathan, who is approaching his first birthday, and what this tax cut is going to mean to him.

The Treasury Department and even the Congressional Research Service, the independent investigatory research arm of this Congress, have both indicated that sure, although the tax cuts might be able to reach a balanced budget within the first 5 years, it is 10 years from now, 15 years from now the backloaded provisions of these tax cuts are due to explode the deficit again, at exactly the time when my son Johnny and many, many children throughout this country are going to enter the work force.

What kind of message are we going to be sending to them in order to score a short-term political gain right now, by offering these huge tax cuts so they are going to explode the deficit early next century, without identifying the corresponding spending reductions to pay for it?

I did not come to Congress to vote for the type of tax measure that is going to jeopardize my son's future and the future of the children in this country.

GOOD NEWS FOR AMERICANS OBSCURED BY PARTISAN RHETORIC

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

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Speaker, first I would respond to my colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KIND], and invite him to join us in the National Debt Repayment Act for the good of the future and his young child, because that would force us not only to balance the budget, but after we reach that, pay off the Federal debt, so his child may inherit a nation debt free, and they would not have to make interest payments.

But I also rise today to call attention to what is happening in Washington. When we listen to these 1-minutes back and forth, it is so partisan that people are forgetting what good is happening here for America and how much it means to our citizens.

We are on the verge of balancing the budget probably by 1999, 2 or 3 years ahead of schedule. Taxes are coming down for the first time in 16 years, the $500-per-child tax credit, capital gains is coming down, the death tax is coming down, college tuition tax credit, all good news for America. Medicare is restored, so our senior citizens can again rest assured Medicare will be there for them in the future.

I hear all this hysterical rhetoric about who is rich and who is not, but I can tell the Members this much, the folks I see on Sunday that are sitting there with three kids and the two parents next to them, one off in college and two kids still home, they understand a tax cut means they get to keep $2,500 more of their own money next year.

TAX RELIEF FOR AMERICA'S WORKING FAMILIES IS COMMON SENSE AND JUSTICE, NOT WELFARE

(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, the American people are probably confused. Part of the confusion may come from the fact that we have so many millionaires serving in this House and in the Senate that I think the two bodies oftentimes lose touch with average Americans.

The average family in my district earns $22,000 a year. Under the Republican plan, most of those families would receive nothing from the $500-per-child tax credit. If they earned $60,000 they would receive benefits, but those who earn $20,000 would receive nothing.

Even Gary Bower, head of the Conservative Family Research Council, has criticized the Republican plan for denying tax relief to these working families who make less than $30,000 a year. He has said, ''The family tax credit ought to go to any working family that pays income or payroll taxes.''

When we provide tax relief to America's working families, it is not welfare, it is common sense and justice.

DEMOCRAT HOSTILITY TOWARD TAX RELIEF FOR THE MIDDLE CLASS

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

Mr. PAPPAS. Mr. Speaker, some things change, some things do not. It seems that the liberals fall into the second category. The truth is, the liberal view of tax relief is about as out of date as Barry Manilow.

Let us be clear. I have not thrown away all of my Barry Manilow cassettes, but I must say I do not listen to them much anymore. The problems with the liberal Democratic ideas are much more serious. They are much more serious because how they view taxes is much more than a matter of taste. It is a question of what is fair and what is not.

Tax policy has a critical effect on how many jobs are created, what kind of jobs are created, and of course, how much money we get to take home with us from working in those jobs. We would never know it from listening to the liberal Democrats. In fact, I cannot even recall the last time when they have even mentioned the importance of economic growth for the middle class, or how the tax proposal would affect economic growth.

So they are still singing the same old song about their hostility toward tax relief for the middle class; oops, I am sorry, I mean, in their eyes, the rich.

A SIMPLE DEBATE: MORE GOVERNMENT OR MORE FREEDOM

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

Mr. RYUN. Mr. Speaker, what we are debating today is very simple: Do we believe, on the one hand, in more government, or, on the other hand, in more freedom?

Throughout recorded history, from the Magna Carta to the Constitution of the United States, the struggle has been the same: freedom from government tyranny. Political freedom, economic freedom, religious freedom, the focus of the struggle changes, but the direction and the goal of the inspiration for the cause have always remained the same: The human soul desires freedom from government oppression, freedom for control of one's destiny, and freedom to worship one's God.

The Republican agenda is an answer to that yearning. Mr. Speaker, we will meet one of those yearnings if we pass, when we pass, the Taxpayer Relief Act of 1997. The hard-working people of my district, the Second District of Kansas, are yearning to keep more of what they earn. After 16 years of wasteful government spending, it is high time that we grant them this freedom.

THE REPUBLICAN BUDGET PLAN IS NEITHER BALANCED NOR FAIR

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

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I believe there should be two goals that drive any budget plan in this Congress. One is balancing the budget in the short-term and in the long-term, and second is fairness.