

commercial or other proprietary data from the Federal Aviation Administration shall be subject to the provisions of section 1905 of title 18, United States Code, pertaining to unauthorized disclosure of such information.

(g) TRAVEL AND PER DIEM.—Each member of the Commission shall be paid actual travel expenses, and per diem in lieu of subsistence expenses when away from such member's usual place of residence, in accordance with section 5703 of title 5, United States Code.

(h) DETAIL OF PERSONNEL FROM THE FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION.—The Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration shall make available to the Commission such staff, administrative services, and other personnel assistance as may reasonably be required to enable the Commission to carry out its responsibilities under this section.

### SEC. 3. REPORT OF THE COMMISSION.

(a) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 30 days after receiving the final report of the Commission and in no event more than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Transportation, after consulting the Secretary of Defense, shall transmit a report to the Committees on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, Appropriations, and Finance of the Senate and the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, Appropriations, and Ways and Means of the House of Representatives.

(b) CONTENTS.—The Secretary shall include in the report to Congress under subsection (a) a final report of findings and recommendations of the Commission under section 2(b), including any necessary changes to current law to carry out these recommendations in the form of proposed legislation.

### SEC. 4. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There is authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this Act.

## INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO ELIMINATE THE PERSONAL EXEMPTION PHASE-OUT AND THE ITEMIZED DEDUCTION PHASE-DOWN

### HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 6, 2001*

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing three pieces of legislation to refine the tax proposal put forward by President Bush. Let me state at the outset that I fully support President Bush's tax proposal as he laid it out. I think it is appropriate for the times and well-designed. Even so, there is no legislation or proposal that cannot be improved upon. And so I offer these three bills in this spirit and in the belief that the President in all likelihood would and should support them.

This bill takes as its starting point the income tax rate reductions proposed by President Bush, phased-in over ten years. I have included these rate reductions to provide the context for my proposed refinement, which is to repeal the phase-down of itemized deductions and the phase-out of personal exemptions contained in the current code. These provisions are sometimes known by the names of Pease and PEP, the former named for its originator. Congressman Don Pease, a distinguished Member of the Ways and Means Committee during the 1986 Tax Reform Act,

and the latter an acronym for personal exemption phases-out.

The income tax contains a number of unfortunate provisions that phase-out various credits, exemptions, and deductions. For example, the amount an individual can take as itemized deductions falls for married taxpayers with adjusted gross income (AGI) over a \$132,950 threshold. These taxpayers see a reduction in their total itemized deductions at the rate of 3 percent for every \$1,000 earned over the threshold. The proportion of a taxpayer's itemized deductions that can be lost due to this provision is capped at 80 percent of their otherwise allowable deductions. Similarly, for 2001 a taxpayer's allowable personal exemptions are reduced by 2 percent for every \$2,500 over and above \$199,450 in AGI. This provision raises the marginal tax rate by .8 percent for affected taxpayers.

The itemized deduction phase-down and the personal exemption phase-out exist for only one reason—to increase taxes on the affected taxpayers. Even more troubling, they do so by significantly increasing tax complexity. Even worse, they raise taxes by raising marginal rates and they do so, not through an explicitly higher statutory tax rate, but through a hidden device.

The reduction of marginal tax rates is a hallmark of the Bush tax proposal. High marginal tax rates discourage people from investing, saving, creating new businesses, and so forth. Reducing these rates is therefore one of the effective things we can do to ensure a stronger economy in the future. The bill I am introducing today eliminates two hidden marginal tax rate increases and is, therefore, completely consistent with the strategy of the Bush tax rate reductions.

The bill I am introducing today is also fully consistent with sound tax policy because it makes the tax code more transparent. Taxpayers ought to be able to determine with little effort the tax consequences of their economic decisions. Hidden marginal rate increases are therefore inconsistent with sound tax policy and ought to be eliminated.

Further, everyone involved in tax policy agrees that the tax code is too complex, too costly to comply with, and too costly to administer. This bill certainly does not sweep away all the cobwebs of complexity, but it will make the code simpler for those affected by these two provisions.

## IN RECOGNITION OF THE ACHIEVEMENTS OF DR. RAYMUND PAREDES, ASSOCIATE VICE CHANCELLOR AT UCLA

### HON. HILDA SOLIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 6, 2001*

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the achievements of Dr. Raymund Paredes, the Associate Vice Chancellor at UCLA. Dr. Paredes opened the doors of opportunity for many students from Los Angeles County through his leadership, direction and execution of academic development programs. He has served not only as a professional role models for Latinos across the United States, but most importantly as a positive role model to the residents of the 31st Congressional District.

He exemplifies how one person's commitment to public education can make tremendous changes towards improving our educational system. Raymund Paredes obtained his B.A., in English from the University of Texas at Austin, in 1964. He went on to earn his M.A. American Studies at the University of Southern California, 1969, and returned to the University of Texas at Austin for his Ph.D. in American Civilization, in 1973.

Dr. Paredes joined the faculty of UCLA's English Department in 1973. His research has focused on Mexican American literature and culture and the impact of demographic change on American culture, art, and education. A driving force in the emergence of Chicano studies as a discipline, he introduced Chicano literature courses to the UCLA curriculum and chaired the César Chávez Center for Chicana/o Studies from 1997 until 1999. He also served as an Associate Dean in the Graduate Division, overseeing the graduate fellowships unit as well as affirmative action programs from 1986 to 1989.

As Associate Vice Chancellor, Academic Development since 1989, Raymund has been engaged in a broad range of activities encompassing K-12 and community college outreach, faculty recruitment and retention, curricular development, promotion of cultural and academic events, and, most recently, establishment of Community Education Resource Centers in five Los Angeles neighborhoods. He also worked on outreach in his capacity as Special Assistant to UC President Richard Atkinson from 1998 to 2000.

Dr. Paredes has long believed that by setting high expectations for students, they will eventually overcome their challenges. Dr. Paredes has been a strong advocate for the establishment of educational partnerships that lead to successful pipelines between high schools and four-year colleges, as well as between community colleges and Universities. He has played a most important role in outreach to the most disenfranchised communities in the state of California. He has helped further the goals of the first successful summer academy for migrant students from California.

Dr. Paredes has served as an appointed member to the Task Force on Latino Eligibility by the University of California from 1992-1997. He has also served as an appointed member of the Advisory Committee on Latino Education by the California State Department of Education, has served as an appointed member of the California Commission for the Establishment of Academic Content and Performance Standards, has served as the co-chair of the Committee on K-12 educational research for the Inter-University Program for Latino Research and currently he is a Consultant on education to the Univision television network.

Dr. Paredes' true contributions to UCLA, the University of California, and the community at large far exceed the span of his myriad responsibilities. A champion of educational access, equity, and diversity, he has been a highly effective ambassador and leader on behalf of those causes. He has spearheaded landmark programs and forged relationships between the University and important local institutions—vital bonds that will endure because of his commitment and persistence.

Sadly, Dr. Paredes is leaving his position at UCLA, as he will be assuming the position of

Director of Creativity, Culture and Arts Programs at the Rockefeller Foundation in New York.

On behalf of the 31st Congressional District, I thank Dr. Paredes for your leadership, your service and most importantly for your commitment to improving the quality of life for students in the state of California.

**IF MEDICARE CAN BUY A PROSTATE BIOPSY FOR \$178, WHY SPEND \$506?**

**HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 6, 2001*

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, Medicare pays different amounts for various medical procedures, depending on where the service is performed. In general (but not always), we pay more for a procedure in a hospital outpatient department, less for the same procedure in an ambulatory surgical center, and often even less when that procedure is performed in a doctor's personal office.

Some people—the very frail or those who are quite sick—often need to be cared for in a setting where intensive support services can be quickly provided. But for most, these various procedures can be performed safely in a variety of settings.

For those who do not need back-up support, it would seem that Medicare ought to pay no more than the lowest cost site of service. I've introduced legislation to ensure that type of savings—savings that would run into the hundreds of millions per year.

The following letter from a group of doctors describes why we should enact this change—ASAP.

FEBRUARY 14, 2001.

Representative PETE STARK,  
Cannon House Office Building,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE STARK: We are a group of six urologists. We are writing this letter to voice our concerns about, and ask for your help in clarifying/rectifying HCFA reimbursement policy as it relates to site of service payments.

To briefly summarize, three routine and frequently performed urology procedures are reimbursed at very different rates when performed in a physician's office versus an ambulatory surgical center. The procedures, corresponding CPT codes and associated payments are:

CPT code and description	Office pmt.	ASC pmt.
52000 Cystourethroscopy .....	\$179	\$418
52281 Cystourethroscopy w/urethral calibration/dilation	232	569
55700 Prostate biopsy .....	178	506

As you can see, if the bill for these procedures is sent to Part A Medicare instead of Part B Medicare the reimbursement is tremendously higher. This is true even though they are exactly the same service provided with identical equipment.

The Medicare Payment Advisory Commission (MedPAC) has stated "All else being equal, Medicare should pay for ambulatory care based on the service, not the setting in which it is provided." AUA Health Policy Brief, Page 5, December 1998). The major cost drivers of providing these services are basically identical regardless of site of service (cost of cystoscopes, ultrasound imaging

equipment, power tables, sterilization equipment, light sources, irrigation fluid, ancillary personnel, and cost per square foot of space). We believe this present policy adversely and unfairly affects all providers who aren't owners of an ASC as well as Medicare beneficiaries.

Medicare beneficiaries are concerned about access and quality of care. Presently we provide these services at four locations. Without a level reimbursement policy concerning site of service, we will have to consider closing some offices and congregating all or most of these procedures at one centrally located ASC.

**INTRODUCTION OF NO GUNS FOR VIOLENT PERPETRATORS ACT**

**HON. DENNIS MOORE**

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 6, 2001*

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, today I join with twelve of my colleagues in introducing legislation that will help protect our communities by keeping guns out of the hands of our most violent criminals.

As an elected District Attorney for twelve years, I know that tough enforcement of our current laws is vital to keeping our communities safe. One of these federal laws in existence makes it illegal for convicted felons to possess a firearm. But would it surprise you to know that there is no similar prohibition on possession of a firearm by a person who has a juvenile adjudication of a violent crime? That is a fact. And it is a narrow loophole in the law that should be closed.

A constituent who owns a gun store in my district, Bob Lockett, brought this loophole to my attention. An individual with a conviction for a shooting death as a juvenile in California tried to purchase gun parts at his store. The State of Kansas has a law making it illegal for persons with a juvenile adjudication of a violent crime to possess a firearm. Therefore, when a search discovered the prior conviction, Mr. Lockett was able to prevent the purchase and notify the authorities. I commend Mr. Lockett for his actions and for bringing this matter to my attention.

Mr. Speaker, although I am grateful that Kansas has such a law, I believe that this should be a federal law to prevent violent perpetrators from possessing firearms nationwide. These individuals with a violent past should be prohibited from possessing firearms.

During my years as a District Attorney, I found that, to the victim of a violent crime, it makes little difference whether the perpetrator was an adult or a juvenile. I believe we all can agree that violent persons should not be able to legally possess a firearm.

Mr. Speaker, persons who have a juvenile adjudication for a violent felony should never possess a firearm. I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

**THE ALTERNATIVE MINIMUM TAX REPEAL ACT OF 2001**

**HON. MAC COLLINS**

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 6, 2001*

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the The Alternative Minimum Tax

Repeal Act of 2001 which will repeal the individual Alternative Minimum Tax (AMT). The domestic tax system has dramatically changed since the creation of the AMT regime. Consequently, this tax regime has long outlived its purpose. Today, the AMT is punitive in nature, overly cumbersome and affects taxpayers who were never intended to fall into this tax trap. To immediately reduce the number of wage earners who are affected, my legislation will extend the current-law provision which allows personal tax credits to be applied against the AMT calculation. The proposal will also immediately increase the AMT income exemption level, originally added to the AMT structure in 1993, so that it is adjusted to reflect inflation since that time. Subsequently, it will increase the exemption amount annually by 10 percent. In addition, the bill will repeal the income limitation that currently applies to that exemption. Finally, at the end of a ten year period, the individual AMT will fully be repealed.

Included in the tax plan outline presented by President George W. Bush, was a statement in support of additional tax code changes that would provide relief from the Alternative Minimum Tax. Please join me by cosponsoring this important legislation. Eliminating the AMT will reduce the complexity of the tax code and remove another heavy burden shouldered by wage earners.

**INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO REDUCE THE CORPORATE TAX RATE TO 33 PERCENT**

**HON. PHILIP M. CRANE**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 6, 2001*

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing three pieces of legislation to refine the tax proposal put forward by President Bush. Let me state at the outset that I fully support President Bush's tax proposal as he laid it out. I think it is appropriate for the times and well-designed. Even so, there is no legislation or proposal that cannot be improved upon. And so I offer these three bills in this spirit and in the belief that the President in all likelihood would and should support them.

The bill I am introducing takes as its starting point the income tax rate reductions proposed by President Bush, phased-in over ten years. I have included these rate reductions to provide the context for my proposed refinement, which is to reduce the top corporate income tax rate to 33 percent to be consistent with the top individual income tax rate in the Bush proposal of 33 percent.

The driving force of the Bush tax program is the importance of reducing tax rates. This is manifested in the reduction in the statutory tax rates, but also in such provisions as the doubling of the per child credit, the effect of which is to soften the high effective tax rates many lower-income taxpayers face due to the phase-out of the Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC). When we reduce these "marginal" tax rates, we reduce the most important disincentives our tax system imposes on work effort, saving, and investment. Think of it! Just as an individual or a family starts to climb the economic ladder they face a marginal tax rate of almost 50 percent thanks to the combination of the federal individual income tax, the