

□ 1415

PHILOSOPHICAL DIFFERENCES ON
TAX RELIEF

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

Mr. ROGAN. Mr. Speaker, there is a great philosophical divide between we Republicans and the Democrats when it comes to the issue of tax cuts. For the 40 years that the Democrats controlled this Chamber, they ended their reign by giving America the highest tax increase in American history. For 2 years the Republicans have controlled this Chamber, and in each Congress we have offered a tax cut for middle class families. Democrats consistently oppose these tax cuts because the less money that gets to come back to Washington by way of the IRS means there is less money available for them to spend on their favorite projects.

We Republicans believe that those people who go to work each day ought to be able to keep more of their hard-earned money to spend for their families. The choice is simply this: If American taxpayers really believe that they do not have enough common sense to spend the money they earn for their families, then they should support the liberal rhetoric that supports high taxes. If, on the other hand, families believe that they ought to be able to make spending decisions for their families, they should support the Republican plan to cut taxes for the middle class.

THE CHOICE IS CLEAR

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

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, this week Democratic and Republican negotiators will decide what sort of tax bill to send to President Clinton. I think the choice is very clear. We can give them the Republican bill, with handouts for the rich, or the Democratic bill, with help for the rest.

As far as I am concerned parents working full time and making \$30,000 a year or less need a lot more help than corporate frequent flyers who use company jets for personal use and then want a tax exemption for it.

The Democratic bill, Mr. Speaker, helps hospitals and will send 214,000 more Massachusetts students to college, and it is a far better bill than the Republican bill, that will cut \$70,000,000 from Massachusetts hospitals and do very little to help students.

The Republican bill skimps on tax breaks for students. It shortchanges lower income working families, it gives enormous tax breaks to the very rich, and it gives handouts to the people who need a leg up, and for people making less than \$93,000. It is a bad idea, Mr. Speaker. I urge my colleagues to reject it.

TUITION CREDIT ASPECTS OF TAX
PROPOSALS

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

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, while the Republican tax bill is loaded with benefits for the rich, it offers little to make higher education affordable for the rest of us. The Democratic tax cut, in contrast, provides a credit of up to \$1,500 in tuition for 2 years of community college.

For example, if you go to a college where the tuition is \$1,500 you will get a full \$1,500 tax credit. Compare that to the Republican plan, where you get only 50 percent of tuition costs up to \$3,000. The \$1,500 tuition bill will get you only a \$750 credit, or half as much.

The Democratic plan would allow employers to continue to deduct tuition expenses. Therefore, millions of workers who are hitting the books to improve their skills through employer-paid plans would be allowed to continue. The Republicans would end the deduction, and put an end to many of those programs.

That is why the Republicans are getting an F for their education plan from student and business groups nationwide. Building opportunity for more Americans by making education affordable is one of the building blocks of the Democratic tax cut. We urge the President to continue to fight for this provision as the negotiations continue.

IN OPPOSITION TO TRADE
BARRIERS BETWEEN STATES

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

Mr. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, this past weekend the Los Angeles Times ran an insightful article about the cooperative spirit of the California delegation. In the spirit of this bipartisanship, I along with my Republican colleague, the gentleman from California, Mr. FRANK RIGGS, and the California delegation have urged the Governor of Florida to repeal an egregious law which unfairly targets small wineries.

Under this law, if a Florida resident orders a bottle of wine from another State, the vintner, the delivery person, and the unsuspecting consumer are all guilty of felonies, punishable by up to 5 years in prison and a \$5,000 fine.

Mr. Speaker, none of us wants trade wars. Florida's own attorney general is against this questionable legislation. Our small wineries are critical to the economy of my district and to the entire State of California. They should not be subject to unfair and extreme trade barriers within this great Nation. Mr. Speaker, we must support the rights of small businesses and interstate commerce.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER
PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SNOWBARGER). Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5 of rule I, the Chair announces that he will postpone further proceedings today on each motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 4 of rule XV.

Such rollcall votes, if postponed, will be taken after debate has concluded on all motions to suspend the rules, but not before 5 p.m. today

SHACKLEFORD BANKS WILD
HORSES PROTECTION ACT

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 765) to ensure maintenance of a herd of wild horses in Cape Lookout National Seashore.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 765

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Shackleford Banks Wild Horses Protection Act".

**SEC. 2. MAINTENANCE OF WILD HORSES IN CAPE
LOOKOUT NATIONAL SEASHORE.**

Section 5 of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for the establishment of the Cape Lookout National Seashore in the State of North Carolina, and for other purposes", approved March 10, 1966 (16 U.S.C. 459g-4), is amended by inserting "(a)" after "SEC. 5.", and by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(b)(1) The Secretary, in accordance with this subsection, shall allow a herd of free roaming horses in the seashore.

"(2) Within 180 days after enactment of this subsection, the Secretary shall enter into an agreement with the Foundation for Shackleford Horses (a nonprofit corporation established under the laws of the State of North Carolina) to provide for management of free roaming horses in the seashore. The agreement shall—

"(A) provide for cost-effective management of the horses; and

"(B) allow the Foundation to adopt any of those horses that the Secretary removes from the seashore.

"(3)(A) The Secretary shall accommodate the historic population level of the free roaming horse herd in the seashore, which shall be considered to be not less than 100 horses and not more than 110 horses.

"(B) The Secretary may not remove, or assist in or permit the removal of, any free roaming horses from Federal lands within the boundaries of the seashore unless—

"(i) the number of free roaming horses in the seashore exceeds 110;

"(ii) there is an emergency or a need to protect public health and safety, as defined in the agreement under paragraph (2); or

"(iii) there is concern for the persistence and viability of the horse population that is cited in the most recent findings of annual monitoring of the horses under paragraph (4).

"(4) The Secretary shall annually monitor, assess, and make available to the public findings regarding the population structure and health of the free roaming horses in the national seashore.

"(5) Nothing in this subsection shall be construed as creating liability for the United