

defense. These tax breaks for the wealthy are evidence that Republican values are out of step with the American people. I hope we will heed the advice of the Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan who warned that, and I quote, the time is not right for whopping tax breaks. I call upon cooler heads to prevail so that we can use this surplus to strengthen Medicare and Social Security to keep faith with our parents and with our children, give tax relief to middle-class families and reduce the Federal debt.

□ 1030

REPUBLICAN PLAN PUTS FIRST THINGS FIRST

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

Mr. HILL of Montana. Mr. Speaker, are tax cuts good for America? Should we have a fairer, simpler Tax Code? Should the excess taxes projected to be paid by the American people over the next 10 years be used as the President and the Democrats propose for massive new spending or should some of it be returned to the taxpayers?

The President says we should do first things first. Last fall, he said we should set aside 100 percent of Social Security for Social Security. But then he proposed a budget that said, no, let us just set 62 percent aside for Social Security and use the other 38 percent for new spending.

By putting spending over saving the President has put first things last. The Republican plan does put first things first. It starts by saying, let us hold the line on spending. Then it says 100 percent of Social Security for Social Security. Then it says, pay down the debt \$2 trillion and set aside 2 hundred billion for Medicare reform and a pharmacy benefit and then reform taxes with simpler, lower, fairer taxes for virtually every American.

This Republican plan is a good plan, it is the right plan for America.

VOTE AGAINST ATTACHMENTS TO D.C. APPROPRIATION

(Ms. NORTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues are about to have an out of body legislative experience. When the D.C. appropriation comes to the floor shortly, they will be asked to appropriate somebody else's money. Worse, a local budget that has no business here will become an excuse for attachments that are anathema to the people I represent.

In our Federalist system no action is regarded as more oppressive than na-

tional usurpation of local law. The Republic will not fall if my colleagues vote against these attachments. It will be weakened if they do what they would not stand for in their own districts and vote to tell local residents how they may spend their own local funds.

Please vote against the attachments to the D.C. appropriation.

WE NEED TAX REFORM NOW

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

Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, last week I was proud to support the largest tax cut in a decade. It is one of the things that I was sent here to Congress to do. But as my colleagues know, Mr. Speaker, paging through this bill, all 500 pages of it, I was reminded again of how tax relief is not enough. Congress must do more. Congress must deliver tax reform and do it now.

Earlier this year I caught another glimpse of that need when a constituent of mine sent me some letters, a case that he is working on with the IRS. In his letters, he has letters from the IRS promising to get back to him on April 19, May 19, June 18, July 16, and most recently, August 16.

It is time to stop this bureaucratic run-around. It is time that we scrapped the IRS code and replaced it with a simpler, fairer code and a tax code that works for taxpayers, not the other way around.

REPUBLICAN TAX PLAN, A BLUE-PRINT FOR FISCAL IRRESPONSIBILITY

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

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I take the contrary view. The Republican tax bill is the new definition of fiscal irresponsibility.

We have a historic opportunity to pay down the national debt. But the Republican plan not only ignores debt retirement, it requires \$155 billion in additional spending on interest on the national debt.

The party that says it loathes government spending proposes \$155 billion in extra spending, not on education, not on veterans health care, not on the environment, but on the Federal equivalent of a credit card service charge. Moreover, the Republicans refuse to extend the solvency of Social Security and Medicare and instead give a huge tax break for the wealthy and special interests. They rejected the democratic plan that makes Social Security and Medicare the first priority.

Mr. Speaker, our Nation's current and future retirees deserve more than that.

Finally, the Republican tax bill gives 65 percent of the tax breaks to the wealthiest 10 percent. The richest 10 percent do not have trouble paying for their children's education, their parents' long-term care, or their own health care premiums. Only the Democratic plan offers targeted class relief for the middle class.

A DIFFERENCE IN PHILOSOPHY

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

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring some truth back into this whole debate about our government surpluses. Here is what the Republican Congress has proposed: \$2 trillion toward reducing the national debt, far more than the President and the Democratic party has proposed; stopping the raid on the Social Security Trust Fund; putting \$200 billion into shoring up Medicare; and if after those goals are achieved, our constituents continue to pay their taxes, give hard-working American working families tax relief.

The Democrats' and the President's plan? Raid Social Security by the tune of \$341 billion, increase the national debt, do not put as much down to the national debt as we do, and keep all of the extra money in Washington. If Americans overpay their taxes, the President, and the Democrats want to spend the money.

The difference is not tax cuts or debt reduction; the difference is tax cuts or new spending on new Washington programs.

The President put it best when he said in Buffalo, New York to a packed crowd of 35,000 people:

"We could give you your money back, but we wouldn't be sure that you would spend it right."

Mr. Speaker, that is the difference. It is a difference in philosophy. We think people should get more of their own money after we start paying down debt, after we stop the raid on Social Security.

KEEPING PACE WITH MEDICAL TECHNOLOGY

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

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning to tell all of my colleagues about a brave 6½ year-old girl named Keeley Woodruff from Beaumont, Texas. Yesterday, Keeley braved Vagus Nerve Stimulator implant surgery to stop the more than 50 epileptic seizures that she has suffered daily since she was 1½ years old. Well, this stimulator has proved to be a safe and