

ways to lessen the need for welfare. My bill, Mr. Speaker, does just that.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in this fight to revitalize our urban communities.

My bill creates meaningful jobs for the unemployed and those about to enter the work force.

Passage of this bill will significantly increase the pace of environmental cleanup by establishing a low-interest loan program to stimulate voluntary cleanup of industrial sites. The cleanup of these sites will benefit public health and welfare, and the environment by returning contaminated sites to economically productive uses.

This bill stimulates the creation of environmental jobs and business opportunities by individuals and small businesses in target urban areas through reduction of the Social Security tax burden.

#### ALTERNATIVE TAX PLANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GEKAS] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, to cut or not to cut, that is the taxing question. Whether it be nobler in the minds of the people who attack the Republican plan to sling an arrow into death, that remains for the Democrat opposition or all those who favor deficit reduction as against tax reduction.

But let me record a little history for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. When the President was running for the Presidency, Bill Clinton's message included a tax cut for the middle class, which, of course, he never was able to implement or refused to implement or reneged on the promise to implement.

And so somewhere in 1993 and 1994, when we saw that the administration was going really the other way, not a tax cut for the middle class but a tax increase for most Americans, when that began to happen and we saw some signs of weakening in the economy, many of us thought that this would be ripe for a time for a tax cut cast in the image that we wanted to present.

So I myself prepared then in 1993 and 1994 a tax package, a tax cut package. It included reducing the payroll tax by 1 percent both for the employer and for the employee. This would spur savings, bring down the tax burden on the middle-class Americans, the working Americans.

□ 1000

I couple that proposition with a capital gains reform.

Now, there was method in my madness. Research, just as some of the speakers have already alluded to, has indicated that a reduction of the capital gains rates spurs millions of transactions to occur almost overnight and produces revenues, stimulates transactions and produces tax revenue. So, in a whirlwind of action, in my plan the capital gains reform would pay for

the reduction of the payroll taxes of working Americans.

I thought it was a good plan, but I was not satisfied, Mr. Speaker, to just take my own judgment on it. I submitted the plan to the Institute for Research on the Economics of Taxation, a well-known and renowned and dependable think tank here in the Washington area whose sole reason for existence is to analyze methods of taxation and various plans.

When they received my plan, they reviewed it; and I received a commendatory letter. I must say it made my ego feel good about it that the plan was workable, and it emphasized that capital gains reform, coupled with my plan of reducing the payroll tax, would not only save money for the working family but spur investment and savings, both of which are vital to a good economy. So I felt pretty good about it.

Now, that brings us to the present. Since that time, many other plans have been presented. The President did come up after the election in 1994 with a tax reduction plan. So did the minority leader, the gentleman from Missouri. So did other members of the minority. So did other members of the Republican Party. But the main thrust of the Republican provision was contained in the Contract With America.

So I say here today that although I had a good idea and one that I will still pursue in months to come about reducing the payroll tax to stimulate the working American families, we have before us now a good alternative, the Contract With America provision that we will be supporting and voting for this week.

Why am I going to support it? And I plan to do so. Because it is part of the Contract With America. Because it does reduce the tax burden of middle-class families. Because it does stimulate savings. Because it will provide for the ability of families to work out their own destinies in how they want to spend their money for their families and will go a long way toward spurring the same kinds of results that we submitted to the think tank about economics of taxation.

Why? Because it will be coupled with capital gains reform. So the best of all worlds will have occurred as far as this Member is concerned. I will be voting for the Contract With America provisions because of capital gains reform, already approved by the people to whom I submitted my plan, and a middle-class tax cut, also approved in our plan.

#### CAMPAIGN PROMISES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOLEY). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOKE] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, do you remember back in the Presidential campaign of 1992 when President Clinton

made a number of promises to the American people? He promised that he was going to give us a middle-class tax cut. He promised that he was going to lift the senior citizens earning test. He promised that he would enact a line-item veto. He promised that he would balance the budget.

He did not say he was going to balance the budget overnight. He said he was going to balance the budget.

Let us look at the record. Let us look at the record.

He reneged on the middle-class tax cut promise. In fact, he raised taxes, attempted to raise taxes in a very, very broad form way. Did not get away with that in terms of the Btu tax but still, in fact, did raise taxes. He reneged on the middle-class tax cut.

No. 2, he did not lift the senior citizens earning test. Instead, what he did do was he cut Social Security benefits by \$24.8 billion, \$25 billion that he cut social security benefits by.

And when pushed to lift the senior citizens earning test which, by the way, Mr. Speaker, is the amount of money up to which you are not penalized for working as a senior, right now that ceiling that limit is \$11,200. We are going to raise it tomorrow in a vote on this floor to \$30,000. We are going to do what President Clinton said he was going to do when he was running for the President, see, and he stole it with promises that he broke.

No. 3, he promised a line-item veto. He never ever offered that as a bill. He never offered that legislation. He did not put himself into it when it did come up on the floor of the 103d Congress. It was not enacted. We got a kind of enhanced rescission package. We passed a line-item veto about a month ago, right here, 104th Congress.

Finally, he said he was going to balance the budget. He has not given a halfhearted attempt at that. The budget he just submitted increases the deficit by \$200 billion a year for the next 5 years, and it starts to skyrocket at about \$400 billion.

When we came out with these things: A balanced budget amendment, which we passed in this House; a line-item veto which we passed in this House; lifting the senior citizens earning limit and the middle-class-tax cut; when we came out with that last fall as an agenda which we were willing to sign our names to, saying that if you give us the honor of representing you American people in the U.S. Congress, here is what we are going to do. We call this our Contract With America.

Those same four things that were in his promises broken, promises to the American people, how did he characterize them? How did he characterize them, Mr. Speaker?

I will tell you how he did. He called it a contract on America. The same promises that he had used falsely, falsely to get elected 2 years earlier he then characterized as a contract on America.

Well, Mr. Speaker, it is not a contract on America. In fact, it is a Contract With America. And not only that, but we are actually fulfilling the broken promises of Mr. Clinton from 2 years ago.

We are giving a middle-class tax cut. We are lifting the senior citizens earnings limit. We are restoring the \$25 billion in cuts that he made to Social Security benefits. We have enacted the line-item veto, and we are balancing the budget.

I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KINGSTON. Well if the gentleman will yield, there is another key element, and that is the welfare reform. The President did say he would end welfare as we know it, yet never submitted a welfare bill. And so that would mean 5 planks in the 10-plank Republican Contract With America the President actually ran on as candidate Clinton in 1992.

Mr. HOKE. The gentleman is completely correct. As I was sitting here making my notes, I was trying to remember what was the fifth item, and that is exactly right.

Mr. KINGSTON. If the gentleman will yield further, I think that, essentially, when you consider what happened to the balanced budget amendment in the other body, three Democrat Senators voted against the balanced budget amendment. If the President did not fight the balanced budget amendment I think it is very possible, given the fact that he is a great salesman, that he could twist some arms and pick up the one, two, three or four votes that are needed to get the thing over the top.

Mr. HOKE. As the gentleman well knows, not only did the President not fight to twist some arms to get the balanced budget amendment passed but, in fact, he worked day and night tirelessly, as hard as he possibly could, to make sure the balanced budget amendment failed.

Mr. KINGSTON. What is also ironic, while he is out saying the Republican welfare reform is mean or inadequate or whatever, not only has he not offered an alternative but then he goes on to talk about our program and how good it is. But he did not use the word Republican. He says, this is what we need: work programs and programs that will end the cycle and get the dad into the picture and identified and so forth.

I think it is disappointing, but you were talking about senior citizens and to increase the Social Security tax as your first year in office and then to fight trying to repeal that tax increase does have a degree of hypocrisy to it.

Mr. HOKE. What we are going to do tomorrow on the floor, we are going to repeal that device that the President passed just a year ago. And I see my time is expired, but we are going to repeal those cuts, and we are going to restore those cuts so that senior citizens get their due.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. There being no further requests for morning business, pursuant to clause 12, rule 1, the House will stand in recess until 11 a.m.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 7 minutes a.m.) the House stood in recess until 11 a.m.

□ 1100

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 11 a.m.

PRAYER

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

Teach us, O God, to use our words as vehicles of communication and messengers of understanding so our conversations are truly heard by one another and there is an honest awareness of what is being said. Keep us from the easy platitudes that have the ring of truth, but do not communicate the realities that need to be discussed. And may the words we say with our lips, be believed in our own hearts, and all that we believe in our hearts, may we practice in our daily lives. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. 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.

Mr. EWING. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Chair's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. EWING. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 369, nays 36, answered "present" 1, not voting 28, as follows:

[Roll No. 282]

YEAS—369

Ackerman	Ballengier	Bentsen
Allard	Barcia	Bereuter
Andrews	Barr	Bevill
Archer	Barrett (NE)	Bilbray
Armey	Barrett (WI)	Bilirakis
Bachus	Bartlett	Bishop
Baesler	Barton	Bliley
Baker (CA)	Bass	Blute
Baker (LA)	Bateman	Boehkert
Baldacci	Beilenson	Bonilla

Bono	Goodlatte	Meyers
Borski	Goodling	Mica
Boucher	Gordon	Miller (CA)
Brewster	Goss	Miller (FL)
Brown (OH)	Graham	Mink
Brownback	Green	Moakley
Bryant (TN)	Greenwood	Molinari
Bryant (TX)	Gunderson	Mollohan
Bunn	Gutierrez	Montgomery
Bunning	Gutknecht	Moorhead
Burr	Hall (TX)	Moran
Burton	Hall (OH)	Morella
Buyer	Hamilton	Murtha
Callahan	Hancock	Myers
Calvert	Hansen	Myrick
Camp	Hastert	Nadler
Cardin	Hastings (WA)	Neal
Castle	Hayes	Nethercutt
Chabot	Hayworth	Neumann
Chambliss	Hefner	Ney
Christensen	Heineman	Norwood
Chrysler	Herger	Nussle
Clayton	Hilleary	Obey
Clement	Hinchee	Olver
Clinger	Hobson	Ortiz
Coble	Hoekstra	Orton
Coburn	Hoke	Oxley
Coleman	Holden	Packard
Collins (GA)	Horn	Pallone
Collins (IL)	Hostettler	Parker
Combest	Houghton	Pastor
Condit	Hoyer	Paxon
Cooley	Hunter	Payne (NJ)
Costello	Hutchinson	Payne (VA)
Cox	Hyde	Peterson (FL)
Coyne	Istook	Peterson (MN)
Crapo	Jackson-Lee	Petri
Creameans	Jefferson	Pomeroy
Cubin	Johnson (CT)	Porter
Cunningham	Johnson, E.B.	Portman
Danner	Johnson, Sam	Poshard
Davis	Johnson (SD)	Pryce
Deal	Johnston	Quillen
DeFazio	Jones	Quinn
de la Garza	Kanjorski	Radanovich
DeLauro	Kaptur	Rahall
DeLay	Kasich	Ramstad
Dellums	Kelly	Rangel
Deusch	Kennedy (RI)	Reed
Diaz-Balart	Kennelly	Regula
Dickey	Kildee	Richardson
Dicks	Kim	Riggs
Dingell	King	Rivers
Dixon	Kingston	Rogers
Doggett	Klecicka	Rohrabacher
Dooley	Klink	Ros-Lehtinen
Doolittle	Klug	Rose
Dornan	Knollenberg	Roth
Doyle	Kolbe	Roukema
Dreier	LaFalce	Roybal-Allard
Duncan	LaHood	Royce
Dunn	Lantos	Salmon
Durbin	Largent	Sanford
Edwards	Latham	Sawyer
Ehlers	LaTourette	Saxton
Ehrlich	Laughlin	Scarborough
Emerson	Lazio	Schaefer
English	Leach	Schiff
Ensign	Levin	Schumer
Eshoo	Lewis (CA)	Scott
Evans	Lewis (KY)	Seastrand
Everett	Lightfoot	Sensenbrenner
Ewing	Lincoln	Serrano
Farr	Linder	Shadegg
Fawell	Lipinski	Shaw
Fields (LA)	Livingston	Shays
Fields (TX)	LoBiondo	Shuster
Flake	Lofgren	Sisisky
Flanagan	Longley	Skaggs
Foglietta	Lowe	Skeen
Foley	Lucas	Skelton
Forbes	Luther	Slaughter
Fowler	Manzullo	Smith (NJ)
Fox	Markey	Smith (TX)
Frank (MA)	Martinez	Smith (WA)
Franks (CT)	Martini	Solomon
Franks (NJ)	Mascara	Souder
Frelinghuysen	Matsui	Spence
Frisa	McCarthy	Spratt
Frost	McCrary	Stark
Funderburk	McHale	Stearns
Furse	McHugh	Stenholm
Galleghy	McInnis	Stokes
Ganske	McIntosh	Studds
Gekas	McKeon	Stump
Geren	McNulty	Stupak
Gilchrest	Meehan	Talent
Gilman	Meek	Tanner
Gonzalez	Metcalf	Tate