[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 gentlewoman 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

nine additional B–2 bombers over the next 20 years could cost over $27 billion.

□ 1345

Let me read a variety of editorials that have appeared in the papers around America.

Stuart News, Port St. Lucie, FL, ''U.S. Must Get Maximum Bang for Military Bucks.''

The cost of these programs is staggering, especially considering the strategic fact that the threats that they are designed to counter do not now exist or, like the B–2 bomber, are designed to attack countries that no longer exist.

They are urging we look at first providing for military pay, for military housing, for the readiness of troops, rather than expensive technological equipment that the Air Force and the Pentagon themselves do not support.

The Atlanta Constitution: ''Pentagon is Not a Welfare Agency.''

There is, however, one notable exception to that trend. Last week, the House Appropriations Committee approved a defense budget for 1997 of $245.8 billion, $11 billion more than the Pentagon says it needs, and the Pentagon is not known for underestimating its needs.

Unfortunately, each additional dollar that we spend on defense is a dollar not available for schools,

for infrastructure, or for deficit reduction.

While other nations invest their wealth in those areas, we build B–2 bombers.

''Don't Sacrifice Military Readiness,'' by the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

Another case is the $2.2 billion for each B–2 bomber, which, again, the Pentagon doesn't want, but which Members of Congress do, to keep weapons contractors and jobs alive in their district. President Clinton himself insists on yet another *Seawolf* submarine to keep the production lines open to build other submarines in the future. Meanwhile, maintenance on helicopters, tanks, trucks, and warships is being deferred. Military pay raises are paltry, and the quality of housing for men and women in uniform isn't as good as it should be.

No; because we are spending billions on a B–2 bomber that the Pentagon does not want.

Milwaukee Journal Sentinel: ''Bring Military Budgets Back to Earth.''

In fact, Congress in recent years has actually padded the military budget

for projects like the B–2 bomber,

that are relics from the cold war and pork-barrel goodies for hometown military contractors.

The evidence against the B–2 is overwhelming. The debate really needs to be about helping people in uniform have decent pay so they are not on food stamps, living in decent housing, like most Americans would like them to live in.

So we have a choice this week, to support the continued expenditure of massive dollars to weapons systems that we no longer need, or we can clearly change direction and focus on priorities that would make this Nation militarily sound and safe.

I urge my colleagues tomorrow to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FOLEY] to strike the B–2 bomber from funding, to close the production line, to allow the military to continue to have its 20-some B–2 bombers, but clearly understand since the end of communism and Soviet dominance in the cold war, the need for the B–2 bomber has been significantly reduced. Significantly reduced.

Let us look forward to helping make the military strong by supporting their good intentions, and not give them things they have chosen not to ask for.

## THE DEMOCRATIC TAX CUT PROPOSAL RESTORES FAIRNESS TO THE AMERICAN TAXPAYER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CHAMBLISS). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Indiana [Ms. CARSON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. CARSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about justice and fairness. When we were children our parents instilled in us a sense of fairness. We were taught to be equitable and impartial and truthful when dealing with others. We were taught to aid those in need. Obviously, all of us in this body took that to heart, and that is why we are here as we pursue public service on behalf of the public.

Let us consider the budget amendment in general, however. Rather than stay within the parameters of the balanced budget agreement which passed the House overwhelmingly, the Republican framers of the tax cut have decided not to play fair, and to abandon the agreement. The original agreement contained a provision to provide at least $35 billion in tax credits for college education. Yet, the Republicans have offered us only $22 billion in education tax credits, in direct violation of the budget agreement.

It seems as though this sense of fairness has been lost on those framing the tax cuts, because they are attempting to undercut the agreement that was made with the President, and will deny American taxpayers $13 billion in tax relief. We should at least play fair and restore this provision of the tax cut.

According to the Department of the Treasury, two-thirds of the Republican tax cuts go to families making beyond $100,000 a year. The majority of constituents in my district, Indianapolis, IN, of which nearly 50 percent make less than $25,000 a year, they certainly will be not happy, they will be unhappy to learn the fact that the Republican tax cut will go to families making over $100,000 a year, for the most part.

I rise to support the Democratic alternative to the Republican tax cut package. Unlike the Republican proposal, the Democratic proposal restores some fairness to the American taxpayer and stays within the parameters of the budget agreement.

In general, the Democratic tax proposal will target its cuts to those making less than $100,000 a year, not the other way around. Seventy-one percent of the Democratic tax cuts will go to nearly 91 million families across the United States that make under $100,000 a year. Twenty-three percent of the Democratic tax cuts will target the most vulnerable of our society, those making under $21,000 a year.

The Democratic alternative will truly allow families to stretch their budget further and provide true tax relief, rather than just smoke and mirrors. I am particularly pleased with the education tax cut initiatives in the Democratic proposal. If we are going to truly effect positive change in our society, provide our young people the chance to improve our Nation's future, we must provide them with the opportunity to access the best education possible.

The Democratic alternative provides more money for the HOPE scholarship, provides incentives for employer-provided educational assistance, and provides a source of cost-free capital for desperately needed school construction; at least $37 billion worth of tax cuts for education. It provides $15 billion more education initiative than the Republican plan does.

Under the Democratic proposal, HOPE scholarship tax credits are provided at a rate of 1,100 for 1997 through 1999, increasing to $1,500 per student after the year 2000.

At Indiana University at Indianapolis, tuition costs $2,400 a year. At Ivy Tech State College, it runs $1,500 a year. The Democratic HOPE tax credit will provide for nearly 50 percent of the tuition at those two referenced universities.

I would encourage, Mr. Speaker, this august body to consider what is fair and adopt the Democratic alternative, so we will truly be providing both HOPE and fairness for our constituents.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about fairness. When we were children, our parents instilled in us a sense of fairness. We were taught to be equitable, impartial, and truthful when dealing with others. We were taught to aid those in need. Obviously, all of us in this body took this message to heart. Otherwise, we would not have chosen a life of public service. Yet I am sad to say that in examining the recent Republican tax cut initiative, some of my colleagues have abandoned these principles.

First, consider the budget agreement in general. Rather than stay within the parameters of the balanced budget agreement which passed in the House overwhelmingly, the framers of the Republican tax cut have decided not to play fair and to abandon the agreement. The original agreement contained a provision to provide at least $35 billion in tax credits for college education. Yet the Republicans have offered us only $22 billion in education tax credits, in direct violation of the Budget Agreement. It seems as though this sense of fairness has been lost on those framing the tax cuts, because they are attempting to undercut