Why do Democrats call for higher spending and attack Republicans as extremists for cutting spending while at the same time attacking Republicans for failing to exercise fiscal discipline? Why?

**SUPPORT EDUCATION SAVINGS ACCOUNTS**

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

Mr. Pitts. Mr. Speaker, last year, the President vetoed the Education Savings Accounts bill that passed both Houses of Congress.

The American people have clear evidence of what Republicans have been saying for years now. The Republican Party is the party of reform. The other party is the party that will defend the education special interests at any price.

One party introduces real reforms with proven results. The other party talks a great game. But when it comes to reform, well, talk is about as far as it goes. If it is a choice between reform and the status quo, they pick the status quo every time.

Offering parents who desire nothing more than to send their children to a good school or at least to a better school is what this is about. Offering parents tax-free savings accounts that can be used for extra tutoring, special education needs, supplementary education materials, or a school in a better part of town is what this legislation is all about.

I urge both Democrats and Republicans who think that these are worthwhile goals to help parents do what is best for their kids. Support our tax bill which includes education savings accounts.

**CHAIRMAN GREENSPAN SAYS “MOVING ON TAX FRONT MAKES A GOOD DEAL OF SENSE”**

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

Mr. Weldon of Florida. Mr. Speaker, Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan recently testified in a way that my colleagues will never ever hear quoted by the other side. In fact, none of the mainstream newspapers appear to see fit to publish this portion of his remarks, save, of course, for the Wall Street Journal editorial page.

Chairman Greenspan said that he would delay tax cutting unless, and here is the key part, “unless, as I’ve indicated many times, it appears that the surplus is going to become a lighting rod for major increases in outlays. That’s the worst of all possible worlds, from a fiscal policy point of view, and that, under all conditions, should be avoided.”

In other words, Mr. Speaker, Chairman Greenspan is saying get the money out of Washington before the liberals spend it. Give it back to the people.

He goes on from there to say, “moving on the tax front makes a good deal of sense to me.” Those are the actual words of Chairman Greenspan, not the spin of the White House or the distortions of those on the other side who are forgetting to include the critical portion of the Federal Reserve Chairman’s remarks.

**REPUBLICAN TAX RELIEF PACKAGE BENEFITS AMERICANS**

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

Mr. Bartlett of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, what would the Republican tax relief package mean to Americans? It would mean that, for many Americans who cannot obtain health insurance through their employers, obtaining health insurance would become easier.

It would mean that more seniors would be able to pass on the family farm or the family business to their children. It would mean that people who save for their future and for their children would be able to get a greater return on their savings.

It would mean that ordinary Americans would see their paychecks go up a little bit, giving them more options, more choices about working, working overtime, or meeting the family budget.

It would mean that paying off those credit card debts would be a little easier. It would mean that married couples would not be penalized so heavily for being married.

Lower taxes means that people would have more control over their lives, over their time, and over their futures.

With a $3 trillion surplus over the next several years, is that really such a terrifying concept?

**TRIGGER MECHANISM ALLOWS RESPONSIBLE TAX CUTS**

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

Mr. Kuykendall. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strong support for the trigger mechanism that we put in the House tax cut bill. This trigger provides a safeguard from incurring massive deficits to finance the tax cuts. It is a simple provision.

If interest paid on the national debt does not go down, then across-the-board tax cuts are delayed until the next year.

It recognizes that budget projections are just that, projections; and if the

**WHY IS TAX RELIEF A THREAT TO DEMOCRATS?**

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

Mr. Shimkus. Mr. Speaker, why is the idea of giving tax relief to taxpayers so upsetting to many Democrats?

Could it be that Washington would rather have more money to spend, and the politicians on that side would rather spend more money?

Why is it that Democrats refuse to acknowledge that the Republicans, the Republicans, have passed lockbox legislation to protect Social Security and Medicare while Democrats in the other body have blocked Social Security lockbox legislation?

Why do Democrats mischaracterize the effect of the Republican tax relief package on the national debt, ignoring the $2 trillion in debt reduction that we provide for?

Why do Democrats refuse to admit that the Republican proposal allocates $2 for Social Security and Medicare for every $1 in tax relief?

Why is the new Washington spending not a threat to fiscal discipline where-as tax relief is?