

for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, NEWT GINGRICH put the crown jewel on his contract last night. And if you earn over \$200,000 a year, it is a crown jewel indeed. But if you earn \$20,000 or \$30,000 or \$40,000 a year, you were sold fool's gold—costume jewelery.

Under the Republican plan passed under the cover of darkness, if you earn \$200,000 a year you will get a tax break of over \$11,000. Those earning over \$350,000 will get \$20,000—more than some working families earn in a year.

But if you earn \$20,000 or \$30,000 you will get a meager \$25 a month. You can see why NEWT GINGRICH calls this plan a jewel—it is precious to the rich.

The Republicans say they can cut taxes without increasing the deficit. We tried that once before in the 1980's. We are still trying to dig, our way out of the huge record deficits it created.

Mr. Speaker, the Republicans are robbing poor Peter to pay Paul. The American people know better. For shame, Mr. Speaker, for shame.

THE BEST TIME TO CUT TAXES

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

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues know, we keep talking about what we tried in 1980-81 to cut taxes. Only difference is we got a Republican Congress now that is going to cut the spending, too, so that will take care of that.

As my colleagues know, the argument over the last several days has been that there is not a good time to cut taxes. Every place we hear this is not a good time to cut taxes. We got full employment, practically full employment, we have got the production facilities in the United States operating at capacity; now is not a good time to cut taxes.

I am going to ask the question of the other side of the aisle over here, "When is a good time to cut taxes?"

Mr. Speaker, I say to my colleagues, "Now you can't cut taxes when the economy is down; that is true, as my colleagues know, because we got to pump it up, we have got to take tax money and generate the economy." So they are also saying that it is not a good time to cut taxes when the economy is doing well. So my question is:

"When is a good time to cut taxes?"

I can tell my colleagues when it is. Down in southwest Missouri, down in the hill country, we used to be a major apple producing area. At that time the question was when was the best time to prune the trees. I tell my colleagues, "The best time to prune the trees is when you got a sharp knife. The best time to cut taxes is whenever you can get it done."

SUMMER YOUTH EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM

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

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I am disappointed that the Senate has not restored the Summer Youth Employment Program in the rescissions package. The rescissions package zeroed out the Summer Youth Employment Program, a very vitally needed program across the Nation in both rural and urban communities. Thirty-two thousand youngsters, teenagers, were employed last summer in the New York City Summer Youth Program.

□ 1045

I am disappointed in the Senate, but I am shocked at the rumor I hear that the President will support this package and not veto it. If the President does not veto this package, it is an abandonment of the youth in our cities. We are going to restore money for national service. At the same time, you are going to leave the zero out for the Summer Youth Employment Program. That is unfair to any national service components that are going to go into our cities. To go into our cities and not have the youth there employed when they get there, they are going to find a hostile environment, I assure you.

I appeal to the President. He should demand the restoration of the Summer Youth Employment Program or veto the bill. Please do not abandoned the poorest teenagers in America.

TAX CUT IS A MIDDLE INCOME, WORKING AMERICAN, JOB CREATION PROGRAM

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, over the past several weeks through this debate on taxes we have been listening to little more than class warfare, the "us versus them" mentality, pitting one segment of society against another. When one looks closely at what we call the crown jewel, there should be a realization that those people who are in the upper 10 percent of wage earners in this country actually shoulder 60 percent of the Federal tax burden. We also should recognize that the tax cut that is going to take place is much greater for those earning between \$30,000 and \$75,000 a year. It is actually 4.4 percent. Those who are earning over \$200,000 a year get only a 2.9-percent cut. And the \$500 per child tax credit, 90 percent of that will be going to families with incomes of less than \$100,000 a year.

We need to realize that this is a program for middle income, working families, and it has some incentives to create more job opportunities for those who are struggling to find greater opportunity. Remember, 4.7 million Americans are completely taken off

the tax rolls because of that \$500 per child tax credit.

APOLOGY DUE AMERICANS OF JAPANESE ANCESTRY

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

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, 50 years ago this year Senator DANIEL INOUE was fighting to liberate Italy from Nazi oppression. He lost his arm and almost his life, as did many other American soldiers of Japanese ancestry.

What a savage irony it is that Senator INOUE and other veterans of the 442d and the 100th Battalions have to listen to the kind of mockery that was displayed on the 50th anniversary of the defeat of nazism by Senator ALFONSE D'AMATO.

I trust that Senator D'AMATO will display some sense of shame. I would like to believe it was an anomaly, that it was something that was spontaneous and not well thought out. I would like to think that Senator D'AMATO would have the common courtesy, as well as a sense of shame, to let Senator INOUE and all Americans of Japanese ancestry know that he apologizes.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina). The Chair would remind Members that references to the other body and individuals in the other body should be avoided.

INTRODUCTION OF BLACKSTONE RIVER VALLEY NATIONAL HERITAGE CORRIDOR ACT OF 1995

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

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, today I am joining my colleagues, Mr. BLUTE, Mr. PATRICK KENNEDY and Mr. REED, in introducing a bill that would revise the boundaries and extend the life of the Blackstone River Valley National Heritage Corridor in Massachusetts and Rhode Island.

This region, which is the birthplace of the American Industrial Revolution, was established by Congress as a national heritage area in 1986 and has proven to be a successful Federal investment. This legislation will build upon the outstanding record of historic preservation and tourism development that the Blackstone Valley has enjoyed during the past 10 years.

Expanding the boundaries of the corridor to include Worcester, MA, New England's second largest city, and four other communities will enhance the opportunities for the Corridor Commission to solicit funds from private

groups to accompany those provided by the Federal Government. This partnership between the public and private sector will serve as a model for our country, by preserving a region without draining the public's pocketbook.

I am proud to join with my colleagues from the region in this bipartisan effort to preserve the Blackstone River Valley. Working together we can help to ensure that this area, which is so rich in history, will be around for future generations to experience and enjoy.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE HONORABLE BOB FRANKS, MEMBER OF CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communications from the Honorable BOB FRANKS, a Member of Congress from the State of New Jersey:

APRIL 5, 1995.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to formally notify you pursuant to Rule L (50) of the Rules of the House that my office has received a subpoena issued by the Municipal Court of Manville, New Jersey.

After consultation with the General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is not consistent with the privileges and precedents of the House.

Sincerely,

BOB FRANKS,
Congressman.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 889, EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS AND RESCIS-SIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1995

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 129 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES 129

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 889) making emergency supplemental appropriations and rescissions to preserve and enhance the military readiness of the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1995, and for other purposes. All points of order against the conference report and against its consideration are waived. The conference report shall be considered as read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my very good friend, the gentleman from Woodland Hills, CA [Mr. BEILENSEN], and, pending that, I yield myself such time as I may consume. All time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

(Mr. DREIER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his re-

marks, and include extraneous material.)

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, this rule responds to a national emergency in defense readiness and training. The rule makes in order for consideration the conference report to accompany the bill H.R. 889, making emergency supplemental appropriations and rescissions to preserve and enhance the military readiness of the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1995.

The rule waives all points of order against the conference report and its consideration, and the conference report is to be considered as read.

The conference report requires a waiver of the 3-day layover rule. This rule is being waived in order to permit the House to consider this very vital measure as quickly as possible. The Secretary of Defense recommended that this bill be completed by March 31, 1995, and since we failed to do that, we are trying to move as expeditiously as possible to get this done.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday was an historic day in the House of Representatives. The new majority completed the final legislation outlined in our Contract With America. The new majority proved that Congress is finally led by legislators that keep their promises and live up the commitments that they make. The new majority proved that they value families ahead of Government, cutting taxes and ensuring that every dollar returned to the people that earned it comes from reduced Government spending, rather than adding to the deficit. And the new majority made the Washington establishment lash out in anger because we are doing something totally new: cutting taxes, reducing government, and cutting the deficit.

People take note of major accomplishments, Mr. Speaker. They measure Congress by high profile legislation, like the tax relief deficit reduction bill that we passed late last night. However, I believe that it is in the more mundane legislative accomplishments that we can really measure the difference in the House of Representatives between this year and past years. When I use the term "mundane," I do not mean in any way to criticize my very dear friend, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

The conference report on this emergency defense supplemental appropriations bill is proof that we are making a real difference, changing the long-ingrained culture of deficit spending in Congress. For years those of us on this side of the aisle have said that we are committed to fiscal responsibility, that the Federal Government must live within its means. However, I can understand how people would want to see some results before they actually are sure that that is the case.

The Contract With America proved that we keep our promises, and this conference report begins to establish

the real record of fiscal responsibility American taxpayers have demanded.

Our \$4.7 trillion national debt is so massive it is almost incomprehensible. How did we get there? You can probably get as many reasons as there are Members of Congress. But I know that one reason is that in the past the standard operating procedure for this House, dealing with emergency spending, is to simply add to the deficit.

Well, Mr. Speaker, that era has come to an end. Things have changed. The new leadership has said that we will find offsetting cuts for all supplemental spending. While the big spenders said it could not be done with a \$1.5 trillion Federal budget, it can. We are doing it here, and we will do it again with a disaster relief supplemental appropriations bill. In fact, it is now the only way for us to meet emergencies.

Make no mistake, H.R. 889 makes supplemental appropriations of a truly emergency nature. It provides \$3.04 billion in readiness funds. Those defense funds are offset with \$2.5 billion in defense rescissions, \$775 million in nondefense rescissions, and \$142 million in foreign assistance rescissions.

Two months ago some said that the House's original nondefense rescissions were going nowhere. They said the Senate would not even consider them. I would note, Mr. Speaker, that instead of failure, the House got much of what it wanted, and this bill cuts \$746 million more than it spends. In other words, we are again doing the people's business and making a down payment on balancing the budget.

Mr. Speaker, the real changes in Congress are at least as evident when we send a bill like this to the President as when we cut taxes and cut spending to pay for it. I urge all of my colleagues to support this very fair rule and permit the House to consider this conference report. There is a critical national security need that must be met, and H.R. 889 meets it.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding to me. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, over the past few years this country has called on the men and women of our armed services to perform duties ranging from humanitarian assistance in Somalia to all out war in Iraq. These duties were performed superbly and with honor. There is not one of us here today who can feel anything but pride for the job our Armed Forces have done in Africa, the Middle East, the Balkans, or in the Caribbean.

I would like to commend the conferees for their work with regard to the defense side of the conference report. While the increases in defense spending are not fully offset by direct defense cuts, this bill is certainly an improvement over the bill which the House sent to conference just a few weeks ago.