

And we have defended a welfare system that offers cash subsidies to unmarried teen-age mothers.

Why are we then surprised when family break-up becomes commonplace, dysfunctional families are routine and 1 out of 3 children born in America are born out of wedlock?

If it were a foreign government that had imposed these policies, it would be regarded as an act of war.

It is not too much to expect that government be the friend, not the foe, of the family. One critical step toward that goal is the passage of the \$500 per-child tax credit. Seventy-four percent of this tax relief would go to families with incomes under 75,000. It is progressive and would be worth a lot more to the guy with a lunch bucket than to the corporate executive in the country club dining room.

This \$500 per-child tax credit would shift power and money from Washington bureaucrats and return it to the moms and dads of middle America.

For a middle class family of four that \$1,000 could mean the difference in whether both parents have to work, it could mean the difference in whether health care premiums can be paid, it could mean clothing costs for an entire year, it could mean the down payment for the cost of a collage education or it could mean a trip to the pizza parlor once a week, but it should be the families' choice not ours.

Please remember family tax relief is not a new spending program, not a new entitlement, not a give away from the Government. It is simply allowing the American family to keep something that already belongs to them—more of their earned income. The time for family tax relief is now. Forty-five million American families making less than \$75,000 a year would receive meaningful relief from the heavy burden of taxation. The American family is tired of high sounding rhetoric and empty speeches about family values while policy makers kick them in the teeth again by saying "we can't afford it now." We can't afford not to do it now. Our national security is intertwined with family security. Strong and secure families mean a strong and secure society.

□ 1945

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

Mr. HUTCHINSON. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. STUPAK. I just had a question, Mr. Speaker. In your statement you indicated that the person would be better off under your tax plan because he would have more money in his pocket. Yet how do you justify the gentleman with the lunch bucket paying Federal taxes, and yet your tax bill repealed the alternative minimum corporate tax, so the corporations do not have to pay their taxes? How would that help the gentleman with the lunch bucket?

Mr. HUTCHINSON. I am referring specifically to the \$500 tax provision, the tax break we offer for the children.

I think it is clear that someone in the middle and low income is going to benefit a lot more than someone eating in the corporate dining room.

Mr. STUPAK. I am asking about the corporate tax repeal.

A DEBATE ON THE ISSUES OF TAXES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KINGSTON). There being no designee of the majority leader, under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I would like to engage my friends, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. STUPAK] and the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER], in debate about this whole issue of taxes, because I think it is quite relevant. We are entering a very critical part of the 100 days.

I might say to my friends, the gentleman from California, the gentleman from Michigan, to answer that question, this tax bill is so weighted for those select few, the privileged few in our society, the ones who are most comfortable, that it is an absolute outrage.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. STUPAK] is absolutely right. The tax bill we will be discussing and voting on this week gets rid of the alternative minimum tax. What is that? I will tell you what that is. That is the tax that corporations, you know, the Fortune 500, the wealthiest corporations in the country, have to pay. The reason they have to pay it is because in the early 1980's, from 1981 to 1985, you had 130 out of the largest corporations in America pay no taxes for one of those years. They were not paying taxes. So, you know, we embarrassed them in this House to incorporate an alternative minimum, which Ronald Reagan finally accepted after harassing him for about 3 or 4 years. Now that the Republicans are back in power, they want to get rid of it.

In addition to that, the capital gains tax, and we are not opposed to a tax for entrepreneurs and investors, we just want to see it equally distributed. The proposal that the Republicans have on capital gains would give 80 percent, close to 80 percent of the benefits to those making over \$100,000 a year or more.

Basically, Mr. Speaker, if you are making \$20,000 or \$30,000 or \$40,000 or \$50,000 you will get maybe \$25 or \$26. If you are making over \$100,000 a year you get about \$1,100. The higher you go up in income, the more you are going to gain.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, the tax proposal in general is weighted heavily. Over 50 percent of the benefits go to those making over \$100,000 a year. That is why we are opposed to it, that and the deficit issue, but the inequity of it is so outrageous. I am not surprised that it is weighted that way, because

during this past week, we have seen two glaring examples of how my friends on this side of the aisle, with the exception of about a half a dozen of them who had the courage to stand up for these proposals, the Republican Party has supported proposals that would reward millionaires and in some instances billionaires from paying their taxes, avoiding paying taxes if they renounce their U.S. citizenship.

You say, "Gosh, would anybody do that? Would anybody actually have renounced their American citizenship?" Yes, they would. You have got about 12 to 24 people in this country who are playing that game. The cost to the U.S. taxpayers is about \$3.6 billion over a 10-year period, giving up their citizenship in an unpatriotic way, after having had this country defend them, defend their interests, defend their assets, and throwing it away so they could avoid paying their responsible share back to the people who worked for them, the men and women of this country.

We had a proposal to get rid of that provision, to make them pay their fair share. The people on this side of the aisle, with the exception of five people, voted to retain it, to keep it, to protect them. This was all in a bill that we passed here last Thursday, over our objections, because of this provision. It was a good bill. It provided a deduction for small business people under health care, 25 percent next year, 30 percent the following year. It could have been a little higher if we had gotten rid of that billionaire provision. We would have provided a little bit more for small business people.

Unbeknownst to us, Mr. Speaker, included in that bill, and not told to us or anybody on this floor, was a secret provision that was made known to the American public by the New York Daily News. It talked about some back-room dealings cut by House Republicans. Last week the House passed legislation that would allow tax deductions, as I said, for self-employed, and repeal the tax benefits for minority broadcasters.

However, hidden in that conference report was one special provision that would allow Rupert Murdoch to reap tens of millions of dollars in tax benefits.

Mr. Speaker, it is interesting, this 100 days started with Rupert Murdoch when he gave the Speaker a \$4.5 million book deal. You know what, it is ending with Rupert Murdoch getting tens of millions of dollars in tax benefits. What a shameful, shameful story.

In fact, according to the Sunday's New York Daily News, "Republicans dropped their opposition to the tax break after learning Murdoch was the beneficiary of the legislation, and consulting Gingrich, according to six sources involved in the negotiations."

In fact, according to an earlier New York Daily News story on Saturday, a Senate staffer is reported as saying

"The Republicans were going to kill the deal until they found out that Murdoch owned the station. Then they almost magically approved it."

Keep in mind, the Republicans claim they oppose this kind of tax break. In fact, the Speaker said he was against it in February. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER] made a big deal about it when he brought this bill up. He almost made a crusade about it in the Committee on Ways and Means about killing these types of tax deals. But we have 17 other pending deals that were on the block that they scrapped, they got rid of. They refused to allow these deals to go forward.

The only case, the only case involving Rupert Murdoch's TV station in Atlanta was allowed to go through with a special tax break.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONIOR. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, that was the point the gentleman just made. While there was a great deal of controversy in the Committee on Ways and Means and on this floor about the fairness and extent to which the Tax Code should be used to sell these communications assets, it was clearly the intent of the Republicans to get rid of all of them, and when amendments were offered to make them fairer, to reduce the cost to the taxpayer, and to scrutinize them more than they have in the past, that was rejected, because all of these had to be killed.

Apparently when they got to conference committee, they went over an inventory of the impact of this amendment, that this would have. They found there were 17 or 18 or 19 deals that were in the works, that were in stages of completion, and would benefit from this tax provision, the sale of communications assets. They decided to kill them all until they got to one, until they got to the one that represented Rupert Murdoch. I think that is what is important to understand here. As the gentleman pointed out, this 100 days started with Rupert Murdoch making a very unusual gesture. That is, a book deal to the Speaker of the House that originally was going to pay him a \$4 million advance. The Speaker, to his credit, later turned that down, after the light of day was shown on that and people recognized the immediate conflict of interest.

The suggestion was that Mr. Murdoch really had no business of an unusual nature before this Congress, that there was no conflict of interest, and the Speaker had no ability to influence. Now we move those statements forward 87 days, and what do we find out? That Mr. Murdoch had specific legislation and matters before this Congress, it was brought to the attention of the Speaker, and the Speaker opened the gate for it to happen, because it was only through his willingness to allow this to happen, and ap-

parently some negotiations taking place in the back room, that this one provision, 1 out of 17, was allowed to go forward.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, not very many people knew about this. I did not know about it. I do not think anybody on our side of the aisle knew about it. It was done with the consent of two or three people on this side of the aisle, including the Speaker.

I might also point out to my friend, the gentleman from California, that the Speaker is beholden to Mr. Murdoch for the sale of his book. He did not take an advance, so, you know, he is beholden based upon royalties for the book. Mr. Rupert Murdoch, who is the owner of the publishing company, can basically, depending upon how hard he pushes for the sale of the book, determine how successful it will be.

The appearance of it is grotesque.

Mr. MILLER of California. It is not only the appearance now, today, afterward. It is what was put forth to the Members of this House. Members of this House thought they were voting on a good bill to allow for the deductibility of 25 percent of the health costs for individuals, for self-employed individuals, in this country, and yet what do they find out? That that bill was now gamed by the Speaker, for the interests of Mr. Murdoch, by the Senate, for the specific purposes of providing camouflage, so under the cover, without anyone knowing this, this provision could be written into law, and Mr. Murdoch could gain apparently what is around \$63 million of benefit.

The tragedy is that that \$63 million now comes out of the very hide of the deductibility, as you pointed out, between this and the billionaires' tax break that was in that bill, which we did know about and we did object to, and unfortunately, we could not get the Republicans on the other side to agree to, these people maybe could be allowed a deductibility of 30 percent of their health care costs, or 35 percent, for the billions of dollars that was put into this legislation, all under the guise that we are doing something nice for the self-employed, which everybody in the House agreed with. But they gamed that with the secret deal here for Mr. Murdoch, and one clearly has a very direct connection to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Mr. BONIOR. Now they are asking us to take their confidences and their word on a major, major tax bill that will benefit, as we said, primarily the very wealthiest, the privileged few in our society. Why would people want to do that, after having seen this last week two glaring examples of greed for the wealthiest people in our society, with the billionaire exemption, and now with this deal with Mr. Murdoch?

Mr. MILLER of California. If I could just say, Mr. Speaker, every day we start out the House of Representatives with the Pledge of Allegiance. Members of this House and our guests in the gallery, they pledge allegiance to the

United States of America. They do not pledge it until their taxes are too high, or until they want to save money. They pledge allegiance to the United States of America through thick and thin, through good and bad. They do not pledge it until their kid does not get into college. They do not pledge allegiance to the United States until their son or daughter gets drafted into the Army to fight an unpopular war. They pledge allegiance to the United States day in and day out.

Now we have a handful of billionaires that, for the sole purpose of avoiding taxes, are willing to renounce their American citizenship, and we are going to say "Give them the congressional stamp of approval."

It is absolutely outrageous that we would do that, considering the other patriotic Americans that have lost their lives pledging allegiance to the United States of America, that have lost their homes pledging allegiance, that have lost their children in wars, that have lost their spouses and their loved ones in wars in this country.

Now a handful of people decide that it is no longer to their advantage to pledge allegiance to the United States. They are going to leave the country for the sole purpose, this is the only way this can happen, for the sole purposes of avoiding taxation on their estates. It is an outrage.

Mr. BONIOR. It is an outrage, and it is an outrage that these two provisions on this good bill that would help small business people all over this country would be prostituted, prostituted by these two select provisions in this bill, one of which we did not know about it, the other of which we fought and we lost to the Republicans, that would protect billionaires, that would protect Mr. Murdoch and his deals.

I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

□ 2000

Mr. STUPAK. It is only fair to our audience to let them know where we are now. This bill has gone through both the House and Senate and the conference reports, and we voted on it. It is now on its way to the President.

And one of the things I have asked for tonight and I hope others would join with me in urging the President to veto this whole bill, the bill that is on its way to his desk to allow that tax break for the self-employed individuals. We do not want to hurt that part of the bill. We want to kill the \$63 million deal that we see for Mr. Murdoch. But the only way we can kill that whole situation is ask for the President to veto that bill.

If he vetoes the bill, I would urge my support, I am sure the Democratic leadership would do the same, to bring a bill to permanently extend that self-insured business deduction expense for health care for working Americans.

Mr. BONIOR. Would you yield on that point?

Mr. STUPAK. Yes, I would.

Mr. BONIOR. If the President vetoes this bill, and I hope he will—if he vetoes this bill we will do another bill here, and we will do it quick because I know people on both sides of the aisle do not want those small business people, those self-employed people, to go without the 24 to 30 percent exemption for their health insurance.

And I would also predict to my friend from Michigan that the other side will not even try to override that veto. They would not have the guts, the nerve, the chutzpah to bring that bill back with those two provisions and try to convince the American people that this is the right policy for this country.

Mr. STUPAK. I would agree. I do not think there would be much intestinal fortitude to try to allow a \$63 million tax break for one company, for the benefit of one individual. Who pays for that but all of us, all the working men and women around this country.

But you know when we were talking a little bit earlier about the alternative minimum tax. We are going to have a tax bill up this week on the floor, and we are going to give tax breaks and tax breaks here and tax breaks there, but one of the most repulsive tax breaks is the repeal of the alternative minimum tax.

I know you started this special order tonight talking about that alternative corporate minimum tax, and you are talking about, before 1985, before 1986 really when the bill was signed into law, how corporations did not pay any taxes. And yet the person with the lunch bucket or the secretary or the clerk or the midnight watchman has to pay his Federal taxes. But corporations did not because they could afford the accountants, the lawyers to find the tax loopholes, and they would not have to pay any taxes.

You brought up, oh, about 130 companies that did not pay any taxes. I guess one of the most striking ones was Du Pont Corporation. Between 1982 and 1985 their pretax profits were \$3.8 billion—pretax profit, \$3.8 billion. You know how much they paid in taxes during those years?

Mr. BONIOR. How much?

Mr. STUPAK. Nothing. In fact, they supplemented their pretax profits by obtaining \$179 million in tax rebates, in tax rebates. I mean, \$3.8 billion, you do not pay any taxes. We turn around through tax loopholes and tax provisions, give Du Pont \$179 million in tax rebates.

They want to bring back that kind of tax system because they say it is good for American families when the secretary, the clerk, or the watchman is paying Federal taxes, but the corporation they work for that may have billions of dollars in profits do not have to pay any taxes. In fact, they can get a tax rebate.

So I know it is going to be a long week; it is going to have some intense battles, but these are the inequities that we are trying to correct to truly

help the middle class. And I do not consider the middle class Du Pont Corp. with \$3.8 billion, or some of these other large corporations that pay no taxes, yet the American people have to pay a minimum 20 percent tax on their wages to the Federal Government.

Mr. BONIOR. There are a lot of good corporations in this country, and they help in employment, they help the productivity of the county, they help the country grow, but they also have an obligation as well to participate in sharing in the burden of taxation so we can provide for this country. And when they do not do it, when, for instance, we subsidize the mining industry in this country with about a \$1.2 billion subsidy each year or the large irrigation industry in this country and others with subsidies, I mean, it hurts everybody in the business sector. It hurts large corporations, small people struggling in business. And all we are asking is that everybody participate in making sure that we have an equitable system.

And what we are getting out of the other side of the aisle, take it out on school lunches, take it out on elderly heating assistance, take it out on student loans. We are going to get a whole debate on student loans coming up here because they want to add for us in Michigan here the cost on the student loans will be about \$4,000 additional for the students in our State because they want to get rid of that interest subsidy, move that right up to the front instead of 6 months after you graduate. That is about a \$4,000 hit.

They are taking all of these savings from middle-income people. They put it in a little pot, and they move it over here, and they use it to pay for these tax cuts for the wealthiest in our society. And oh, yeah, they give some to middle-income people.

Let me give you an example what they give to middle-income people. Capital gains tax cut. You earn about \$50,000 a year. You get about \$26 back on an average. You earn \$200,000 a year, and you will get a cut of about \$11,266 under their tax plan. Where is the equity there?

Mr. STUPAK. You were talking a little bit about some of the things that have happened on this floor. We were talking with welfare and AFDC, aid for and to dependent children. Everyone gets all excited about that, but yet we have this corporate welfare, too, where it is aid for dependent corporations, AFDC as we call it in 1995.

And we do not mind helping out any corporations. And there are good corporations out there. We do not mind helping them out. But if you take this fiscal year and this tax year we are in, for every taxpayer in this country, we are giving corporate welfare out at the amount of \$1,388 for every individual. You know what we give for heating, for food stamps, for housing, for low-income folks?

Mr. BONIOR. How much?

Mr. STUPAK. \$450 for each taxpayer. It is three times greater for corporate welfare than it is for individuals.

And you mentioned student loans, which is part of this tax bill. The student loans, my university, Northern Michigan University, University of Northern Michigan, their tuition has gone up this year alone. It is proposed to go up 15 percent. Where are they going to get the money?

But yet we are going to let the corporations not pay any taxes. And that money to help out with our direct student loan, the interest on the loan, the Stafford grants—

Mr. BONIOR. Stafford loan, Perkins loan for the low interest, work-study.

Mr. STUPAK. Work-study, you are right. Where is it going to go? To help pay for this tax plan for the corporations.

Mr. MILLER of California. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONIOR. Yes.

Mr. MILLER of California. I would like to say the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. STUPAK] makes a very important point. I think the people in this country have got to begin to focus on where is the money coming from to pay for this tax bill.

The money is coming from the people who need it the most in this country. We saw that in terms of the nutrition programs, where \$7 billion was taken out of nutrition for children, for the tax cut. We saw \$9 billion out of the interest subsidy that allows young people to stay in school and not start paying interest on those loans until they have the degree that allows them to get the job, almost \$20 billion in total out of student loans.

We also know that the money that they are talking about taking and giving back to the seniors was money that is now supporting the Medicare system. We know that there are additional cuts for Medicare. This is one of the greatest transferences of wealth from middle-income families, from working families, from families striving and sacrificing before they ever take a student loan to pay for the education of their children. To take money from these people and to transfer it to high-income individuals, most of whom when you talk to them they say if that is how it is done, then do not bother.

People making over \$200,000, over \$150,000, sure, they would like the money. But they say if that is the price, is that kids are not going to be able to go to school or not get a school lunch or these kinds of programs, they say I do not need it, put it on the deficit, lower interest rates, or leave it with the kids so they can get an education.

But what we see is all of this camouflage about middle-income people when, in fact, we see that we had a whole group of companies that never paid taxes up until 1988, and now they are going to relieve those companies of the alternative minimum tax. They

will go back to making billions of dollars and not paying any taxes, not paying their fair share. They are going to give capital gains to the highest-income people in the country, as you point out, middle-income people with capital gains, a very slight amount.

The point is that is why they do not want the cap is that this is a massive transfer from moneys that help people in this country achieve advancement and status and education and training to participate in the American economic system. And they are gathering up all of this money and they are going to transfer it this next week into the tax bill to go to high-income people.

Mr. BONIOR. And it is the same people that already have, are doing well. I mean, one of the most telling statistics that I have seen this year is the one that says, since 1979, 98 percent of the wealth and income—income increases in this country have gone to the top 20 percent of in this country. That means 80 percent of the folks are not going anywhere. They are standing still. They are losing ground.

Here we are, instead of trying to help those folks get into the game and be a full participant in this society, we are giving more to the top 20.

Mr. MILLER of California. Those are priorities. I mean, we have to, we are not wealthy enough. We are going to offer an incentive program for education, recognizing that families are struggling.

We heard testimony this last Friday out in San Francisco, Congresswoman ESHOO and Congresswoman PELOSI and myself, about families who were struggling far beyond the student loan debt. They have refinanced their houses. They have done everything they can.

So we are going to offer—the minority leader, Mr. GEPHARDT, is going to offer, allow them the deductibility of those education costs and those training costs for people who are going back to school so they can keep their jobs, allow them the deductibility on student loans, allow them to set up an educational IRA so they can start saving if they have very young children.

But we have enough money to do that, but we do not have enough money to do that and then to give away money to people who essentially right now do not need this kind of assistance because they are making very high incomes, in the top 1, 2, 3 percent of all the people in the country.

Mr. STUPAK. The other thing I think in this whole debate that is somewhat lost is this money, this tax shift, that we are seeing money go from the working class to the wealthier corporations and to wealthier individuals in this country. It is going to them. It is not going for deficit reduction. It is not going to reduce the National debt.

We are going to shift over 5 years like \$188 billion, and yet we have a \$176 billion deficit, \$4.7 trillion debt.

Why are we running around giving tax breaks to the wealthiest people and

the wealthiest corporations while we are deficit spending? Wouldn't the money be better served, couldn't we help out those corporations, couldn't we help out those individuals if we would, of course, put the money toward deficit reduction, which we could do more of?

You know, the logic is, is this the right time in this Nation's history to be giving tax breaks when we are running a deficit? Where are you going to get the money for the 188 other than taking it from the working class? But wouldn't we really be doing our kids a bigger favor if we brought down the deficit, the debt?

Mr. MILLER of California. The gentleman is quite correct. To borrow money, to give a \$500 credit to somebody making \$150,000 to \$200,000, you ought to see what the children are going to have to make to pay that money back over the next 25 years because we borrowed it from the Treasury now.

If we were flush, if we had a big stack of money in front of us and we had all of our bills paid, fine, then give a dividend to the shareholders of America, give a dividend to the taxpayers, let them participate.

But I assume when you go to your town hall meetings you are hearing what I am hearing. People are saying how can you borrow money to give a tax cut when you have the deficit? Pay down the deficit.

Because what do they remember? They remember after the President made those cuts, those \$500 billion, that interest rates went down. Their children for the first time were able to buy a house. They were able to refinance their houses from the high interest rates of the 1980's and saw the economy moving.

What were they presented with this last week? The home sales again are in the doldrums. The inventory is backing up. People cannot afford to enter the home market again as first-time buyers. That would be the benefit of the deficit reduction.

But they have chosen to provide, you know, hundreds of billions of dollars that they simply cannot pay for in any other way rather than just ravaging programs like student loans and child nutrition and a whole host of programs that help families provide a better life for their children, far in excess of the tax credit for the very wealthy.

□ 2015

Mr. BONIOR. The tragedy in all of this, and if I could help bring it to a close, and I will yield to my friend from Michigan before I do, because I know my good friends from Texas are waiting, and I do not want to keep them much longer, and my friend from New Jersey is waiting as well.

You know, we started this conversation this evening when we talked about the inequity in the tax bill, and we started off by saying this hundred days was begun with Rupert Murdoch giving the Speaker a \$4.5 million book deal,

and it is really ending that way in the sense that the President has on his desk right now a bill that will provide Mr. Murdoch with tens of millions of dollars in tax breaks as a result of a provision that was put into the conference report on the tax bill that we have just had here in the House of Representatives that would have benefited small businessmen and their health insurance concerns.

And, you know, I cannot tell you how totally frustrated I certainly am, and millions of Americans, I think, join me in the frustration to see my friends on this side of the aisle help the millionaires and, in some instances, in this case, the billionaires reap these tax benefits at the expense of everybody else, and then more disturbing is the way it was done where no Members on this side of the aisle were aware of it.

I hope the President will stand up and veto this bill.

Mr. President, if you are listening, if you veto this bill, you are not going to have any trouble sustaining your veto in this House of Representatives. The Republicans would not dare, after your veto, to bring this bill back to the House floor with the billionaire provision and the millionaire writeoff provision for Rupert Murdoch and expect the American people to buy it.

It will have covered their 100 days in a way in which will bring disrepute upon their efforts, and so with that, I would yield finally to my friend, the gentleman from Michigan, to conclude, and I thank my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER], for his eloquence and his support of working families.

Mr. STUPAK. I believe the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] is right. You know, it was H.R. 831. I think I said 381, but it is H.R. 831, which was to amend the IRS Code to permanently extend the deduction for health insurance costs for self-employed individuals, something we all wanted to do. In order to get this bill through and get it passed by April 15, so people could take advantage of it, because it had expired, so they could take advantage of it for the 1994 tax season, they put in a provision permitting this nonrecognition of the capital gains to take care of the Viacom situation, again, all honorable, all well-intended.

But what happens so often on this floor, then, they put in things we do not know about, or they slipped something in. I was always proud to say the House never did that, that we had very strict rules and amendments and everything had to be germane to the bill before it. No one got special treatment in the House. The Senate, at times, the other body, may add a couple things here and there. We go to conference. Those things are knocked out and taken care of. You know what got knocked out on this one was the American people, and about \$63 million we have to pay for now.

Mr. BONIOR. And 17 other minority broadcasters got knocked out just to take care of Mr. Murdoch on the other end of the deal.

Mr. STUPAK. So in summation, I hope the President does veto the bill. I believe in the intent of the bill, but I certainly do not believe in the final analysis of this bill and what we now know in less than 48 hours after it was passed that there was a special deal. So I hope the President, if he is listening, as you indicated, would veto this bill, bring it back. We will work hard to get it passed by the end of the week.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE SELENA QUINTANILLA PEREZ

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KINGSTON). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ORTIZ] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. ORTIZ. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I rise today to pay tribute to an outstanding young international recording star and businesswoman, Selena Quintanilla Perez, known throughout the world as simply "Selena."

She was murdered on Friday by a disgruntled employee.

Today, I want not to dwell on the circumstances of her tragic death, but on the way that she faced adversity, overcame the odds, and how she really lived each and every day of her 23 years.

Selena was born near Houston, Texas and began singing in Corpus Christi at age 5 with her father's band, Los Dinos.

When she began performing at age 9, the band became known as Selena y Los Dinos.

She grew up in the humble Molina barrio of Corpus Christi where the neighbors all know each other. In 1994, she took home the Grammy Music Award for "Selena Live," in the category for Best Mexican-American Album.

This year, her album, "Amor Prohibido" or "Forbidden Love" went quadruple platinum.

Ironically, Selena's newest song, "Foto y Recuerdos,"—"Photographs and Memories"—was No. 4 on the Latin charts on the day she died. Her song, "Amor Prohibido," earned another Grammy nomination for this year.

Selena was known as the Queen of Tejano music, which is the late 20th century version of the popular Tex-Mex conjunto, an accordion based rhythmic style of music. Selena has described her music as a combination of polka, country, and jazz.

Last month, at the Tejano music awards, she won seven major awards, including female entertainer of the year. However she or anyone else wishes to categorize her music, Selena's music touched the hearts and souls of her listeners.

She spoke to the everyday obstacles and triumphs in our lives.

She spoke to the fears, anxieties, hopes and ecstasy in all of us, simply

because she knew well all these aspects of the human spirit.

While Selena's hits were recorded in Spanish, her first language was English, and she had just begun recording in English in an attempt to cross over into the pop mainstream. She was still recording her first album in English when she died.

She was one of our young people who could reach across the divides that separate us as a society to show this country, through her music, how much we share as human beings.

Selena was a woman who paid back the generosity of her community.

She always went to the schools and spoke to the children about drug abuse, honesty, and staying in school to get an education. Her community loved her so much, I have never seen such an outpouring of support and love from a community. People all over Texas drove with their headlights turned on, and tied black ribbons to their car radio antennas, on in silent tribute. She was genuinely kind and pleasant, always with a generous manner for her fans or her hometown people.

She was one of us.

She was a role model for the young people in the community. The young people mimicked her songs and her easygoing persona. They admired the fact that she never forgot her roots, and they felt stronger because they shared those roots. Young people could look to Selena and know that she had come up out of the barrio and had made a huge success out of her life and her music.

They believed that she spoke to them through both her music and her deeds, and they loved her for that.

When word spread on Friday that Selena had been murdered, millions of her fans simply stopped what they were doing and just cried, both at the tragedy of a woman dying so needlessly so young, and for their personal pain at the loss. Her life was far too brief.

She was only 23 years old when she was murdered, and there is little doubt that her greatest years were on the horizon.

I will miss Selena very much.

Just 3 years ago, when I was the chairman of the congressional Hispanic caucus institute, she entertained at the institute's annual gala at my invitation, and as always she brought down the house.

While she was in Washington for the gala, I took her to the largely Hispanic Mount Pleasant neighborhood to entertain DC's Hispanic community.

Since we both came from low income neighborhoods, it was important for both of us to share the abundance of the annual gathering with those less fortunate.

That night we took another Mexican star with us, Rosa Gloria Chagoyan. Thousands greeted her and were deeply moved by her music. But most of all she will be missed by those to whom she spoke through her music, to the hearts she touched with her message,

and to those who just plain loved the melodic sound of her beautiful sultry voice.

This Easter, think of Selena. On this Easter Sunday, who would have been 24 years old.

In closing, let me say a word to the young people to whom Selena meant so much. Just because she is gone, please do not forget her message—stay off drugs, be honest, get an education, care about each other, get involved—and no matter what—never give up.

We will always carry her music, her message and her love in our heart.

To her husband, Chris Perez, her parents Mr. and Mrs. Abraham Quintanilla, her brother and Sister and her entire family, we offer our deepest sympathy. May she rest in peace.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my good friend, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TEJEDA].

Mr. TEJEDA. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleague from Corpus Christi and the tens of thousands of fans in south Texas and around the world to mourn the loss of a talented young Tejano Artist, Selena Quintanilla Perez. Known internationally for her talent and vivacious personality, Selena was murdered this past Friday in her hometown of Corpus Christi, TX. Just 2 weeks shy of her 24th birthday, Selena leaves us a legacy of spirit and hope. My heart goes out to her family, her friends, and her many fans.

Nothing I can say will reduce the pain, the heartache. Nor can I begin to answer the difficult question: Why, how could this happen to one with so much promise, so much talent, and so much to give. News of her death sent shockwaves from Washington to south Texas, from Los Angeles to Miami, from Mexico to South America.

Selena began her singing career at a young age, singing with a family band. From her humble beginnings, she succeeded in winning a Grammy and obtaining international fame. Her success did not take her away from her family, she and her husband lived next door to her parents' home. Now a senseless criminal act has taken her from us, but her legacy will live on.

Selena was more than a rising star in the vibrant Tejano music industry. Selena was a role model for many, from young children to senior citizens. She represented hope, speaking out against drugs and preaching the need to stay in school and obtain an education. Even with her frequent travels and the demands of her growing singing career, Selena earned her high school degree through correspondence courses.

Despite her overwhelming popularity, Selena consistently held strong ties to her Hispanic heritage. Selena succeeded in bringing Tejano music into mainstream America and is recognized not only in Texas, but in all of America, Mexico, and South America. Her latest release, "Amor Prohibido," has topped the Latin charts for 43 consecutive weeks. Prior to her death, her