

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR  
WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON TO-  
MORROW

Mr. WELLER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

## TIME FOR A TAX CUT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WELLER. Madam Speaker, I have the privilege of representing one of the most diverse districts in America. I represent the south side of Chicago and the south suburbs in Cook and Will Counties, industrial communities like Joliet, bedroom communities like Morris and New Lenox, farm towns like Tonica and Mazon.

I hear one common message as I travel throughout this very diverse district and listen to the concerns of the people I have the privilege of representing. That message is fairly simple. That is, the American people want us to work together, they want us to come up with solutions to the challenges that we face.

When I was elected in 1994, I was elected with that message of finding solutions and finding ways to change how Washington works, to make Washington more responsive to the folks back home.

□ 1745

We were elected, of course, to bring those solutions to the challenges of balancing the budget, and raising take-home pay by lowering taxes, and reforming welfare and taming the IRS. But there were a lot of folks here in Washington who said, you know, those are challenges that you will never solve, that you will never be able to do that, and they said it just could not be done. And I am proud to say tonight that we did. We did do what we were told we could not do. I am proud that our accomplishments include the first balanced budget in 28 years, the first middle class tax cut in 16 years, the first real welfare reform in a generation and the first ever reform of the IRS. Our efforts produced a balanced budget that has now generated a projected surplus of extra tax revenue of \$2.3 trillion over the next 10 years. We now have a \$500 per child tax credit that is going to benefit 3 million children in my State of Illinois. Welfare reform that has succeeded in reducing welfare rolls by 25 percent, and taxpayers now enjoy the same rights with the IRS that they have in a courtroom. For the first time taxpayers are innocent until proven guilty.

Madam Speaker, these are real accomplishments of this Congress, and I am proud to have been part of those accomplishments, but we also have greater challenges ahead of us.

Because this Congress held the President's feet to the fire, we balanced the budget, and now we are collecting more in taxes than we are spending, something new here in Washington, and the question before this House and this Congress in Washington is: What do we do with that extra tax revenue, \$2.3 trillion, an extra tax revenue? We are collecting more than we are spending.

I think it is pretty clear. There was an agreement, a bipartisan agreement, that the first priority for this extra tax revenue is to save Social Security, to make sure that we keep Social Security on sound footing for our seniors and future generations, and I do want to note that last fall the Republican House passed and sent to the Senate legislation that would earmark 90 percent of the surplus of extra tax revenue for saving Social Security. Now this year President Clinton says he only needs 62 percent; we can save Social Security with 62 percent. Well, we agreed that at a minimum we should set-aside 62 percent of surplus tax revenues for saving Social Security.

Of course the question is: What do we do with the rest? Bill Clinton says that we should save Social Security and then spend the rest, the remaining 38 percent of surplus tax revenues, on new government programs, on big government. I disagree and say that we should save Social Security and we should raise take-home pay by lowering taxes.

The question is pretty simple before this House: Whose money is it to start with?

You know, if you think about it, if you go to a restaurant, and you buy a meal, and you find that you overpay, the restaurant will usually say, wait a second, you have given us too much, you should take this back. You have paid too much, and that extra money they should get back to you. Well, it is clear today that this government is collecting too much, and it is time to give that too much back in a tax cut.

There is a pretty simple question again. It is do we want to save Social Security and spend the rest of the surplus tax revenue, or do we save Social Security and give it back for working families, give it back by eliminating the marriage tax penalty and rewarding retirement savings?

You know the Tax Foundation tells us that today's tax burden is too high. The average family in Illinois sends 40 percent of its annual income, its earnings, its salary, to government at local, State and Federal levels. Forty percent of your income goes to government at one level or another. And I also want to note that the IRS tells us that since Bill Clinton was elected President in

1992, taxes collected by the Federal Government from individuals and from families have gone up 63 percent. The tax burden on America's families is the highest ever.

My colleagues, we can save Social Security, we can eliminate the marriage tax penalty. Let us save Social Security, and let us lower taxes for working Americans.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PRO-  
VIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF  
H.R. 99, TEMPORARY EXTENSION  
OF FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINIS-  
TRATION PROGRAMS

Mr. DREIER (during the special order of Mr. PAUL), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106-4) on the resolution (H. Res. 31) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 99) to amend title 49, United States Code, to extend Federal Aviation Administration programs through September 30, 1999, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

CONGRESS RELINQUISHING THE  
POWER TO WAGE WAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. PAUL. Madam Speaker, I have great concern for the future of the American Republic. Many Americans argue that we are now enjoying the best of times. Others concern themselves with problems less visible but smoldering beneath the surface. Those who are content point out that the economy is booming, we are not at war, crime rates are down, and the majority of Americans feel safe and secure in their homes and community. Others point out that economic booms, when brought about artificially with credit creation, are destined to end with a bang. The absence of overt war does not negate the fact that tens of thousands of American troops are scattered around the world in the middle of ancient fights not likely to be settled by our meddling and may escalate at any time.

Madam Speaker, the relinquishing of the power to wage war by Congress to the President, although ignored or endorsed by many, raises serious questions regarding the status of our Republic, and although many Americans are content with their routine activities, much evidence demonstrating that our personal privacy is routinely being threatened. Crime still remains a concern for many with questions raised as to whether or not violent crimes are accurately reported, and ironically there are many Americans who now