

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DEUTSCH] have a request at this time?

REQUEST FOR PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE FOR 1 MINUTE

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I be able to address the House for 1 minute on this particular issue.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

Mr. TIAHRT. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, do we not have 5 minutes coming up now where everybody is going to get a turn to speak?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain 1-minute speech requests.

Mr. TIAHRT. I object, Mr. Speaker. Let us go to the 5 minutes and continue the business of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

FURTHER REQUEST AND CLARIFICATION OF PROCEDURE

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, I move to adjourn.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my motion to adjourn.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, if I may be heard, I think there was a misunderstanding of what the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DEUTSCH] was attempting to do. I think it would be very helpful, perhaps, if the Speaker would now recognize the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DEUTSCH] and let him renew his unanimous-consent request. I think we can move along.

INTRODUCTION OF CONCURRENT RESOLUTION TO REMOVE PROVISION FOR SPECIAL TAX BREAK FOR RUPERT MURDOCH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DEUTSCH] renew his request?

Mr. DEUTSCH. Yes. I do, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. DEUTSCH] is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing, along with many Members, I believe, a sustainable one-third vote, a concurrent resolution to take out the provision that gives a special tax break to Rupert Murdoch for \$63 million. At a time when we are cutting back on student loans, student work programs, student lunch programs, to do a thing that is just sleazy, it looks sleazy, it smells sleazy, it walks sleazy, it talks sleazy, and it is sleazy, and it is just something that this House, the greatest deliberative body in the world, should not be part of.

We have the opportunity to correct our actions. I urge the House tomorrow, I urge the leadership of this body, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH], specifically, who has said that he is against this particular provision, let him speak in deeds, not just words.

I do not think there is one person in the entire country that believes that Senator MOSELEY-BRAUN was the impetus. We know that is not how this process works. The Speaker's relationship with Mr. Murdoch is clearly something that has been well documented in the press. I urge the support of both parties with the concurrent resolution tomorrow.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE ON HOUSE OVERSIGHT FROM FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 70 AND REFERRAL TO COMMITTEE ON RESOURCES

Mrs. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on House Oversight be discharged from further consideration of House Joint Resolution 70, and that the joint resolution be re-referred to the Committee on Resources.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR CERTAIN COMMITTEES AND THEIR SUBCOMMITTEES TO SIT TOMORROW, WEDNESDAY, APRIL 5, 1995, DURING 5-MINUTE RULE

Mrs. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the following committees and their subcommittees be permitted to sit tomorrow while the House is meeting in the Committee of the Whole House under the 5-minute rule: the Committee on Banking and Financial Services, the Committee on Commerce, the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities, the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, the Committee on House Oversight, the Committee on International Relations, the Committee on the Judiciary, the Committee on Resources, the Committee on Small Business, and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. It is my understanding that the Minority has been consulted and that there is no objection to these requests.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, we have checked with the ranking members of each of those committees and subcommittees, and they have agreed to that.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. BONIOR addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

THE TAX CUT PACKAGE IS GOOD FOR THE ECONOMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOSTETTLER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOSTETTLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise this afternoon because Americans are overtaxed. Because of this, I support my colleague Mr. ARCHER's bill to lower taxes.

There is a growing realization in this country that we cannot afford to operate on deficit budgets. We spend too much money primarily because we are involved, at the Federal level, in too many things. If we really want to control spending, we must come to grips with the fact that the Government is entirely too big. Day after day, special interest groups file through this city claiming that they understand the need to reduce Federal spending but that their program only costs a little relative to the size of the budget. This reminds me of the chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers' boast that progress is being made regarding the size of the national debt as it relates to the national economy, while the national debt gets larger and larger and larger. These interest groups, and some of my colleagues, are missing the point. Government is too big.

But the mindset that still has a formidable presence in Congress is to see how little in Federal spending we can get away with cutting. Oh, they say, the voters are really mad about the deficit and debt, so we'll have to cut some things, but maybe not too much. Even among Members who say they want a balanced budget, there seems to be a large group that isn't interested in cutting \$1 more than needed to do this.

The chief reason why there is resistance to cutting taxes, even among those who campaigned in favor of tax cuts, is that if you cut taxes, but are striving for a balanced budget, you have to cut spending that much more. The current argument against cutting taxes is that it is irresponsible to do so in the face of a \$5 trillion national debt. My response is this: We have this debt not because of the tax rate but because of this body's insatiable lust for spending. What is irresponsible is for

us to continue spending like we have. We spend too much because we have developed a mindset that Uncle Sam has to do everything.

I am willing to trade being called draconian and mean spirited by the liberal media and the liberals on the other side of the aisle in exchange for being about to tell my constituents that I voted to cut spending enough to balance the budget. I am willing to tell voters I voted to cut their taxes while at the same time voting for heavy spending cuts. I am willing to do this because I have come to a conclusion after 3 months in this city—the powers that be in this city—and I am not referring to Members of Congress—don't care about the taxpayers of my district. The powers that be in this city don't care about the future of my children. The powers that be in this city don't care about balancing the budget. The powers that be in this city only care about feeding their faces in the Federal trough. As a result, since the powers that be in this city have set their faces against the taxpayers in my district, against the future of my children and against balancing the budget and retiring the debt quickly, I am setting myself against them. So when you tell me that if we cut taxes that means we will have to cut spending that much more to balance the budget, my response is: "That's the whole point."

You have heard and will hear from our friends on the left that we're about to repeat the same cycle that brought massive deficits and debt in the 1980's. Let's look at what the Kemp-Roth tax cuts did and what happened to spending at the same time.

Early in the 1980's, President Reagan delivered on his promise of deep, across-the-board tax cuts. Aside from the 20 million new jobs and the longest and largest uninterrupted economic recovery in postwar American history, the tax cuts brought 14 years of increased Federal revenues. Total Federal revenues went from \$517 billion in 1980 to \$1.1 trillion in 1993. Total individual income tax revenues went from \$244 billion in 1980 to \$509 billion in 1993. Congress cut taxes considerably and doubled Federal revenues. You can't blame increasing deficits and debt on something that caused revenues to double.

So why did the deficit go up by 250 percent? Because during this same time period spending went up by \$800 billion or 130 percent. The increase in spending was \$200 billion greater than the increase in revenues caused by the tax cuts. That's why the deficit and the debt went up. Remember this when our friends on the left tell you that cutting taxes will increase the deficit. That's only true if we abrogate our responsibility to cut spending, and I'm not going to do that.

Now, let's remember just what is being proposed here. The American Dream Restoration Act stated that families should receive a tax credit of \$500 for each child under age 18. This

credit is available to families earning up to \$200,000. A segment of that credit is available to families earning up to \$250,000.

That there is an earnings limit at all is in itself a compromise. That there is an earnings limit at all—make no mistake about it—constitutes redistribution of wealth, albeit on a small scale.

The opponents of this bill say it is wrong to offer a tax credit to families earning up to \$200,000. That means they believe it is OK to exclude these families, no matter how many children they might have, solely on the basis of the fact that they earn more money.

Although these families are just as capable to taking the \$500 or \$1,000 or \$2,000 or \$3,000 and investing it or spending it, the mindset on the left says the Federal Government needs that money more and that those families do too well to qualify for tax relief.

Now, this idea to sock it to the so-called rich is nothing new. Yesterday's Wall Street Journal quoted some IRS statistics showing that, in 1992, before the Clinton tax increase, households making more than \$100,000 accounted for 3 percent of all tax returns but paid 39 percent of all Federal income taxes. The same editorial notes that households making more than \$100,000 reported a total income of \$858 billion, of which \$512 billion remained after taxes and deductions. If each of those families was forced to pay everything past \$100,000 in taxes, which everyone in this Chamber would agree is an asinine concept, the Government would have collected an additional \$135 billion in tax revenues, less than half of the budget deficit that year.

The point is that the effort to exclude families because they make more money is simply caving in to the shrill, yet baseless—the much-publicized yet anemic and the intimidating yet foolish cry from the left that the tax credit favors the rich. The fact is, those of us who know the tax cut package is good for the economy should have the courage to vote for a package that includes the provision to give a \$500 per-child tax credit to families making up to \$250,000, a 50-percent capital gains tax reduction, a front-loaded IRA, a repeal of the Clinton tax increase on social security benefits and an increase in deductions for small businesses. We can do this and balance the budget if we have the courage to cut spending and ignore the special interests that dominate this city.

□ 1645

TAX CUTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BILBRAY). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. BECERRA] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, there is nothing wrong with tax cuts. Obviously, it is great if we can give the American people a tax cut.

Two questions we have to ask, though, are: Is it being done equitably and can we afford to pay for the tax

cuts, because somewhere we will have to pay for the loss in revenue.

We have heard Speaker NEWT GINGRICH describe within the contract on America this tax-cut proposal as the crown jewel of the contract. It is a crown jewel all right, but the only problem is you only get the jewels if you are privileged enough in society and can afford them.

The plan gives away billions of dollars in tax breaks and other goodies to corporations and the well-to-do, those groups, the only groups, in fact, that in the 1980's benefited from the trickle-down economics we experienced in that decade. If you do not belong to this group of corporations or well-to-do, the plan not only does not help but you have to pay for it as well.

How will you pay? We have seen a little already. Who takes the hit? School lunch programs, student loan programs, student grant programs for colleges, summer youth employment programs, home heating assistance for seniors. There will be more middle-class programs cut and dismantled over the next several months to pay for these expensive tax cuts.

The capital gains tax cut that we will see by itself benefits, for the most part, those that have incomes in the six-figure range. Seventy-five percent of the benefits will go to the top 12 percent of Americans in this country. Overall, 50 percent of the benefits go to those who earn over \$100,000, 12 percent of the entire population.

Let us take a quick look at a chart that we prepared here to show who benefits but who pays. If you happen to earn \$200,000 or more, you are going to get about \$11,266 from a tax cut from the Republican proposed legislation. If you earn under \$30,000, you can expect to get, over the year, \$124 in that tax cut.

If you take a look here, you can see how many people in America earn those different ranges of income. How many people earn over \$200,000 a year? Less than 1 percent of the population. Yet they are going to take the lion's share of those tax cuts. How many earn under \$30,000 or between \$30,000 and \$75,000? About 45 percent of the American public.

You can see from this chart how much, close to 50 percent of the American public will get out of these tax cuts. They are not going to the average middle-class family. They are not going to the average family period. They are going mostly to those who are well-to-do.

Why? It is unclear. We have not specified where the cuts will come from, the money to pay for those cuts. We have not discussed how we will somehow make up for the loss in money to pay for school lunch programs, but we do know that those who earn over \$200,000 will benefit tremendously from this.

Is it just a Democrat or someone who happens to represent an area that has a lot of middle-class or working-class