

□ 1000

ATLANTA TRAGEDY GOOD EXAMPLE OF WHY WE NEED GUN CONTROL

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this morning I wish to rise and offer our sympathy to the people of Atlanta, to those who have lost their loved ones and those who are now recovering in Atlanta's hospitals, to Mayor Campbell and the elected officials to which I know that, being the largest number of mass killings in the history of that city, this and yesterday were tragic days.

That is why I think this recent vote was most important. As we move toward conference to be able to establish this conference's and this Congress' position on protecting our youth and having a reasonable and rational response to gun violence in America, it is important to be able to have effective background checks.

What a tragedy that this individual, this alleged perpetrator had a background of violence; and, yet, he was allowed, until we get further facts, seemingly, to get guns.

This Nation must stand up against the proliferation of guns in this country fairly and responsibly. We must do it together. Republicans and Democrats. Mr. Speaker, I look forward to us saying to the American people enough is enough.

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 whereas tax relief is?

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 lightning 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

projections are overestimated, the tax cut will be deferred, avoiding additional debt.

There is no question that Americans are overtaxed and deserve to keep more of their hard-earned dollars. But tax relief, no matter how desirable, must be provided responsibly. That is what the House's tax cut accomplishes.

It is critical that this trigger mechanism stays in the legislation as it comes out of the conference committee.

Tax cuts must be dependent upon tax reduction. I urge the House conferees to keep this responsible provision. Not only is it fiscally responsible, it is plain common sense.

TRIGGER MECHANISM IN TAX BILL PROVIDES FOR TAX RELIEF AND DEBT REDUCTION

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

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, on the tax cut and on the debt reduction, we are interested in both. We developed a trigger last week when we passed our tax bill that accomplishes the assurance that we are going to pay down the debt. The Senate is putting in a provision in the tax bill that it sunsets after 10 years.

Additionally, we are working on a new trigger that is based on revenues. It says, in effect, that, if the revenues are not there, we are not going to have these kinds of tax cuts.

So the first portion that comes in from increased revenues would be to expand spending. The next portion would be to pay down the debt. What is left over from that would be additional tax cuts.

Let me just give my colleagues a fact that is interesting in terms of the overzealous taxation. We are talking about doing away with 10 percent of the income tax. If we did away with all of the personal income tax, revenues coming into the Federal Government would still be greater, larger than they were in 1990. That is how fast government is growing. That is how we are sucking the taxes out of Americans' pockets.

Let us leave more of that money in the pocket of the people that earned it.

PEOPLE WHO PAY TAXES ARE WEALTHY, ACCORDING TO THE DEMOCRATS

(Mr. HEFLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have never once heard a Democrat talk about who pays the taxes. I have never heard even a single Democrat cite this remarkable statistic: The top 50 percent of income earners pay 96 percent of the taxes, while the bottom 50 percent pay only 4 percent of the taxes.

Now, let me repeat that, and let me be a little more precise. The top 50 percent of income earners, according to the latest IRS data, pay exactly 95.7 percent of the total Federal income taxes. The bottom 50 percent, those with incomes below \$23,160, the bottom 50 percent pay only 4.34 percent of the total Federal income tax in the country. In other words, low income earners pay almost no Federal taxes at all.

That is why any tax cut is immediately labeled tax cut for the wealthy. Even the \$500 per child tax credit that passed 2 years ago, which was available to all families except the wealthy, was called tax cuts for the wealthy by the other side.

If one is a taxpayer, Democrats think one is wealthy, and one should not have one's tax reduced under any circumstances.

GODSPEED TO REV. DOUGLAS ZIMMERMAN AND HIS YOUTH MISSION TEAM

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, the Reverend Douglas Zimmerman of St. Thomas Episcopal Parish in Miami, Florida has always been known for his unselfish giving and his invaluable service to his parish and community.

Among his many gifts are the precedents he sets and the ways in which he leads children by example into following Biblical teachings.

This Monday, August 2, Reverend Zimmerman will, once again, instruct students to give of themselves as he organizes a group of seven dedicated students and four adults who have volunteered part of their summer vacation to lend a helping hand to underprivileged families in Central America.

During this mission trip, Reverend Zimmerman and his dedicated team of 11 will travel to Honduras, a country which was ravaged by Hurricane Mitch, to establish places of refuge for families which have been left desolate.

They will bring light to a world of darkness by providing children and their families with the basic necessities which we often take for granted. During their 9-day trip, the mission team will have the unique opportunity of building a House of the Lord, a church where individuals, families, and entire communities can gather.

In light of his many contributions, we congratulate Reverend Zimmerman and the St. Thomas Episcopal Parish youth mission team, that they will have a fortunate journey this summer.

TAXES AND REGULATORY COSTS AMOUNT TO ONE-HALF OF AMERICANS' INCOMES

(Mr. DUNCAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, the national media has created some very false impressions about the tax cut legislation passed by the House.

First, the tax cut amounts to less than 30 percent of the projected surpluses over the 10-year period of the bill.

Second, in separate legislation, we have set aside more than 70 percent of the surpluses to help pay down the national debt and in a lockbox to meet future needs of Social Security and Medicare.

Third, we added language that says that tax cuts will not kick in if the surpluses do not come in as projected.

Fourth, this is a tax cut spread over 10 years, with the cuts during the first 5 years amounting to only 1½ percent of Federal revenues over that period.

The tax cuts are very moderate, and the Republicans in the House have set aside more than 70 percent of the future surpluses for debt reduction, Social Security, and Medicare.

Mr. Speaker, the average taxpayer pays almost 40 percent of his or her income in taxes now and another 10 percent in government regulatory costs that are passed on to the consumer in the form of higher prices. One-half of everybody's income is too much. Let us give a little bit of it back.

RAISE MINIMUM WAGE

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

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to highlight an important issue that is currently being neglected by the House, the dire need for a raise in the minimum wage for our Nation's workers.

Both sides of the aisle recognize the advantages of new legislation. For this reason I question our delay in moving forward. Our hesitation is leaving cupboards empty as American families struggle unnecessarily.

Today's minimum wage leaves families at 19 percent below the equivalent 1979 poverty level. There is no excuse for this abhorrent fact to continue into the year 2000.

□ 1015

An increase in the minimum wage gives us the unique opportunity to give gifts of security and comfort to the American people. I believe that by stalling on this pertinent issue, we are directly denying our constituents the chance to live the American Dream.

Opponents of increasing the minimum wage would have us believe an increase in the minimum wage would cause employees to lay off workers; that it would hurt the poorest workers and destroy the economy. But I ask,