

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

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mrs. CLAYTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

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

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

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

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

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

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

MIDDLE-CLASS TAX RELIEF

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

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, we are in a very important debate right now over taxes. The Republican Party is working for middle-class tax relief, and the liberal Members of the Democrat Party and the President are working against middle-class tax relief. I think it is ironic that a President who ran in 1992 on a platform of supporting middle-class tax relief is now fighting middle-class tax relief.

As my colleagues know, once the President was elected, his first act in 1993 was to pass the largest tax increase in the history of this country. Now, we are at another debate. For the first time in 16 years, because of a Republican majority in the House and Senate, we have an opportunity to give significant tax relief, and yet we are being accused of all kinds of things and we are having to fight for this.

It is interesting, because 76 percent of the people who will benefit from the

tax relief have a household income of \$75,000 or less. Only 1 percent of those who are going to have a tax benefit have a household income of over \$200,000, yet we are being accused of giving a tax break for the wealthy.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know what it is with the liberal psyche that being wealthy is synonymous with being evil. It is interesting, because entrepreneurs and people who tend to be wealthy create jobs in this country, and yet liberals seem to hate the job-creator.

I strongly believe that we need tax relief for the middle-class, and will the entrepreneurs also benefit from it? Yes, they will. Is it bad? Well, I always take the case of Ted Turner. I am from Georgia. Ted Turner has brought CNN to Atlanta. He has created hundreds and hundreds of jobs. Is it bad? No; it is not. Will Ted Turner get some tax relief? Yes; he will. Is that horrible? What is so bad about that, I ask my liberal colleagues? Yet, we do not hear from them about that. All we hear is well, we just do not want the rich to get tax breaks. As I said, Mr. Speaker, 76 percent of the tax relief goes to families with a household income of under \$75,000.

Now, what is it that the liberals and the President are backing away from? We seem to be in a gridlock right now on the \$500-per-child tax credit, and the way the Republican bill is, is that middle-class families with children under 17 years of age and with household incomes of under \$110,000 will get a \$500-per-child tax credit. Now, what does the President want to do? Well, he wants to use that tax credit to give another welfare benefit to people who are not paying taxes. So what has happened with a President who has promised middle-class tax relief, and also, incidentally, promised welfare reform, and only reluctantly passed welfare reform last year, now is trying to go back on that?

Welfare enrollment has decreased 15 percent. There are less people dependent on the U.S. Government now than there were 1 year ago, and yet the President wants to fly in the face of all of that, break the spirit of that bipartisan legislation, if you will, by giving people who are not working a \$500-per-child tax credit on top of something that we are already doing called the earned income tax credit, which is a benefit from going from welfare to work, and it is something that has had bipartisan support, and yet the President wants to say, no, that is not good enough, we are going to give you one more giveaway program. We are going to give you \$500-per-child for every child you have while you are not paying taxes.

Common sense would tell us, Mr. Speaker, that is a ridiculous thing to do, particularly when we have at stake 11 million middle-class children whose parents desperately need tax relief for education needs, for medical needs, for shelter, for food, and so forth like that.

I am a father of four small children. Most of my friends, Mr. Speaker, are in

the sandwich generation, if you will. That is, their parents are dependent on them or close to being dependent on them, and their children are dependent on them. I can say as I line up in the carpool line and as I go out to the Tee-ball field and I go out to the soccer field, and my wife is a proud soccer mom, I will say that the parents out there desperately need tax relief.

Now, they are not coming out here in Washington and protesting, they are not writing letters, they are not sending us faxes every minute, and the reason why, Mr. Speaker, is because they are out working. These are folks who work 8, 9, 10 hours a day, 5 days a week. They want tax relief, but they do not have paid professional lobbyists who can go out and campaign for it. We just have to do it on our own and we have to do the right thing.

This is the good old American middle-class who is getting squeezed year after year, they need tax relief, they do not need the President expanding welfare, they do not need the fun and games of politics, they do not need more big liberal programs. They need tax relief, and I urge my colleagues to support in a bipartisan fashion the Republican tax bill passed by the Committee on Ways and Means.

NO FUNDING FOR B-2 BOMBER

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

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to address myself to a serious issue that is coming before the Congress tomorrow, and that is our defense appropriation budget. There is an item in there that I will seek to eliminate by virtue of an amendment by the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] and myself, which would be to strike the funding for the B-2 bomber.

In this time of budgetary constraints, Congress must learn to prioritize our defense dollars. As such, Congress should not authorize the additional procurement of aircraft we do not need and the Pentagon clearly has stated they do not want.

In testimony before the House Appropriations Subcommittee on National Security on June 11, 1997, Pentagon comptroller, John Hamre, testified that while the B-2 is an exceptional aircraft, there is no more money for it. The massive deep attack weapons mix study conducted by the Pentagon concluded that it would not be cost-effective to buy more B-2 bombers. According to the Pentagon, the current fleet of 21 B-2 bombers is sufficient to meet the two-war scenarios. No money is programmed in any budget plan to pay for the outyear costs that will be forced by this decision. Other programs given higher priority by the military may have to be cut back.

Finally, the Congressional Budget Office projects that to build and operate