

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY,
NOVEMBER 6, 1995

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at noon on Monday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TUESDAY,
NOVEMBER 7, 1995

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Monday, November 6, 1995, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Tuesday, November 7, for morning hour debates.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR
WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON
WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

□ 1500

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NETHERCUTT). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WISE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. WISE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BURTON addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

THE DEMOCRATS: AFRAID THE
PARTY IS OVER?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SCARBOROUGH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, earlier this morning I was amused by what I heard from many of the Mem-

bers on the Democratic side coming up and talking about how off base the new Republican majority was in planning to balance the budget and cut taxes. We heard one Member come up and say it was going to be the end of the Republican party; that they were going to pay, because they were absolutely outraged at these tax cuts that we were forcing on the American people.

Another Member came up and said that he was proud of what they did in 1993, that they helped bring down the debt, and that the Republicans were being mean-spirited because these tax cuts would hurt senior citizens, these tax cuts would hurt middle-class Americans, these tax cuts would hurt everybody: dogs, cats, you name it. The Democrats think if you cut taxes, it is going to hurt all of America.

The facts are these: Americans are taxed more today than they have ever been. Those Members that came up, proud of what they did in 1993 and not liking what we are doing today, forgot to mention one thing. In 1993, the Democratic Party, without the help of one Republican vote, passed the largest tax increase in the history of America. What did that tax increase do to those senior citizens who they now claim to want to protect? It raised taxes on senior citizens. In fact, it stole money from senior citizens and their Social Security funds by raising the tax rate to 85 percent.

If that was not enough, if their assault on Social Security was not enough in the 1993 tax increase, they decided to make sure that seniors would be punished for being productive. So what did they do? They lowered the earnings level from \$34,000 to \$14,000. Heaven forbid that our senior citizens dare to make a positive impact on our economy after they retire and get on Social Security.

I tell you, they talk about wanting to help the working class, and then they criticize tax breaks that are going to help the working class. Somehow they have not gotten past the old, worn-out 1960's radical notion that you can love jobs and you can love job creation, but you have to hate the person that creates the jobs. It makes absolutely no sense.

I guess all these Democrats coming out and kicking and screaming, saying no, please, please, save the American people from tax cuts; explain why on the cover of U.S. News and World Report this week there is a story that says "The Democrats: Is the Party Over? They know they are in trouble, and it is even worse than they think."

I would suggest that one of the reasons that the party is over for the liberal Democratic Party in America is because they have consistently been enemies of working-class Americans. They have consistently voted for higher and higher taxes. Any Democrat you hear speaking today on the budget most likely voted in 1993 for the largest tax increase in the history of America.

Despite what they say about wanting to protect senior citizens' wages and

wanting to protect Medicare and wanting to protect Social Security, facts are a hard thing to shake. The fact is, it was the Democratic Party that voted to raise taxes on senior citizens and on Social Security recipients. How they can come up 2 years later with a short memory and criticize the Republican Party in the most just absolutely extreme terms imaginable is beyond me. They call us Nazis because we want to preserve and protect Medicare.

My gosh, the spokesman for the President of the United States said we wanted Medicare to die and probably wanted senior citizens to die, also. This is not the talk of a rational party, this is the talk of people who know that the curtain is coming down on 40 years of the most radical governing concepts that have ever invaded Washington, DC. We are moving beyond that, we are daring to make a difference, we are daring to empower American taxpayers and the middle class again. That is what we do. Hopefully the Democrats will come on board.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Ms. MCKINNEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. MCKINNEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maine [Mr. LONGLEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. LONGLEY addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

CONTINUATION OF REPORT INTO
TAXPAYER SUBSIDIZED LOBBY-
ING IN WASHINGTON, DC

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MCINTOSH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to continue our report on the Subcommittee on Regulatory Relief's investigation into taxpayer-subsidized lobbying that goes on here in Washington. Most recently, our subcommittee has uncovered a group known as the National Council of Senior Citizens that receives 95 percent of its funding, or \$73 million, from the taxpayer each year.

The NCSC, as it is known, is organized as a nonprofit 501(c)4 corporation. It gets its grant money mainly to operate programs that are to benefit senior